

# JANDAKOT AIRPORT COMMUNITY AVIATION CONSULTATION GROUP MINUTES OF MEETING

<b>CACG MINUTES OF MEETING</b>	
<b>Meeting Date:</b> Wednesday, 01 June 2016 <b>Time:</b> 16:00 <b>Location:</b> JAH Airport Management Centre, 16 Eagle Drive Jandakot	
<b>Members Attending</b>	<b>Observers/Advisers Attending</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CACG Chairperson – Steve Klomp</li> <li>▪ Banjup Residents Group – Malcolm Wilcox</li> <li>▪ City of Canning – Cr. David Brown</li> <li>▪ City of Gosnells – Andy Brighthouse</li> <li>▪ City of Melville – Cr. Clive Robartson</li> <li>▪ Jandakot Airport Holdings – John Fraser</li> <li>▪ Jandakot Airport Operators Group – John Douglas</li> <li>▪ Jandakot Airport Chamber of Commerce – Jack Garber</li> <li>▪ Jandakot Residents &amp; Ratepayers Association – Leanne Chaproniere</li> <li>▪ Royal Aero Club of WA – Linda Maule</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Aircraft Noise Ombudsman – Ron Brent</li> <li>▪ Aircraft Noise Ombudsman (Deputy) – Tim Abberton</li> <li>▪ Airservices Australia – Chris Murray</li> <li>▪ Airservices Australia – David Moore</li> <li>▪ Airservices Australia – Neil Hall</li> <li>▪ Dept. of Infrastructure – Rod Channon</li> <li>▪ Dept. of Infrastructure – Marcelo Alves</li> <li>▪ Dept. of Transport WA – Peter Ryan</li> <li>▪ Dept. of Planning WA – Craig Shepherd</li> <li>▪ Jandakot Airport Holdings – Sarah Harris (CACG Secretariat)</li> <li>▪ Jandakot Airport Holdings – Joanne Wann</li> </ul>
<b>Member Apologies/Absence</b>	<b>Observer/Adviser Apologies</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ City of Cockburn – Andrew Trosic</li> <li>▪ Heliwest Group – Alan Bailey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Civil Aviation Safety Authority – Craig Peterson</li> </ul>
<b>1 Attendance/Apologies</b>	
<p>1.1 Meeting attendance and apologies are noted above.</p> <p>1.2 Malcolm Wilcox has replaced Dino Elpitelli as the Banjup Residents Group representative on the CACG. The Chairperson acknowledged the contribution Dino Eliptelli had made to the CACG.</p>	
<b>2 Previous Minutes</b>	
<p>2.1 The previous minutes were accepted as a true and accurate record of the meeting and can now be made available on the Jandakot Airport website.</p>	Secretary
<b>3 Matters Arising from Previous Minutes</b>	
<p>3.1 Previous minutes item 3.1 – the Department of Infrastructure is finalising the induction package that was issued to the CACG members for comment. The draft version of the CACG induction documents will be provided to Malcolm Wilcox.</p> <p>3.2 Previous minutes item 8.2 – feedback was sought from members regarding whether the minutes of the September 2015 meeting would still be a true and accurate record of the meeting if comments made by John Douglas regarding a tabled letter were removed. John Douglas stated that the letter had been tabled for discussion by a CACG member and that he does not consider his recorded statement as being offensive. Steve Klomp advised that as the purpose of the CACG is for different views to be shared it is appropriate for the published minutes to remain. Mr Klomp noted that any members tabling a document for discussion should consider the content being submitted and to expect different views to be expressed at the meeting.</p> <p>3.3 John Douglas queried the protocol for members of the public to respond to published CACG minutes. Steve Klomp advised that the CACG, like most organisations and groups, operates under a hierarchical system and members of the public should go through their community representative or send general queries to the Chairperson through the secretariat. Email protocol will be discussed further under General Business (agenda item 8).</p>	Secretary

# JANDAKOT AIRPORT COMMUNITY AVIATION CONSULTATION GROUP MINUTES OF MEETING

<p>3.4 Clive Robartson asked whether the process for approving minutes could be achieved in a shorter timeframe than the 3 months between meetings so that the community is better aware of current discussions. It was agreed that draft minutes of CACG meetings can be published on the CACG webpage once members have had seven days to review the draft minutes and there are no contentious issues regarding the record of minutes. If there is a significant objection to the record of minutes then the draft minutes will not be published on the CACG webpage until ratified at the next meeting. Draft minutes will still need to be formally accepted at the following meeting even if there are no issues raised during the review by members. Once minutes are ratified the final version will replace the draft version on the CACG webpage. The Secretary will endeavour to distribute the draft minutes for review within 2 weeks of the CACG meeting.</p> <p>3.5 Jack Garber put forward a motion for the Jandakot Airport Master Plan and Major Development Plans to be tabled at CACG meetings to provide consultation as a group in accordance with point 2 of the CACG Terms of Reference that states that the role and purpose of the CACG is to “complement the consultative requirements established for Master Plans and Major Development Plans”. Mr Garber does not believe that the CACG has provided a consultative view on Master Plan 2014. Andy Brighouse and Linda Maule commented that the word “complement” in the Terms of Reference statement is understood to mean that the CACG participants provide information to the people they represent regarding what is being planned and to encourage a response during the public comment period. It was agreed that no amendment is required to the Terms of Reference. John Fraser noted that the process for Master Plan and Major Development Plan consultation is stipulated in the <i>Airports Act 1996</i> and the timings of CACG meetings may not always coincide with the timings defined by the <i>Act</i>.</p>	Note
<b>4 Airservices Australia Update</b>	
<p>4.1 David Moore apologised for this being the second time where the Perth Basin Aircraft Noise Information Report was not published prior to the CACG meeting. Airservices has a small team preparing all of the airport reports and it is sometimes difficult to get them all published before the respective CACG meetings.</p> <p>4.2 Airservices will be moving to online reporting and is currently in discussions with the Aircraft Noise Ombudsman regarding the proposed changes. Airservices anticipates that the online reports will be available within a week after each quarter and will feature interactive graphs. In the future information will become available monthly. Complaint analysis will be focused on the issue of complaint, rather than the number of complainants, and information will become categorised as known issues, new issues and resolved issues. David Moore expects to be able to provide a demonstration of the online reporting at the next CACG meeting.</p> <p>4.3 During April there were 22 complainants with 10 different issues. Three complainants were from Canning Vale while the others were all from different suburbs. Helicopters were the main issue – 1/3 of the complaints related to emergency services aircraft. Malcolm Wilcox commented that he lives close to the airport and agrees that helicopter noise is an issue. Mr Wilcox queried whether WebTrak could show a specific identifier when the movement is for emergency services. David Moore will discuss this with WebTrak and Airservices personnel. John Douglas noted that typical helicopter pilots would not be flying throughout the night, so if the activity is at an unusual time there would be a reason for the helicopter operating.</p> <p>4.4 A Canning Vale resident identified what appeared to be an aircraft near-miss on WebTrak and sent a letter regarding his observation to a number of local, state and federal agencies. The raw radar data was reviewed by Airservices and the closest the two aircraft came in proximity was 1km. The computer processing the radar information for WebTrak was unable to differentiate the specific tracks of the aircraft when they did get close due to the aircraft using the same transponder code. This is very common - aircraft operating under visual flight rules within the Jandakot Control</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">D. Moore</p> <p style="text-align: center;">D. Moore</p>

# JANDAKOT AIRPORT COMMUNITY AVIATION CONSULTATION GROUP MINUTES OF MEETING

<p>Zone (3 nautical mile radius of the airport) will squawk the same transponder code as this allows Perth Air Traffic Control to ignore these aircraft. It was noted that WebTrak is a display tool and the altitude variance can be +/- 400ft, depending on factors such as aircraft altimeter accuracy, barometric pressure, distance from the radar head (at Perth) and the computer processing the information for WebTrak.</p>	
<b>5 Overview of the Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF)</b>	
<p>5.1 The Aircraft Noise Ombudsman and Deputy Aircraft Noise Ombudsman presented an overview of the Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) system.</p> <p>5.2 The ANEF is often used as the principle tool to identify the noise an airport generates. It is a composite noise index that seeks to create a single line that indicates the level of aircraft noise that can be expected at a specific location. It allows planning authorities to determine whether an area is exposed to 'acceptable' or 'unacceptable' noise.</p> <p>5.3 The noise contour formula was determined through a dose survey that sought to align objective noise levels and the subjective response to that noise. The dose survey was conducted in 1978 and the report published 1982.</p> <p>5.4 The ANEF treats 90 flights at 68 decibels exactly the same as 180 flights at 65 decibels. This is because senses respond in logarithmic scale – a 3 decibel change (which is the minimum noise change that is considered perceivable) represents a doubling of numbers. The ANEF calculation also uses a weighting factor of 4 for night time (defined as 7pm to 7am) flights, so a flight every hour between 10pm to 6pm is considered the same as a flight every 20 minutes between 8am to 6pm. The assumption of noise being 4 times worse at night compared to day noise was determined during the dose survey in 1978, when the high level of annoyance experienced at night was mostly because the aircraft interfered with the analog TV reception.</p> <p>5.5 There is an incorrect perception that a noise monitor can prove or disprove an ANEF. The ANEF uses noise information for different aircraft types, with noise levels specified at various distances from the runway threshold. These specified noise levels are based on set conditions – straight flight tracks, temperature 15C, barometric pressure of 1013.2 hectopascals, 14.8 km/hr headwind, and flat topography. The ANEF is also a 20 year forecast. When the Airbus A380 was being developed the manufacturer did not have noise readings, so airports used the noise levels for a Boeing 747 in the initial ANEF calculations. The Airbus A380 is quieter than the B747, resulting in ANEF contours shrinking when the ANEF was recalculated using actual A380 data.</p> <p>5.6 The ANEF assumes that being inside a normal non-insulated house with an open window will cut noise by 10 decibels. In reality this depends on factors such as what material the window is constructed of, how big the window is and where it is located, whether there is any shrubbery near the window etc.</p> <p>5.7 It is widely agreed that the ANEF understates general aviation noise as it over emphasises noise levels and under emphasises noise frequency. The ANEF contours generally don't go far beyond general aviation airport boundaries, and the circuit paths are rarely within the ANEF footprint.</p> <p>5.8 Of the 79 residents who have contacted the Airservices Noise Complaints and Information Service over the past 6 months regarding Jandakot Airport aircraft noise, only 4 of these residents are within the ANEF contour area.</p> <p>5.9 In the ANO's experience, a person's reaction to aircraft noise is largely determined by their expectations. Because noise is highly subjective it is important to provide as much information as possible about what noise and activity they can expect. The ANEF does not tell a person what level of noise they can expect. The ANO considers the noise above contours to be much more meaningful, as they show the number of daily noise events that can be expected above a specific level of decibels (usually 60, 65 and/or 70). Airports are increasingly using noise above contours to provide</p>	

# JANDAKOT AIRPORT COMMUNITY AVIATION CONSULTATION GROUP MINUTES OF MEETING

	<p>information about the movement volume and noise level. The contour lines represent a daily average, so the ANO encourages airports to also identify the minimum and maximum daily events. The ANO suggests replacing lines with shaded zones as there is still a perception that noise stops at the contour line.</p> <p>5.10 Standards Australia will shortly be publishing a new book about how to describe noise so that ideally the entire aviation industry uses the same language when providing information about noise.</p> <p>5.11 John Douglas noted that local operators are concerned about the Calleya Estate residential development in Banjup. The area is outside of the ANEF, but it is located directly under the runway 06/24 circuit path and aircraft will be overhead at around 700 feet. On a busy day this will be a considerable amount of aircraft going overhead maybe every few minutes. The Calleya developers had to monitor the water table for 1-2 years before construction and Mr Douglas queried whether developers should also be required to monitor aircraft noise and provide that information to prospective purchasers. Ron Brent commented that noise monitoring in development areas would be a useful tool for developers to demonstrate the current noise impact.</p> <p>5.12 Jack Garber queried whether the ANO has 'tips and tricks' for aircraft operators and flying schools to lower noise levels. Ron Brent advised that every airport is different, and the airport's Fly Neighbourly program should identify what can be done. The ANO noted the significant noise improvement at Jandakot Airport that resulted from the small change of having simulated engine failures conducted over the runway. This improvement was identified through discussions with the ANO, Airservices, airport and local operators following a complaint from a member of the public. Analysing noise complaint data is a part of this process – by determining the key complaint issue the relevant stakeholders can then discuss what improvements can be made around that issue.</p> <p>5.13 Malcolm Wilcox stated that most people affected by aircraft noise will usually complain once and then give up when there is no change. Ron Brent agreed, noting that the process between complaint and resolution will affect actual complaints made. The ANO estimates that for the aviation industry maybe only as few as 1 in 600 people unhappy with aircraft noise will actually complain because most people don't know who the complaint goes to and there is no expectation of any resolution.</p>	
<b>6 Jandakot Airport Update</b>		
	<p>John Fraser provided an update on the development of Jandakot Airport.</p> <p>6.1 MASTER PLAN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Jandakot Airport Master Plan 2014 was approved by the Minister for Infrastructure and Regional Development on 17 February 2015. The Jandakot Airport Chamber of Commerce has lodged an Administrative Appeals Tribunal action against the Ministerial decision on Master Plan 2014. The hearing is listed in July 2016.</li> </ul> <p>6.2 AVIATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A draft Major Development Plan (MDP) for the extension of runway 12/30 and construction of associated taxiways has been submitted to the Minister for Infrastructure and a decision is expected this month. Runway 12/30 is proposed to be extended from 990m to 1,508m.</li> <li>▪ The Jandakot Airport Chamber of Commerce has applied for a stay action on the MDP through the Administrative Appeals Tribunal. The Justice will make his decision this week.</li> </ul> <p>6.3 INFRASTRUCTURE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The City of Cockburn has tendered the South Link Road intersection (with Jandakot Road, Berrigan Drive and Dean Road) works. Pending final agreement on the funding arrangements, construction is expected to commence by the end of this year.</li> <li>▪ Jandakot Airport Holdings has proposed a dual lane intersection at the</li> </ul>	

# JANDAKOT AIRPORT COMMUNITY AVIATION CONSULTATION GROUP MINUTES OF MEETING

<p>Berrigan Drive / Karel Avenue entrance to the airport. The City of Cockburn is withholding approval to proceed until the Southern Link Road intersection funding agreement is finalised. These works will be conducted on completion of the Southern Link Road to minimise traffic impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Environmental studies are complete for the East Link Road (northern airport boundary connecting to Johnson Road, Canning Vale). An MRS amendment is now underway.</li> </ul> <p>6.4 COMMERCIAL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Site 25 – construction of a 120 room hotel is expected to commence this year.</li> <li>▪ Site 315 – construction of a 1,200m<sup>2</sup> office and 5,000m<sup>2</sup> workshop for PCS is complete.</li> <li>▪ Site 506 – construction of a 1,600m<sup>2</sup> office building for Schlumberger is complete.</li> </ul> <p>6.5 ENVIRONMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Due to the time constraints of this meeting an environmental update will be provided by Joanne Wann, JAH Environment Manager, at the next meeting. Malcolm Wilcox noted that he is particularly interested in the Jandakot Underground Water Protection Area and the measures that the Airport takes to protect the water source.</li> </ul>	J. Wann
<b>7 Correspondence</b>	
<p>7.1 Further correspondence was received from Mr Ryan regarding his request for the September 2015 CACG meeting minutes to be amended (see item 3.2).</p> <p>7.2 The President of the Banjup Residents Group advised that Malcolm Wilcox would be replacing Dino Elpitelli as the representative on the CACG.</p>	
<b>8 General Business</b>	
<p>8.1 Steve Klomp addressed the emails that have been circulating between CACG members with the wider community being copied in. As Chairperson, Steve expects courtesy to be shown during meetings and in all correspondence. Steve outlined his requirements for CACG email etiquette:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ anyone who is mentioned in an email has a right to receive a copy of that email;</li> <li>▪ email content must be courteous and suitable to be read by anyone;</li> <li>▪ all emails sent by the CACG secretary will be blind-copied (bcc'd) to the distribution list to ensure members email details are not inappropriately distributed or used;</li> <li>▪ written responses are to be made to the Chairperson through the Secretary. The CACG functions through a hierarchy and there is no need to copy everyone else in the email.</li> </ul> <p>Jack Garber commented that not being able to make other members aware of responses amounts to censorship and he takes exception at having to send his comments to the Secretary who then determines what is shared. Steve Klomp advised that he expects all correspondence to be forwarded to the Chairperson to decide a course of response.</p>	Note
<b>9 Next Meeting</b>	
9.1 The next meeting will be held Wednesday 31 August 2016.	Note
Meeting Closed 18:10	