

**Question on notice no. 162**

**Portfolio question number: SQ24-001363**

**2024-25 Supplementary budget estimates**

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport Committee, Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts Portfolio**

**Senator Bridget McKenzie:** asked the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts on 14 November 2024—

- (1. There were 56 community and feedback information sessions or stalls run by the Department of Infrastructure. Only two were held in the suburb of Luddenham, which is the closest to the airport, and only three took place in Penrith. Can the Department explain why communities such as the Blue Mountains received more?
2. Why has the Department deleted the information page relating to the community information sessions as on the 12/11/2024?
3. The community of Linden and Woodford in the Blue Mountains submitted over 550 submissions. Can the Department confirm whether the submissions were created in a campaign form, not individual concerns?
4. With such a low population, compared to other impacted communities, why was the decision made to alter the flight paths that would substantially benefit the Woodford and Linden communities in the final EIS?
5. What were the reasons and considerations for the Department's decisions to change the flight paths over Linden and Woodford?
6. What were the 26 LGA's that the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications, and the Arts letterboxed information to?
7. Could the Department list any other communities that have benefitted from the changes made for the final EIS?
8. What consideration for changes was given to the whole electorate of Lindsay, who made close to 1000 submissions from the Department's submission report. Could the Department explain why there were not considerable changes to a community of over 120,000 but changes were made for a community with a much smaller population of around 2500?
9. Have all possible flight path alternatives now been considered by the Department?
10. Once the Western Sydney International Airport opens, how will the Department ensure that the Reciprocal Runway Operations Noise Abatement Procedure is implemented consistently whenever conditions permit, and what measures will be in place to monitor and enforce adherence to this procedure?

**Answer —**

Please find answer attached

**Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport**

**QUESTION ON NOTICE**

**Supplementary Budget Estimates 2024 - 2025**

**Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts**

**Committee Question Number: 162**

**Departmental Question Number: SQ24-001363**

**Division/Agency Name: DIV - International Aviation Technology and Services**

**Hansard Reference: Written (14 November 2024)**

**Topic: Stakeholder engagement**

**Senator Bridget McKenzie asked:**

1. There were 56 community and feedback information sessions or stalls run by the Department of Infrastructure. Only two were held in the suburb of Luddenham, which is the closest to the airport, and only three took place in Penrith. Can the Department explain why communities such as the Blue Mountains received more?
2. Why has the Department deleted the information page relating to the community information sessions as on the 12/11/2024?
3. The community of Linden and Woodford in the Blue Mountains submitted over 550 submissions. Can the Department confirm whether the submissions were created in a campaign form, not individual concerns?
4. With such a low population, compared to other impacted communities, why was the decision made to alter the flight paths that would substantially benefit the Woodford and Linden communities in the final EIS?
5. What were the reasons and considerations for the Department's decisions to change the flight paths over Linden and Woodford?
6. What were the 26 LGA's that the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications, and the Arts letterboxed information to?
7. Could the Department list any other communities that have benefitted from the changes made for the final EIS?
8. What consideration for changes was given to the whole electorate of Lindsay, who made close to 1000 submissions from the Department's submission report. Could the Department explain why there were not considerable changes to a community of over 120,000 but changes were made for a community with a much smaller population of around 2500?
9. Have all possible flight path alternatives now been considered by the Department?
10. Once the Western Sydney International Airport opens, how will the Department ensure that the Reciprocal Runway Operations Noise Abatement Procedure is implemented consistently whenever conditions permit, and what measures will be in place to monitor and enforce adherence to this procedure?

**Answer:**

1. From the release of the preliminary flight paths on 27 June 2023 to the end of the public exhibition of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on 31 January 2024, 35

community information and feedback sessions, including supplementary sessions held by Airservices Australia were held across the Sydney Basin, each for a duration of 3–5 hours. During this period, 19 community information stalls were also held, each for a duration between a full day and half a day. 2 online sessions were also held between the release of the preliminary flight paths and the end of the public exhibition of the Draft EIS.

The locations and quantity of community events were informed by the objectives of the Engagement Plan (refer to Section 9.2 of the EIS), being to:

- build awareness and educate impacted communities and key stakeholders about the airspace and flight path design process, proposed changes and how it will impact them through information that's relevant, timely, consistent, coordinated, and accessible;
  - ensure impacted communities and key stakeholders understand how their feedback can influence airspace and flight path design; and
  - ensure impacted communities and key stakeholders have felt they had the opportunity to have their say during public exhibition of the Draft EIS.
2. This page was not deleted from the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications and the Arts' website. The [wsiflightpaths.gov.au](http://wsiflightpaths.gov.au) site underwent an update on the 7 November 2024 to facilitate the publication of the final EIS. The page referred to was moved as part of this update and is available at [www.wsiflightpaths.gov.au/contact-us](http://www.wsiflightpaths.gov.au/contact-us).
  3. The department received a mix of both individual and form submissions from the communities of Linden and Woodford in the Blue Mountains. More details can be found in the Submissions Report at [www.wsiflightpaths.gov.au/pdf-documents/eis-documents/WSI\\_EIS\\_Submissions\\_Report.pdf](http://www.wsiflightpaths.gov.au/pdf-documents/eis-documents/WSI_EIS_Submissions_Report.pdf).
  4. The description, rationale and assessment of refinements are provided in Appendix G – Assessment of the refinement to the project in the EIS, available at [www.wsiflightpaths.gov.au](http://www.wsiflightpaths.gov.au).
  5. As above.
  6. For the release of the preliminary flight paths a letter box drop was undertaken to 922,435 residential and business addresses across the following 12 LGAs.
    - Blacktown City Council;
    - Blue Mountains City Council;
    - Camden Council;
    - Campbelltown City Council;
    - Cumberland City Council;
    - Fairfield City Council;
    - Hawkesbury Shire Council;
    - Hill Shire Council;
    - Liverpool City Council;
    - City of Parramatta Council;
    - Penrith City Council; and
    - Wollondilly Shire Council.

For the release of the draft EIS the department cobranded with Airservices Australia for a letter box drop to 1.6 million addresses in the following LGAs.

- Bayside Council;
  - Blacktown City Council;
  - Blue Mountains City Council;
  - Camden Council;
  - City of Campbelltown;
  - City of Canada Bay;
  - City of Canterbury-Bankstown;
  - City of Hawkesbury;
  - City of Lithgow;
  - City of Liverpool;
  - City of Parramatta;
  - City of Penrith;
  - Cumberland City Council;
  - Fairfield City Council;
  - Hornsby Shire;
  - Inner West Council;
  - Ku-ring-gai Council;
  - Municipality of Burwood;
  - Municipality of Strathfield;
  - Northern Beaches Council;
  - Oberon Shire;
  - Sutherland Shire;
  - The Hills Shire;
  - Wingecarribee Shire;
  - Wollondilly Shire;
  - 2508 (Helensburgh and surrounds, City of Wollongong); and
  - 2251, 2256, 2257 (Lower Central Coast, Central Coast Council).
7. Suburbs and localities that benefit from the refinements are set out in Appendix G – Assessment of the refinement to the project, the Addendum Technical paper 1: Aircraft noise and the Submissions Report.
  8. All submissions that suggested alternative flight paths have been considered. A description of the process applied in considering alternative flight paths following community consultation is provided in section 6.3.3 of Chapter 6 of the EIS.
  9. As above.
  10. Airservices Australia, as the national Air Navigation Service Provider, will be responsible for operationalising the preliminary flight paths, including the Reciprocal Runway Operations-Noise Abatement Procedure (RRO-NAP), including any relevant conditions of approval.