



**COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA**

**PARLIAMENTARY STANDING  
COMMITTEE**

on

**PUBLIC WORKS**

**Reference: Extension on the main runway at Adelaide International Airport**

**ADELAIDE**

**Friday, 7 February 1997**

**OFFICIAL HANSARD REPORT**

**CANBERRA**

JOINT COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC WORKS

Members

Mr Andrew (Chair)

Mr Hollis (Deputy Chair)

Senator Calvert  
Senator Ferguson  
Senator Murphy

Mr Richard Evans  
Mr Forrest  
Mr Ted Grace  
Mr Lee

The terms of reference for this inquiry are the:

Extension on the main runway at Adelaide International Airport

## WITNESSES

<b>CHILDS, Mr Barry, President, South Australian Exporters Association, c/- South Australian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Commerce House, 136 Greenhill Road, Unley, South Australia 5061 .....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>CHUGG, Mr Alan Mark, District Sales Manager, Cargo, Singapore Airlines Ltd, Aviation House, Adelaide Airport, South Australia 5950.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>.....</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>CORNISH, Mr Wayne, President, South Australian Farmers Federation, 122 Frome Street, Adelaide, South Australia 5000 .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>.....</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>HARRISON, Mr Ian, General Manager, Policy Development, South Australian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Enterprise House, 136 Greenhill Road, Unley, South Australia 5061 .....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>HAYMAN, Mr Donald Malcolm, Manager, Projects and Consulting Services, Federal Airports Corporation, 2A Lord Street, Botany, New South Wales 2019 .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>.....</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>JOHNSTONE, Mr Rodney, National President, Australian Residents Association, PO Box 2240, Adelaide, South Australia 5001.....</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>MILLN, Mr Michael David, Senior Adviser, Aviation, South Australian Department of Transport, PO Box 1, Walkerville, South Australia 5081.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>.....</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>MUNCE, Mr Barry Roderick, Consultant, Airplan, Federal Airports Corporation, 2A Lord Street, Botany, New South Wales 2019.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>.....</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>ROBERTS, Mr Ian Noel, Airport Runway Extension Project Coordinator, South Australian Department of Transport, Head Office, PO Box 1, Walkerville, South Australia 5081 .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>.....</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>STEWART, Mr Terry John, Project Manager, South Australian Urban Projects Authority, Level 8, Riverside Centre, North Terrace, Adelaide 5000.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>.....</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>TEAGUE, Dr Peter Fletcher, Senior Acoustic Consultant, Consultant to Rust PPK Pty Ltd, Vipac Engineers and Scientists, PO Box 2419, Kent Town, South Australia 5067 .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>.....</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>TREE, Mr John Laurence, Manager, Technical Services, Federal Airports</b>	

<b>Corporation, 1 James Schofield Drive, Adelaide International Airport, South Australia .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>.....</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>TUSTIN, Dr Don, President, Glenelg Residents Association Inc., 2 Rugless Terrace, Glenelg, Adelaide, South Australia 5045 .....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>WALLACE, Mr Douglas Thomas, Manager, Planning, Consultant to the South Australian Department of Transport, Rust PPK Pty Ltd, GPO Box 398, Adelaide, South Australia 5001 .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>.....</b>	<b>128</b>

**CHAIR**—I declare open this public hearing into the proposed extension to the main runway at Adelaide International Airport. This project was referred to the parliamentary Public Works Committee for consideration and report to parliament by the House of Representatives on 3 December 1996.

It is rather unusual for me to open a hearing with an apology but I must do so this morning because the committee, while we would maintain is adequately represented by both the chairman and the vice-chairman, would normally be more numerous than it is and would have been more numerous but for the untimely passing of sitting Senator John Panizza, whose funeral is being held today. For that reason, all of the senatorial members of the committee are at present at his funeral. It has also affected the Western Australian member of the committee who would otherwise have been with us as well. I am sorry that that is the case. I would not want anyone to feel that the committee is in any sense taking this hearing in a cavalier way but, having established the sitting date, advertised the sittings and found there was in fact very little objection to the proposal, we decided to go ahead. All committee members will be fully briefed on the hearing prior to parliamentary consideration of it and the report to parliament.

I should mention at this stage that this reference is somewhat unique, having been referred to the South Australian Public Works Committee and Commonwealth Public Works Committee simultaneously. The South Australian committee tabled its report to the South Australian parliament on 4 February.

In accordance with subsection 17(3) of the Public Works Committee Act 1969, in considering and reporting on a public work the committee shall have regard to the stated purpose of the work and its suitability for that purpose; the necessity for, and the advisability of, carrying out the work; the most effective use that can be made, in the carrying out of the work, of the moneys to be expended on the work; where the work purports to be of a revenue producing character, the amount of revenue that it may be reasonably expected to produce; and the present and prospective public value of the work.

This morning the committee inspected the western end of the main runway at Adelaide International Airport and adjacent areas, including the recreation reserve. Adelaide airport is in the federal electorate of Hindmarsh, which is represented by Mrs Chris Gallus MP. It is also in the state electorates of Mawson, Hanson, Colton, Peake and Morphett. The committee extended an invitation to all federal and state members to be present during the site inspection this morning and the public hearing today, and has an apology from Mrs Gallus.

Today the committee will hear evidence from the Federal Airports Corporation, the South Australian Department of Transport, the South Australian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Glenelg Residents Association and the Australian Residents Association. I now call representatives from the Federal Airports Corporation and the South Australian Department of Transport, who will be sworn in by the assistant secretary.  
**\DB\WLBHAYMAN, Mr Donald Malcolm, Manager, Projects and Consulting Services, Federal Airports Corporation, 2A Lord Street, Botany, New South Wales 2019**

**MUNCE, Mr Barry Roderick, Consultant, Airplan, Federal Airports Corporation, 2A Lord Street, Botany, New South Wales 2019**

**TREE, Mr John Laurence, Manager, Technical Services, Federal Airports Corporation, 1 James Schofield Drive, Adelaide International Airport, South Australia**

**MILLN, Mr Michael David, Senior Adviser, Aviation, South Australian Department of Transport, PO Box 1, Walkerville, South Australia 5081**

**ROBERTS, Mr Ian Noel, Airport Runway Extension Project Coordinator, South Australian Department of Transport, Head Office, PO Box 1, Walkerville, South Australia 5081**

**WALLACE, Mr Douglas Thomas, Manager, Planning, Consultant to the South Australian Department of Transport, Rust PPK Pty Ltd, GPO Box 398, Adelaide, South Australia 5001**

**TEAGUE, Dr Peter Fletcher, Senior Acoustic Consultant, Consultant to Rust PPK Pty Ltd, Vipac Engineers and Scientists, PO Box 2419, Kent Town, South Australia 5067**

**STEWART, Mr Terry John, Project Manager, South Australian Urban Projects Authority, Level 8, Riverside Centre, North Terrace, Adelaide 5000**

**CHUGG, Mr Alan Mark, District Sales Manager, Cargo, Singapore Airlines Ltd, Aviation House, Adelaide Airport, South Australia 5950**

**CHAIR**—Welcome. The committee has received a submission from the Federal Airports Corporation, dated 13 December 1996, and the South Australian Department of Transport, dated 15 January 1997. Do you wish to propose any amendment?

**Mr Hayman**—No, Mr Chairman.

**Mr Roberts**—No, Mr Chairman.

**CHAIR**—It is proposed that the submissions be received, taken as read and incorporated in the transcript of evidence. Do members have any objections?

**Mr HOLLIS**—No.

**CHAIR**—There being no objection, it is so ordered.

*The submissions read as follows—*

**CHAIR**—I ask a representative of the Federal Airports Corporation to read the summary statement.

**Mr Tree**—The project brought before the committee involves the extension of the main runway at Adelaide airport by 572 metres to provide a total length of 3,100 metres. The airport's main runway imposes weight and payload constraints on international passenger and freight aircraft. The existing runway is of insufficient length to accommodate fully laden freighters flying direct to any major Asian port. Additionally, the runway is of insufficient length to accommodate some fully laden passenger flights, which have the ability to carry freight, to destinations beyond Singapore and even to Singapore under some conditions.

An economic analysis prepared by the state government indicates the project can be justified by the economic benefits it produces. Using a low growth outcome, the project has a positive net present value of \$9 million and a benefit cost ratio of 1.14.

At present over 75 per cent of South Australia's airfreighted exports are perishable goods. Approximately 63 per cent of such goods are exported via Melbourne or Sydney airports. Most of the airfreighted goods are shipped in the cargo holds of passenger aircraft. These arrangements limit the state's export potential. More particularly, they create uncertainty in the state's ability to export goods on time and can lead to a reduction in the quality of perishable goods because of the increased shipping time to market.

The ability to avoid delays and ensure goods arrive at overseas markets in an unspoilt condition is important. The benefits of reduced delivery times and the ability to reliably provide good quality goods on time and at reduced costs will help make South Australian goods more attractive overseas. This should increase export markets, enhance the viability of South Australia's exports and economic returns, and hence benefit the state as a whole.

A range of alternatives were considered for the extension of the runway. These alternatives were assessed in terms of their environmental and community impacts, economic costs, their impacts on airport and road operations and compliance with the objectives of providing a runway of suitable length. It was decided that the main runway should be at least 3,100 metres long as this would provide the minimum length to achieve direct flights to the furthest Asian destinations in the majority of weather condition with the least impacts. This length requires that the existing runway be extended by a distance of 572 metres.

The chosen option involves extending the runway to the south-west across Tapleys Hill Road and the Patawalonga Creek into the Patawalonga South Golf Course, which is located on land controlled by the West Beach Trust. This option requires redevelopment of the Patawalonga South Golf Course to free up land for the runway extension and diversion of Tapleys Hill Road around the extended airport boundary.

The existing Patawalonga Creek channel will be filled in and a new channel provided as part of the redevelopment of the golf course. These modifications are currently being designed

and implemented as part of a separate project by the Urban Projects Authority. Relocation of various services is required and they include water mains, gas mains and reclaimed water mains from the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works. In addition, there will be some minor service relocations due to the reconstruction of the Sturt River bridge.

The obstacle limitation surfaces of the main runway are to be changed as a result of the runway extension. Consequently, there are new obstacles such as trees and power poles which would restrict aircraft operations; hence it is proposed to underground sections of power lines which run along Military Road, and there are approximately 25 Norfolk Island pines in the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works and other trees which require trimming or removal so as not to penetrate the OLS. Furthermore, power lines at the north-east end of the runway in Passmore and Britton streets, which are low voltage lines, and Marion Road, which are high voltage, will be placed underground.

Works are currently under way on the West Beach Recreation Reserve in order to free up land so that Tapleys Hill Road can be diverted around the runway extension. It is expected that the Patawalonga South Golf Course works will be completed in May 1997. Road construction works are proposed to start in February 1997 and be completed by November. Based on the road construction timetable, it is expected that construction of the runway would commence in March 1997 and be completed in June 1998, with the taxiway and other airport works to be completed by November 1998.

In August 1995, the state and previous federal government announced the extension of the runway. In the 1996 August budget, the present federal government agreed to provide \$48 million for the project. The South Australian state government has committed \$20 million towards the cost of the project with the federal government agreeing to reimburse the state for this expenditure when the airport is leased.

The proposed works have been subjected to a full environmental study and the preparation of an EIS. The EIS and the responses to the submissions have been reviewed by the state and Commonwealth environmental agencies and recommendations have been made to the respective environment ministers. The works will have no heritage impact. Numerous meetings have been held with the community, local government and intergovernmental agencies to ensure full and proper consultation on all issues. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

**CHAIR**—Mr Tree, your submission focused on the impact of the runway extension on exports for South Australia.

**Mr Tree**—Yes.

**CHAIR**—In the proposal are there any advantages for domestic air traffic?

**Mr Tree**—There will be some slight advantages to the domestic airlines in that currently in hot weather the runway length does impose restrictions on, typically, flights to distant destinations like Darwin, so even the 737 aircraft have payload penalties in the very hot



weather because of the current runway length.

**CHAIR**—If we then allow aircraft to take off in warmer weather as a result of the extended runway, does this mean there will be additional noise infiltration for those residents close to the airport?

**Mr Tree**—For aircraft taking off over the sea, which is the preferred direction in terms of the wind—75 per cent of movements take off over the sea—I doubt that the human ear would be able to detect the difference. Dr Peter Teague would be able to answer that in more detail, I think.

**Dr Teague**—With variable meteorological conditions such as humidity and temperature you can get a small change in the efficiency with which noise is propagated through the air, but typically it is of the order of two to three dBA, and that is not discernible to the average human ear response.

**CHAIR**—But surely as a result of this extension there will be more aircraft movement, which will mean residents will be alerted to aircraft movement more frequently?

**Dr Teague**—Yes, there will be more frequent flights; that is right. But you have to determine, I suppose, the average energy produced by the noise, which takes into account the maximum noise level in addition to the frequency of flights. That average energy level, if you like, which is related to human response, community reaction and so on, would not significantly increase.

**CHAIR**—Mr Tree, do you have any indication, for the record, of what the increased frequency might be? I am not preventing you adding to Dr Teague's answer. I just wanted also to lead into this question of frequency of flights.

**Mr Tree**—We would not expect the total number of aircraft movements to change by any measurable or significant amount because of the runway extension. What we may see is a shift in the aircraft types using the airport. The longer runway will make it more attractive to larger aircraft like the 767, but we expect that to happen over a long period. The increase in the number of movements that might eventuate from the runway extension is very difficult to estimate. Mr Hayman may want to comment on that.

**Mr Hayman**—Perhaps Mr Milln might be in a better position to comment on that at this stage.

**Mr Milln**—The runway extension is targeted on the development of international services rather than domestic services. International services comprise only a very small proportion of total movements through Adelaide airport—in the vicinity of two or three per cent. There are in the order of 2,600 movements a year. So, even if we are successful in percentage terms of increasing international flights, in terms of overall movements discerned by residents it is going to be very low. Our targets are in the order of several flights a week

rather than hundreds of movements or anything of that nature.

**CHAIR**—Do you want to ask any noise related questions?

**Mr HOLLIS**—I guess this question is a noise related one. If this extension goes ahead, how adequate will Adelaide airport be when it is completed?

**Mr Tree**—In what sense?

**Mr HOLLIS**—I see in the briefing papers that even with this extension it will still be one of the shortest runways, if not the shortest runway, in Australia. Is this only a stopgap measure? The next question was going to be: is there a master plan for Adelaide airport? Are we working towards a master plan or are we just responding to needs? Within five or 10 years will there be another hearing for another extension in some other direction at Adelaide airport?

**Mr Tree**—I might just make a couple of comments, and I think Mike Milln might want to make some as well. Firstly, there is a master plan for Adelaide airport. The history of the master plan is that in the early 1980s, about 1982, the first draft master plan and environmental impact assessment was produced; that was updated by the corporation in 1991 and the draft was revised and a preliminary environmental impact assessment was done; in 1994 there was a review and update of the master plan again; and again, just starting last year, we have done an addendum to that master plan and we have now done an environmental impact assessment of that addended master plan.

As early as 1982, when the first draft was produced, it showed an extension of the main runway in line with the length that we are extending now. I have a copy of that here if you wish to see it. That extension has remained consistent throughout the master plan documents and it is still the same length extension as roughly stated in the current master plan.

The master plan does not indicate any extension beyond that which is currently proposed. So that would be the maximum length that we would propose to extend the main runway at Adelaide. To answer your first question, that length will be adequate for the targeted destinations that this state wants to focus its export drive on, I guess, but the length will provide access to markets as far away as Seoul and, under some conditions, even Honolulu. But, basically, all of Asia will be covered by this runway extension, including India. Mike, you might like to add something.

**Mr Milln**—I could add a couple of comments to that. The selected runway length is a compromise—there is no doubt about that. A fully loaded 747 requires 3,600 metres and this runway is going to be 3,100 metres long. Yes, we would like it to be longer, but the costs involved in that I do not think can be justified either now or in the future. As aircraft technology is changing, the new generation aircraft in general terms need less runway length than the 747 100 and 200 series freighters that primarily need the longer length.

So the 3,100 metres was selected, firstly, on the basis that it would be enormously

expensive to extend it beyond that point because of removal of obstacles like the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works and so on but also because 3,100 metres does allow full volumetric payload on all passenger aircraft types to virtually any destination other than the west coast of the US. So it gives us all of north Asia and all conceivable targeted destinations that we aspire to, but it still does have some shortcomings in terms of freight uplift on older generation aircraft.

The 747 400s that Cathay Pacific and Singapore Airlines are flying have better payload capabilities and this runway length will allow Singapore Airlines, for instance, to fly full freight aircraft from Adelaide direct to Singapore.

**Mr HOLLIS**—Are there any full freight aircraft going now or is it just the freight in the hold of passenger planes? What is the situation? Do we have any direct freight?

**Mr Milln**—Yes, we do. Malaysia Airlines have operated a freight flight for the past 12 months.

**Mr HOLLIS**—How frequently?

**Mr Milln**—Once a week and Malaysia Airlines is presently incurring significantly increased operating costs because it has to operate via Melbourne in both directions. As soon as the runway extension is available to it—the Adelaide market is not big enough for the aircraft to operate to Adelaide only so it will still be paired with another port, probably Melbourne—it will enable the aircraft to operate into Melbourne, which is a bigger import port, and then out of Adelaide back to KL. At the moment it is operating back via Melbourne as well because of our runway length.

There is a Malaysia Airlines representative here if you wanted to get a view from the airline direct and Mr Chugg is here from Singapore Airlines.

**CHAIR**—On the same subject, I am a little reassured by the statement made by Mr Tree that the footprint for Adelaide airport, the plan we are looking at, was set up at a quick tally 15 years ago.

**Mr Tree**—Yes.

**CHAIR**—Are you telling me then—and this seems to be reinforced by Mr Milln—that the design of aircraft over the last 15 years has tended towards shorter rather than longer take-off lengths?

**Mr Milln**—Yes. Chapter II aircraft such as the DC10, DC8 and Boeing 707 are all aircraft for which 3,100 metres would not be enough, but the new generation aircraft—the B777, A340, the A330 and so on—all require more than the 2,500 metres we have at the moment but the 3,100 metres that this project is going to produce will be enough.

**Mr HOLLIS**—Are Singapore Airlines happy with it?

**Mr Chugg**—Singapore Airlines would welcome the extension, certainly.

**Mr HOLLIS**—Do you find the present one—and mention has been made of Malaysia Airlines—a constraint on business? Are you losing business because of it or does it just make it more difficult?

**Mr Chugg**—With our present operating pattern, we are just operating A310 passenger aircraft and it does not provide us with any limitations with our present schedule. Adelaide has come under consideration for freighter services in the past and the length of the runway has been the only inhibiting factor for the operation of those services.

**CHAIR**—Are your passenger aircraft fully loaded in the cargo hold or are they sometimes shortloaded in order to facilitate the take-off?

**Mr Chugg**—The aircraft that we operate currently have not encountered a cargo restriction based on the length of the runway. Aircraft that we have operated previously have, but the A310 aircraft are limited not by the runway itself but by the physical limitations of the aircraft at the moment.

**CHAIR**—A freighter aircraft would require a longer runway because of the heavier load I would presume?

**Mr Chugg**—We started flying Adelaide-Singapore without a payload restriction on a freighter service.

**Mr HOLLIS**—What infrastructure is there at Adelaide airport for cargo?

**Mr Chugg**—As far as the infrastructure is concerned, it has a state-of-the-art cold store, which means that the perishable commodities are extremely well looked after. It would be at least the best in the southern hemisphere. The infrastructure at Australian Air Express and Ansett are adequate to handle the general cargo movements. There would probably be additional equipment required for freighter operations, namely, the 20-foot pallet loader, which the airport lacks at the moment. That would enable outsize cargo to be handled on a freighter service. That is the main piece of equipment that is needed.

**CHAIR**—Mr Cornish, from a Farmers Federation point of view do you believe that the restricted capacity of Adelaide airport to handle freighter aircraft is restricting the enthusiasm that your producers would have to provide the produce to go into that freighter aircraft? Would there be more produce moved if the facility were available?

**Mr Cornish**—Certainly, I believe it is absolutely critical to the future. We are getting by—I suppose that is the terminology that needs to be used—at this stage. There is a significant amount of South Australian freight being moved through Sydney and Melbourne.

That has made major impacts on quality assurance and our ability to be internationally competitive.

I think we need to take what is on offer at the present time in direct relationship to where we will be in the immediate future. The northern Adelaide pipeline project, which you would be well aware of, will have a major impact on production capabilities out of South Australia. If there is a market to be found for that additional produce, it must be export orientated. If it is to be put on domestic markets, it simply will create a huge raft of problems nationally not only in South Australia. The whole focus of that initiative is totally export orientated.

We simply cannot cater for that in world international competitive terms under the present regime through Adelaide at the present time. We need that airlift capability to accommodate not only the present product levels that are there but also levels that are actively being sought. Those export markets are being developed rapidly and that potential is going to turn to reality very quickly because the pipeline is being laid as we speak. We must be able to cater for that in a much better form than we can at the present time.

**CHAIR**—I notice that in the submission to the committee Ansett, as a domestic carrier, was expressing concern that the additional facility may involve an additional cost load on Ansett because of the additional cost of using Adelaide airport. It was anxious that we should recommend that there be a distinct separation between the current costs being carried by the domestic carrier and the cost of using the airport as borne by exporters. If this is something that is going to distinctively advantage South Australian primary producers, do you think they too would be happy to share in part of this cost load?

**Mr Cornish**—That is a very difficult question to answer. I am not sure how you propose the mechanism to derive the funds. I would be interested to hear the complete—

**Mr Milln**—I would like to answer that, if I may. This project is all about reducing the costs of our exporters, not increasing them. We are trying to make our exporters more competitive not less. That is precisely the reason why this project is being publicly funded. I am not entirely clear what the basis of Ansett's fear is. All indications we have are that this project will not add significantly to the lease price of the airport. It seems to me that the future operator of Adelaide airport is not going to have a significant additional infrastructure cost to pass on to its customers. I think Ansett should relax.

**CHAIR**—I do not know if the FAC would want to add to that, but it would be aware of the Ansett concerns expressed to the committee.

**Mr Tree**—We are aware of Ansett's concerns which basically relate to their company having to pay for the extension. If it is publicly funded, they will not have to so I do not think they should have a problem.

**Mr Hayman**—I think their concern was that the lessee of the airport may pay a

premium or the price may be increased, which means they will be seeking to recover their additional purchase price by some mechanism. But we do not believe, as Mike has said, that the sale price of the airport will change significantly just because of the runway length.

**CHAIR**—Presumably it would become a more saleable item though—

**Mr Hayman**—More saleable, for sure. It is not part of my area, but we believe that it will not affect the purchase price significantly.

**CHAIR**—Turning to the area of safety, presumably we have an existing airstrip that is shorter than the FAC would like to have. My question is: have we had any situations where aircraft have been loaded to capacity for the airstrip and there has been any hazard as a result of a decision to abort a take-off—due to a bird strike or something—where the pilot has had to make a decision to stop or go and you have felt that traffic on Tapleys Hill Road or passengers in the aircraft have been threatened by the current short length of the strip?

**Mr Tree**—Safety is not an issue.

**CHAIR**—Is not?

**Mr Hayman**—Is not.

**Mr Tree**—It is not an issue. The pilots basically operate the aircraft in accordance with the available runway length. We have someone from Airservices Australia in the audience if you want to explore that further, but the pilots operate the aircraft within the restraints of the runway. We have certainly had, to my memory, no incidents of an aircraft actually overshooting the existing runway length in the event of an aborted take-off.

**CHAIR**—At Adelaide?

**Mr Tree**—Yes, at Adelaide.

**Mr Hayman**—The aircraft performance requirements are set down when it is certified. The operating procedures of the airlines all take into account the possibility that an aircraft may have to abort and so the actual operation of the aircraft does provide for the aircraft to abort and pull up within the available distances. There are, of course, sometimes unusual circumstances which do cause an aircraft to overrun a runway, but generally in Australia most of the aircraft have stopped within 90 metres of the actual runway end. They have gone on to the stopway or the blast area. Generally, as soon as the nose wheel has gone off the end of the blast area, they have become bogged. We have at least 350 metres from the end of the existing runway to Tapleys Hill Road which does provide a reasonable safety margin.

**CHAIR**—Some may see the sewage works as a greater hazard than Tapleys Hill Road, too, I suppose. Informally, the thought had been put to the committee that perhaps

there ought to be some sort of modern braking facility, such as a surface that would break up to allow aircraft to stop well short of Tapleys Hill Road. Are you suggesting that there is not evidence of a need for that—either a catching fence or a cracking surface or a sandpit or whatever is chosen?

**Mr Hayman**—There have been studies overseas on foam beds and other types of material beyond the end of runways that would crush and enable an aircraft to come to a stop by bogging in a controlled manner. They have been very difficult to design to accommodate all the various types of aircraft wheel loads over the range of aircraft. Some of them might just ride straight over the top if the surfaces are too strong. If they are too weak, the very heavy aircraft might come to a very severe stop. We have found that where the natural surface is sand or not too heavily compacted that is a good retardation medium for bringing the aircraft to a stop. Sure, you might have to dig the aircraft out to tow it back to the hard stand later on, but it brings the aircraft to a fairly quick braking point and it comes to a complete stop.

**CHAIR**—I suppose it is like riding a bike.

**Mr HOLLIS**—Let us talk about noise for a little while. Coming from New South Wales, I am quite familiar with this issue having participated in committee hearings dealing with Sydney airport. For these hearings in Adelaide, we have left a couple of hours whereas we usually leave three or four days for a hearing on Sydney airport. What is the mechanism if someone complains about noise to the airport here? Do you log complaints and how frequently do you get complaints? What is the main element of complaints?

**Mr Tree**—Until recently, the Federal Airports Corporation used to log complaints and report on those complaints to the Adelaide Airport Consultative Committee. Since then, that responsibility has been transferred to Airservices Australia. An Adelaide Airport Environment Committee has now been formed and those results would be reported to that. As well—you might not be aware of this—there are several noise monitoring stations around the airport under the approach paths of the runways. There is one in the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works, for example, and there is one at the end of each runway. From those instruments, a quarterly report is produced which, again, is available to the airport environment committee.

**Mr HOLLIS**—What is the main level of complaint?

**Mr Tree**—The number of complaints is very few and negligible compared with Sydney airport. A lot of them relate to helicopter movements as there are helicopters based at the airport. The others are really random complaints. Some can be from as far as 10 kilometres away from the airport. If you like, I can take that question on notice and get you some recent statistics.

**Mr HOLLIS**—Over the last 12 months or so, have you noticed if the complaints have increased, decreased or stayed at a level?

**Mr Tree**—I believe that they have remained fairly static. Again, I can get some recent

information for you.

**CHAIR**—Just while we are still dealing with noise, the Joint Public Works Committee has not only been extensively involved with Sydney airport—obviously there are a number of hearings now as a result of the 2000 Olympic Games and the changes that will occur in Sydney with which the FAC would be even more familiar than the committee—but we have also been involved in the cost of noise attenuation which has meant extensive works in places like Newington College and a great deal of Commonwealth outlay. Has there been any proposal for noise attenuation or any suggestion to the FAC that noise attenuation works would be justified in domestic buildings close to the airport?

**Mr Tree**—The Federal Department of Transport carried out a noise amelioration study last year. It has the results of that study. I have not seen that report. We have not had any representation direct to the airport from the committee to say that they want it. I think that is really a question mainly for the Federal Department of Transport because it is outside our boundary and there is not very much we can do about that.

**Mr Milln**—As John said, the Federal Department of Transport did carry out a study, a scoping, of what amelioration would be necessary and what its cost would be under the same criteria used for the Sydney noise amelioration program. A similar program was carried out at Coolangatta airport as well.

It was a decision of the federal department not to proceed with that program, mainly as a budgetary consideration in the last budget. Whether or not that data will be used in the future in order to proceed with a program similar to Sydney's remains to be seen, but the scoping study has been done.

**Mr Hayman**—The only other comment I can make is in relation to the proximity of residents at Adelaide. They are closer to the airport boundary than they are at any other major airport in Australia. I think the big difference is the frequency of movements at the airport. Many of the residents have been in those locations for some time and have been acclimatised to the low level of activity, even though that noise can be quite loud at times. I think the annoyance level increases somewhat with the total exposure to the aircraft noise in places such as Sydney, where they have an aircraft going overhead every minute. It is a different situation from Adelaide, where the actual jet operations are spasmodic throughout the day.

**CHAIR**—I want to reinforce a point you made earlier, Mr Hayman. Are you suggesting under oath to the committee that in the foreseeable future that frequency will not increase even with the additional freight work?

**Mr Hayman**—The forecasts of traffic growth over the next 15 years do provide for a reasonable increase in the total number of aircraft movements.

**CHAIR**—But that is domestic as well as international.

**Mr Tree**—Traffic will definitely grow.



**Mr Hayman**—I believe the figure is something like 40 per cent to 2010. So over 15 years we will have approximately a 40 per cent increase.

**CHAIR**—On your earlier figure, if you were to double the export movement, that would be only six per cent of total movement.

**Mr Hayman**—Yes. The growth in handling international aircraft over the years has been almost minimal. There has been a very low growth rate.

**Mr HOLLIS**—There is a curfew on the airport, isn't there?

**Mr Hayman**—Yes.

**Mr HOLLIS**—What are the hours?

**Mr Hayman**—The hours are 11 p.m. till 6 a.m. They are the standard curfew hours, although there is a dispensation for an early morning arrival under certain conditions.

**Mr Tree**—Qantas have a dispensation for, I think, four flights a week. During six months of the year they arrive at 5 a.m. The criteria for the dispensation are that they land over the sea; that they do not use reverse thrust; and there are a number of other criteria on the operation.

**Mr Milln**—We have the state manager for Cathay Pacific, Jean Slade, here. I know she has to leave. If you have any questions you wanted to ask of another airline, she has to leave right now so—

**CHAIR**—If Ms Slade wishes to be sworn in and to join the FAC or the DOT team, she is welcome to do so.

**Mr Milln**—I feel responsible for asking Jean Slade to come. I am not trying to provoke questions to be asked of her, but I just wanted you to be aware that she has to leave.

**CHAIR**—I am grateful for that. I am very happy to indicate a preparedness of anyone on the committee to meet with anyone in the room at any time. But, in terms of giving evidence right now, I am happy to have Ms Slade join us—at your invitation, Mr Milln—and be sworn in if there is something she particularly wants to add to what has been said.

**Ms Slade**—I think informally I would just like to say that we concur with the Singapore Airlines statement about the impact on the freight operations. I will just leave it at that for the moment.

**CHAIR**—I thank Mr Milln for the invitation. There were some questions I wished to put on the location of the extension and the consequent relocation of Tapleys Hill Road. The

popular view—and, as a South Australian, I must confess to a bit of parochialism in all this—the idea of digging a tunnel appealed to me much more than relocating the road. I would like a comment from the FAC on the feasibility of the tunnel option. It seemed to me that, having dug the tunnel, we had more flexibility about what we did with the total length of the airstrip. We had a certain permanence that was lost in what looked like the rather temporary re-routing of a road.

**Mr Tree**—I might answer and make some comment as well. The tunnel option represented a significant increase in cost of the order of about \$30 million. The tunnel option does not save much in terms of the land taken. I think there was a perception in the community that the tunnel would require much less land taken, much less impact in terms of the golf course. But that is not quite true because, beyond the end of the runway, you need a runway safety area. You also need a certain distance between the localiser, which is a navigational instrument, which has to be at least a certain distance from the end of the runway. That, together with room for this taxiway and security clearances, basically means that there is a fair bit of land required beyond the end of the runway, regardless of whether the road goes underneath the runway or the road goes around the runway. There is a small difference, but it is marginal.

In terms of extending the runway in the longer term, you might feel that, if the tunnel were put in, it would not be any inhibition to extending the runway in the future. The problem in extending the runway further would be the sewage treatment works, which would be a very significant cost to relocate. It would have to be relocated to make the clearance surfaces available to the aircraft. So there would be a very significant cost in extending the runway beyond what is proposed at the moment in that direction.

If you went in the other direction, you would also have a significant cost. That would require the demolition of a large number of houses—again, to achieve the required clearance surfaces as well as, probably, to ameliorate some of the noise impact. To go any further than the current proposal would result in a very significant cost which would be very difficult to justify.

As well, I will just make a comment about the master plan. The current master plan for the airport fixes the maximum length of the runway at the proposed extension. So we are not planning to extend the runway any more than what we are today, even in the ultimate plans for the airport.

**CHAIR**—If I looked at that red line and I were a West Beach or Glenelg resident, I would say, 'I am going to travel some extra distance simply because I am now going around the end of the runway.'

**Mr Tree**—Yes, it is a reasonable question. I would refer that to Mr Roberts.

**Mr Roberts**—There is about 150 metres—some six or seven seconds of travel time. It was taken account of in the cost benefit analysis, so we took account of what the cost to the

community would be—their time and fuel costs in travelling that very short distance.

**CHAIR**—There would be 38,000 cars travelling 150 metres.

**Mr Roberts**—Yes, that is right. It did not swing the equation to be negative to the proposal. By far the most significant factor here is that we are dealing with a development where, for the moment at least, there is no perceived further extension seen by current judgment for this airport. If we invested an additional \$30 million in the ground today, compared with some \$13 million or \$14 million in roadworks, we could well break even on the saving by not spending that additional \$30 million well before anybody gets around to thinking that the airport ought to be extended.

As John says, there is a major hurdle to that extension in that not only would we have to pay for the extensions to the runway but we would have to remove the sewage treatment plant. So it is a major step up in gross state product that we would have to achieve to justify those additional expenditures.

**Mr Wallace**—If I might add to that, the tunnel option precludes the replacement of the Africaine Road link, which was of great concern to the surrounding community—an issue that provided for community connectivity. The only other connections are either West Beach Road to the north or the King Street bridge—which is below the photograph—to the south to link between Military Road and Tapleys Hill Road. The tunnel prevents that. There is no ability to connect into the tunnel arrangements because of height clearances and a range of other constraints; whereas the road around does provide the ability to link and replace Africaine Road.

**CHAIR**—Doesn't it have some environmental impacts that you may not have with the tunnel—a sewer running through the old course of the Patawalonga, or part of the old course of some of the Patawalonga Creek and catchment area? Through the old golf course area we begin to intrude into what, as I recall, is part of the Patawalonga catchment and creek area.

**Mr Wallace**—Yes. The runway extension itself will affect that, whether a road tunnel goes under there or not. The runway extension will see the replacement of that portion of the Patawalonga Creek entirely contained within that red area. That is being designed in to the golf course and work has already been completed to see a diversion of the new Patawalonga Creek further west and it is incorporated as part of the golf course design. Mr Terry Stewart, from the Urban Projects Authority, has that scheme. Perhaps Mr Stewart might wish to explain that on that plan.

*A chart was then shown—*

**CHAIR**—I am sure Mr Fetter will be quite happy to hold that up and perhaps if Dr Teague could hand you his microphone, that would mean that Hansard would have everything that was said on record.

**Mr Stewart**—The plan that we see here shows the airport extension—the road diversion as proposed. The land to the north of the existing golf course is the area in dark green and that is the area that is being developed for the holes that are lost down in this area that is required for the airport land.

The creek that previously ran along Tapleys Hill Road has been diverted and now runs through the western part of the existing front nine of the golf course. The other thing I think this does show, to some degree, is the current road alignment. If the road was not required, the boundary of the airport would, in fact, still be roughly along this side of the road. That is correct? So in actual fact, the additional reserve land lost is not much greater than the width of the road.

**CHAIR**—There are obviously people who are witnesses to the hearing who will not have had the benefit of seeing that. Perhaps if we break for lunch, there may be an opportunity for you then to point it out to them as well.

Without being too facetious, there is not the sort of water in the Patawalonga Creek in that catchment area that would encourage the Premier to barefoot ski, at a quick observation. But I do wonder what the environmental impact of diverting the creek is to those species of wildlife that have become accustomed to the creek being where it is.

**Mr Stewart**—That has certainly been taken into account. The section of creek that runs through here—actually, Doug, you may want to talk on that in terms of the EIS process. That was covered in that document.

**Mr Wallace**—Perhaps I can answer that. The EIS did examine the effects of the filling of that portion of Patawalonga Creek and the diversion. The diversion actually will recreate, has recreated and is in the process of recreating a new waterway which has the ability to be even better than the current system—or the Patawalonga Creek. It is designed with swales and landscaping and has opportunities for reeds, et cetera. It could actually be a new, enhanced system.

**CHAIR**—You are going to do a better job than God did, is that what you are telling us?

**Mr Wallace**—Really what I am saying is that the current Patawalonga Creek is not in good condition and by starting afresh we can improve it—or at least recreate what it would have been in its earlier days.

**Mr Tree**—I am sorry to interrupt, but I might make the point that man has already interfered with the current Patawalonga Creek.

**Mr Wallace**—Yes, quite significantly. And it needs to be put in the context that there will be no more water flowing down that new diversion than previously—the maximum flow is

in the order of eight cubic metres per second—whereas the entire Patawalonga, which is a different water body itself, is fed by the Sturt drain and the Brownhill Creek, which are not shown on that plan at all. Upstream, in the northern portion, on FAC land, the existing Patawalonga Creek is retained and that diversion simply goes around the outside. We have looked at it in environmental terms and with respect to the impact on species et cetera. The advice is that any species that may be affected will recolonise in that new waterway.

**Mr HOLLIS**—Was it universally welcomed? Everywhere we go environmental groups come before us and tell us that the proponents always say that it is going to be better than it was in the past—a brave new world—and the environmentalists usually say, 'No, no, this is disaster.' But there has been no comment here. Has this new creek diversion proposal been universally welcomed?

**Mr Wallace**—From a golf course point of view, it brings the opportunity for the whole recreational space to have an enhanced amenity through that area. The current Patawalonga Creek is available to nobody, basically; it is not used by anybody. It was on the periphery of the existing golf course, and it was in a modified and fairly poor condition. What we are saying is that we are replacing it in a better condition, acceptable through the enhancement of a golf course amenity and of public recreational areas.

**Mr Roberts**—I would like to add to what Doug has been saying. We have surveyed the old creek and, as John Tree said, it is already degraded. However, we have a baseline survey of fauna in the area, and one of the obligations on the contractor involved in filling that creek will be to relocate into alternative habitats any fauna discovered during the course of the works. Rust have assisted the South Australian department with the development of the environmental management plans for all of the works. This is just one small part of a broad environmental responsibility that we have to bear in delivering the construction and design of the works.

**Mr Wallace**—That was part of the recommendation in the EIS, and now we have implemented that as part of the design process.

**Mr HOLLIS**—Mr Wallace indicated that the golf course would welcome it. But there are various other people who occupy parts of land there. From memory, there is a pony club, a baseball group—what else is there? Are they all happy with what is happening with the airport and so forth? What I am trying to establish is whether there have been any reservations at all. Apparently there have been none from environmental groups. What about the neighbours? Do the neighbours all welcome it?

**Mr Wallace**—Perhaps I could ask Mr Fetter to stand aside and look at this other plan. It is important to go back to a bit of history here. The original proposal—or project—that we were evaluating in the EIS had an alignment for that red line which was further west. That dissected the Glenelg Baseball Club, which is that portion of land there.

The other occupiers of the land in that area include the golf driving range, which is up there. That is unaffected by the proposal. It retains, and in fact gets better, access as a result of

the proposal. We readjusted the road alignment in a tighter way and reduced the design speed. With assistance from the FAC in terms of their requirements, we were able to amend the project so that it did not dislocate the Glenelg Baseball Club. This meant quite a large cost saving. The Glenelg Baseball Club is a well renowned facility in South Australia and nationally. So that has been retained. The only other location was the dog club. There are no pony clubs on this particular land at all. Mr Stewart from the Urban Projects Authority can answer that. All the land occupiers have been involved in consultation. The golf course has been redesigned and reconfigured. All the stakeholders who were there previously have been accommodated or have been avoided by the works. The only one that has needed to be relocated is the dog training club which has been relocated on the West Beach Trust Reserve elsewhere.

**Mr Stewart**—Just on the dog club facility, that is the facility there. Very early on we approached the dog club and resolved to relocate them and build them a new facility on the West Beach Reserve land down in that location. They are currently operating from that site in temporary facilities and their building is nearing completion. So they are quite happy. From their point of view they are moving to a better facility in a better location. In concluding, on the new Patawalonga Creek alignment, the increasing colony of ducks appears very happy there.

**Mr HOLLIS**—They have surveyed them.

**CHAIR**—It is certainly true that, following all of the rain that has fallen over the last 24 hours or so, there were quite a number of ducks down there this morning.

There was one other environmentally sensitive question I wanted to pursue. In the evidence that Mr Tree gave he suggested that there would be a need to trim and remove some trees, but he was careful not to quantify the proportion of trimming to removing. I think we ought to have on the public record some idea of how many trees. I do not believe the project should cease for the sake of trimming a few, but I do think we should have on the public record how many it is expected may need to be removed.

**Mr Tree**—I did say in my submission that there were 25 Norfolk Island pines in the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works which would require either lopping or removal. In respect to other trees, there are a number of trees in the suburbs at the north-east end of the airport which we now trim on a regular basis. Because of the operation of the airport as it stands now, we knock on people's doors and ask if they would mind us trimming their trees. It is done on that sort of basis. We do regularly trim the trees. Often people will ask us to remove a tree they do not like and we replace it with whatever. There has been one occasion when, about 12 months ago, an old lady in one of the streets got a little bit upset when we needed to trim her favourite tree. In the end we had to use the Civil Aviation Safety Authority legislation to enable us to trim the tree. But that sort of thing happens very rarely. So we would be continuing our program of tree trimming through the area except that we would probably be trimming a few more trees than we are now. I do now know the exact number but we have surveyed it. We have plans and survey information on all the trees that do need trimming, if you wish it.

**CHAIR**—No, Mr Tree, I was actually asking what proportion of that 25 you expected to have to remove altogether.

**Mr Tree**—It has been suggested that, initially, we trim the trees to the height required and see how they react. If the trees die we will remove them; if they survive we will leave them.

**Mr HOLLIS**—You must be going to do a fairly severe trim!

**Mr Wallace**—In relation to the lopping, we have taken some advice and some of those Norfolks have been trimmed in the past. The advice is that if you exceed about the top third then you start to seriously affect the health of the tree. But Norfolks are fairly rapid growers and they have a fairly long, extended stem at the top. I think the maximum height that needs to be removed is around six metres or so and there are only a few that need it; most of them are pretty marginal. But, as you know, all of these trees are growing permanently. As they grow they may interfere with the clearance line so they need to be trimmed. Really, if it is in a clearance line and the health and the quality of the tree is such that you need to trim it, if you take a third of it off and it dies then it has to be removed. It is taking the precaution that we need to trim it for safety reasons. If there is no need to remove the tree then everything is fine.

**CHAIR**—I assure you we are not seeking to compromise safety in any way. Perhaps I misunderstood a little of what Mr Tree was saying and imagined that we were going in initially both to trim and remove, depending on the location of the tree. I now have the impression—and correct me if I am wrong—that we are going in fundamentally to trim and it will only be those trees that have more than a third of their canopy removed and may therefore deteriorate that are likely to have to be totally removed.

**Mr Tree**—That is correct, yes.

**Mr Roberts**—That is a strategy that we discussed with SA Water and their operators, United Water, only a couple of weeks ago. It was through those conversations that that strategy of seeing what we can get away with emerged: to maximise the retention of existing trees.

**Mr HOLLIS**—Perhaps this is the sort of question we should have put earlier, but we have been doing detail. As I understand it, Adelaide Airport is going to be offered for lease. Is this an appropriate time to be spending this amount of money on the airport?

**Mr Milln**—We think it is because the provision of the runway will not be undertaken by a commercial operator. We have said from the outset that the revenues earned from this runway will not pay for it. Its justification is in the wider economic benefit to the community rather than revenue to the airport operator. So the question then is: do you do it now at public expense or after leasing it at public expense or not at all? Our strong view is that it needs to be

done now prior to leasing in order to attract the sort of lessee whose priority is on the development of international services through Adelaide Airport.

**Mr HOLLIS**—We were talking about freight before and I took note of what people were saying about the state-of-the-art cold store here. But on another inquiry I was on they were talking about international freight and it was put—and Adelaide Airport might have been the one—that a country like Australia should only have one or so major international freight areas instead of putting a few facilities at various airports in Australia and really not having any airport that is state of the art. There should be a dedicated international freight airport rather than having components of an international freighter airport at many airports in Australia and not really achieving anything.

**Mr Milln**—I am not sure which inquiry you are referring to but certainly the parliamentary inquiry into the export of perishable air freight comprehensively shot down that theory because 90 per cent of freight in and out of Australia is actually carried on passenger aircraft, not freight aircraft. Centralising a freight facility is not going to service adequately the needs of passengers who are going to a whole range of destinations. The sort of facility you are talking about would be for dedicated freight aircraft only. The view of the South Australian government is that it is that movement of freight to a point of export that we are trying to alleviate. We do not see very much benefit in our having to truck our freight to a Parkes airport hub any more than there is in our presently doing it to Melbourne and Sydney. Perhaps an airline operator would like to comment on that.

**Mr HOLLIS**—But on that, though, you have said that most of the freight is going on passenger transport, so there is no airport in Australia that would have sufficient capacity to be a freight airport as such.

**Mr Hayman**—Currently, Sydney airport has about three dedicated freighters a day. I am not sure what Melbourne has, but it is fewer.

**CHAIR**—Mr Cornish, did you want to make a comment?

**Mr Cornish**—I wanted to make a comment in relation to the product that we are, perhaps, considering here as well. The product simply cannot tolerate that type of philosophy. Mr Milln has suggested Parkes. If all South Australian perishable products had to be shipped to Parkes and then exported out of that facility, it just simply, from a quality point of view, will not work and function. Apart from the cost implications, the quality impediments would render South Australian producers most ineffective on the world scene.

**Mr HOLLIS**—What precisely are we talking about? You mention products, but what are we talking about? I thought that crays and things like that were exported from there. What is the main commodity that is exported from there?

**Mr Cornish**—The products that I am referring to are fresh fruit and vegetables, flowers, meat and those kinds of perishables.



**CHAIR**—And crays as well.

**Mr Milln**—South Australia is currently the largest exporter of fresh chilled tuna in the country. A very considerable portion of that is presently transhipped interstate.

**CHAIR**—Mr Cornish, do you have any indication of the additional cost currently being carried by South Australian producers, say, with a carton of broccoli or whatever, in cent terms as a result of having to truck it or rail it to Melbourne prior to getting it lifted or alternatively having it airfreighted out of South Australia with the short load that is topped up in Melbourne?

**Mr Cornish**—The road transport rates between Adelaide to Melbourne and Adelaide to Sydney vary. To Melbourne it is probably, depending upon the type of truck that you require, approximately \$80 a tonne. To Sydney it is probably around about the \$100 a tonne mark. There are different rates for different types of product. But, presuming we are talking about perishables, we are talking about pantec rates, and that is roughly where they would fall out.

**Mr HOLLIS**—On this same inquiry—I cannot remember what inquiry it was—we took evidence in South Australia. One of the things that was put to us in some cases was that produce was trucked from South Australia to Melbourne and then came back to South Australia on something else. Does that nonsense still go on?

**CHAIR**—I do not want to prevent Mr Cornish from commenting, but Mr Chugg had indicated he wanted to speak to this as well. I thought this is the sort of thing he may be aware of as an operator.

**Mr Chugg**—One of the basic rules of airfreight is the least number of times a consignment is handled, the better off it is going to be. Hubbing within Australia would be to the detriment of that. Exporters are like passengers. They want the most direct service that they can get because airfreight is, by its nature, time sensitive. If it is not time sensitive, it will end up going by sea. The minimum transit time that you can achieve is going to make it more competitive.

As far as road freight across to Melbourne is concerned, not only are perishable products being road freighted, such as the tuna and the horticultural products, but also a lot of the manufactured items which are also trying to compete in the world markets. It becomes a matter of whether the exporter is going to be viable or not—if they can deliver on time to the markets, wherever they might be in the world. If we are adding an extra day or two to every consignment we are sending out of Adelaide because we have to go via Melbourne and Sydney, then you will find that the exporters in South Australia will have that to work against them in every consignment they have.

So, from an airfreight point of view, the opportunities to obtain direct access to

capacity from Adelaide airport will enhance the competitive nature of South Australian exporters. If they are not able to gain that direct access, then they are going to be under severe competition from not only exporters in eastern states and in other states in Australia but also other exporters around the world.

**CHAIR**—It seems to me that we have almost come full circle in the questions to the FAC and the Department of Transport in that we have got back to the point at which we started in terms of the advantage of this to South Australia. But there was an issue that I wanted to raise and that was one of the points made by the FAC when they spoke to the committee briefly this morning about the changed plan for the taxiway.

I thought the public record would not be complete without one of the FAC representatives commenting on the changes to the taxiway plan and the reasons for it since it will look a little unlike most normal airport developments when it is complete. Should this procedure go ahead as it is, the taxiway is clearly not where any other airport developer would expect it to be.

**Mr Tree**—I will make some initial comments and then Don Hayman may like to add some. It was initially intended that the taxiway go right to the end of the runway extension, which is the normal standard and practice. However, during the detailed geotechnical investigations we found that the quality of the mud in the bottom of the Patawalonga was very poor and this resulted in a significant cost to construct the taxiway across that creek. So, in terms of the design, we realigned the taxiway to come in about 150 metres short of the runway end.

While that saves us money in terms of the project, there is an implication for aircraft operations, but we feel that implication is minor. In particular, all of the international passenger aircraft to the destinations that we are talking about would be able to operate from the point where the taxiway enters the runway for take-offs over the city. The intention is that only those very long haul international aircraft, in particular the freighters, would backtrack towards the end of the runway to get that extra 150 metres in length. That is because the freighters are typically older aircraft, like the Boeing 747 200 series, and their performance characteristics are not as good as the modern aircraft, therefore, they require as much length as they can get.

While the aircraft backtracks, you suffer a little loss in hourly runway capacity, but the number of those movements we expect a year will be minimal. So we feel that it is a reasonable compromise in terms of the cost versus the extra benefit. It should be borne in mind, however, that the aircraft taking off over the sea, which is the preferred direction and where 75 per cent of the take-offs occur, basically, will have the full length available to them—the whole 3,100 metres. It is only the take-offs across the city where there is any minor penalty to the operation.

**Mr Hayman**—There is another minor operational view on taking off towards the north-east. The aircraft will need to operate in that direction when they have a headwind that

helps the aircraft get airborne so that the penalty of losing a little bit of runway length is not really the total 150 metres because they will gain something from the headwind component.

**CHAIR**—Are there any other observations that anyone wishes to make? There will be an opportunity for the witnesses to be recalled. Can I thank both the FAC and the South Australian Department of Transport representatives for appearing before the committee this morning.

[12.20 p.m.]

**\DB\WLBCHILDS, Mr Barry, President, South Australian Exporters Association, c/- South Australian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Commerce House, 136 Greenhill Road, Unley, South Australia 5061**

**CHAIR**—I welcome representatives of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. The committee has received a submission from the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry dated 23 December 1996. Do you wish to propose any amendments?

**Mr Harrison**—Yes, if I can table a further submission, which would form the basis of the comments we would like to put to your committee at today's hearing.

**CHAIR**—That is fine. It is proposed that the original submission and the additional submission be received, taken as read and incorporated in the transcript of evidence. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

*The submissions read as follows—*

**CHAIR**—Mr Harrison, do you wish to make to make a short statement before the committee proceeds to questions?

**Mr Harrison**—Yes, very briefly. What we have tabled today says that the employers chamber which incorporates the South Australian Exporters Association fully supports and endorses those points that have been put to your committee by the South Australian government and the Federal Airports Corporation. We make the point in our submission that we believe the economic growth of South Australia, the very important challenge before us all, relies on export success. We see the extension of the Adelaide airport facility so that it can more properly meet the needs of the exporters of this state, both today and in the future—the way we want to see our state develop—substantiates this important project.

We recognise in our submission that there is a tourism aspect of this issue—it is freight and tourism. The discussion earlier today has recognised that a lot of the freight that travels out of Adelaide goes as part of an aircraft that is predominantly there to carry tourists. So the tourism impact is important. We believe that the additional runway length will facilitate Adelaide as an attractive destination for tourist carriers. That will enhance not only our tourism but our freight capacity. We recognise that it will increase speed to market. I believe the discussion you have just had covered that pretty importantly. Reduced transport costs and better access for tourists are the outcomes of the sorts of initiatives that we believe that will come from this extension of the airport.

The final point I make is a substantive point—and there is one other that I will come back to. We see that extending the airport alone is not the panacea of this state's economic challenges—I will not call them problems—but will form the basis of some important infrastructure that we can then work with—'we' being the business community through the employers chamber and the government of this state through its various arms—to promote business activity into South Australia. The parallel I would draw to the committee's attention is this very successful campaign that has been conducted to build up the port of Adelaide and throughput through the port of Adelaide, the seaport, because of the partnership activities of the business community through the chamber and government over many years.

In our submission I made mention of a couple of recent statistics that are relevant for our ports corporation; namely, that South Australia was recently rated the most efficient port in this country and also that throughput through our port has increased by something like 170 per cent over the past six years.

We believe very clearly in this state that that is because of the partnership activities of the business community and the government. What we are saying and what is relevant to today's hearing is that, given the greater infrastructure for Adelaide airport, we believe that sort of campaign will be embarked upon and will have benefits, if not to that level, then certainly benefits as significant.

Mr Chairman, in finishing the submission today we mention that there is one other piece of infrastructure that the employers chamber has a firm view that South Australia needs.

That is a railway link to the north. We thought we would put on record that there have been previous commitments given in regard to that. We would not like to see the same time frame apply to the extension of our airport facilities.

**CHAIR**—Thank you, Mr Harrison. You were successful in putting that on the record. It would be a bit improper for me to direct any questions on the railway link, given that the focus is entirely on the airport. You have, however, successfully anticipated my first question, which was to note that much of the export opportunity that was seen as a result of the extension to the airport runway—should it go ahead—was in the aquacultural and horticultural area. As a chamber, you are here representing specifically neither fishermen and their related industries nor fruit and vegetable growers. Are there other industries that you as a chamber are particularly anxious to facilitate or encourage and which you see benefiting from the freight aspect of this facility ?

**Mr Harrison**—I might have difficulty in naming precise industries. Mr Childs may wish to comment on that. The most recent figures would show that 57 per cent of all air freight out of Adelaide is transhipped via other airports. You have just had a discussion about both the time and cost implications of that. From the chamber's view point, we are looking for this state's integration into the Asian market to as great an extent as possible. That is where we see this state's future. Continued reliance on the domestic market in Australia is not going to satisfy the living standards that future South Australians should rightfully expect and demand. I would not want to pre-empt what might eventuate out of better infrastructure, but I am sure there are export opportunities that are not being pursued at the moment or are being constrained by the costs imposed through the requirement to tranship. I do not know whether Mr Childs has any specific examples through the exporters association, but it is the principle that we would like to rest with.

**Mr Childs**—I would like to endorse those comments. Speed to market is important. There are high technology, high value cargoes that require speed to market and can be flown. That adds to the other argument on perishable products.

**CHAIR**—I appreciate that this is something of a chicken and egg situation, but I am presuming that you have no evidence of people seeking to get into South Australia and being unable to do so because passenger seats are all booked out? We are not quite at the point where tourism demand is not being met through a shortage of transport. Am I right about that?

**Mr Harrison**—Yes. We would not have evidence of that. Last year, the employers chamber presented a comprehensive tourism policy to the government in this state. One of the five important aspects we recognised in that policy—and it has been agreed by the various agencies responsible for tourism promotion in the state—is that air access is one of our restrictions.

What we are saying to the government is: here is the chicken and egg part—do you put in infrastructure and then go out and pursue the marketing, or do you market and perhaps

not be able to satisfy the requirement? We do not expect international tourists to come into Adelaide and go back from Adelaide straight to their point of departure. We would rather see it being linked to other ports in the country. But it is important that they can either arrive or leave Australia through Adelaide airport. I cannot say that there are specific examples of instances where tourists cannot get in. The enormous incidence of visitation into Adelaide is through domestic carriers through the other ports around Australia. But the increased tourism exposure that this state has sought—with some success—in the Asian region will be justified very quickly, and we would expect to see increased international visitation through Adelaide airport.

That extends to the other types of infrastructure you provide for tourism—actual product, roadways, visitor attractions when they actually get here. The whole argument is: do you have the infrastructure in place and then market, or do you provide for the satisfaction of tourists when they get here and then go and market for them?

**CHAIR**—I presume, Mr Harrison, that there have been no negative vibes at all from any of the members of your chamber to this proposal? I ask that question because I noted in our tour of the airport facility this morning that there are a couple of industrial sites very close to the airport facility, and they are not necessarily sites that would be using the airport for transport of their manufactured goods. You have had no-one complaining about the proposal? None of your membership has expressed any reservations about what we have to consider today?

**Mr Harrison**—No, Mr Chairman. This is seen as being one of the important measures which will give this state a better economic prospect for the future and be for the benefit of all, including those operations near the airport.

**CHAIR**—Mr Harrison and Mr Childs, thank you for appearing before the committee this morning, albeit briefly, and for your enthusiastic endorsement of where the state ought to be going.

**Mr Harrison**—Thank you very much.

[12.32 p.m.]

**CHAIR**—Welcome. The committee has received a submission from the Glenelg Residents Association, dated 11 January 1997. Do you wish to propose any amendments to that submission?

**Dr Tustin**—No, there are no amendments.

**CHAIR**—Is it the wish of the committee that the documents be incorporated in the transcript of evidence? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

*The documents read as follows—*



**CHAIR**—Dr Tustin, do you wish to make a short statement to the committee before we proceed to questions?

**Dr Tustin**—Yes, I do, thank you. The residents association has been interested in a number of issues in the background. Some were raised this morning, so I might comment on them very quickly. There are a number of people who live by the seaside who would have been pleased to see a tunnel as compared to a road around the edge of the runway. It became very clear in discussion over this that budgetary considerations were paramount as compared to quality issues. A number of people would be more pleased to drive through a tunnel and would be very proud of that. They do see a road around the perimeter as being a bit of a second-rate option. There is some disappointment that budgetary considerations have introduced that.

We are also interested in environmental issues and the wildlife that is there. It is quite clear that diverting the Patawalonga Creek will have an impact on wildlife. We accept that it is not safe for large birds to be right under a flight path. We have asked that the creek be diverted so as to encourage a wide variety of other wildlife. At this point, we are reliant on the assurance from the bodies that they have heard that and they are not arguing with that. If it is not too late, it might be appropriate to request some monitoring, to ensure that is followed through, because some of the answers that were given to you did not reflect our enthusiasm that the wildlife be protected. There was more there than simply alsatians. To ensure that is not completely overlooked, I will raise it again.

Our major concern has been over noise. The proposal, as residents understand it, is that the runway will be extended by half a kilometre towards the houses in North Glenelg. They expect that that will produce an increase in noise and the noise levels are already quite high.

The EIS and the response document predict only a small increase in noise and we believe there is a suggestion in those written documents that the increase in noise can be traded off in some way against the reduction in noise that is due to a change in the fleet. We are very concerned about that suggestion. We think the EIS is there simply to describe the effect of extending the runway. We do not think it is the role or the prerogative of an EIS to be suggesting trade-offs. We do think that if the fleet of Australia is to improve, then the residents of North Glenelg should benefit from that, just as other people in Australia benefit. We do not think it is appropriate to ask one group of people to accept a trade-off.

We have been very uneasy about the confidence of, and the predictions from, the noise authority people who have been involved in this project. They say there is no need for noise amelioration in the houses. They say there is no need to control airport operations. They originally saw no need to measure noise levels until after the airport was extended. They are very confident in their computer modelling. We are very uneasy about their degree of competence and their dismissive attitudes. We know that at this stage there are recommendations from other bodies that ongoing noise monitoring is required. We are concerned that that was introduced on the recommendation of independent bodies. We started

with the expectation that noise measuring would have been taken for granted and would have been incorporated.

So we have paid attention to the modelling. There is no detail in the reports about the assumptions on which the modelling is based. We are told simply that they are worst case scenarios. It is, we believe, impossible to compare one set of modelling against another because the authors of the modelling have changed their assumptions and there is no record at any point, available to us, about what the assumptions are. So when a taxiway varies, people say, 'Oh well, the other models are not relevant now.' It is very hard to know what the assumptions are that produced the different modelling. We are simply asked to accept other people's assessments that they are worst case scenarios.

In a sense, we have not been given a descriptive report; we have been given a very evaluative report, we believe. There are predictions about the number of people affected, in both reports that have come through. They talk about three noise zones, which I will call the high, medium and low. For the high noise zone, the boundary is right on a road by a residential area. It is right on the road, and we are told that that is the edge of the high noise zone and it will not extend into the residential area. People who live in that area describe those comments as 'convenient.' They are not persuaded by that work.

In the medium noise zone, we are now told that—for some reason we cannot understand and which has not been explained to us—there will be 40 fewer people in that medium noise zone, due to the extension, than before. I have seen a graph which shows lines moving and I cannot understand yet how it could be that 40 fewer people move into that medium noise zone. For the low noise zone, the prediction is that there will be 50 more people in that.

The writers have added up those figures, so that they added the plus and the minus and the plus and said that the overall total is that there will be 20 people affected. We are very concerned about that adding because that adding mixes up the people whom the model says will be exposed to higher noise with people whom the model says will not be. We are very unsettled about the way in which this work has been done. In fact, we would say that the models are simply not accurate or reliable. We have been given no information that the modelling has got any reliability at all.

If we apply scientific standards to this work, the assumptions are not stated. There is no record of the assumptions on which the modelling is made. The reliability seems to be not there, so an earlier report gives quite different predictions to a later report. The figures are quite important to the people living in that area, and they were chopping and changing around. It is hard for us to have any confidence that the modelling is reliable.

In terms of whether the modelling will be supported by measurements, we really do not know because the noise measurement has not yet commenced and is being done only because it has been asked for. A common scientific standard would be to talk about the degree of error in the modelling. That is not stated anywhere. Our suspicion is that if it were stated, then the

error variance would be quite a lot bigger than the numbers who are being predicted as being affected.

So our view is that this technical report does not look good on any of the normal scientific standards. Yet this is a report that has been presented to influence public policy and, if it were accepted, it would have a major effect on the people who live under the extended runway. In our view, the technical report is not substantive. It is described by people in my committee as the outcome of computer games; some committee members describe it as shonky because there is so little substantiation. We would come here today to ask this committee to set a standard on reports of this kind so that they do meet the scientific criteria of stating assumptions, having demonstrated reliability, having demonstrated validity, and error estimates being well and truly stated. As the current report does not meet any of these standards, we would ask that you give no further weight to that than you give to the views of residents who live in the area. We have not come with scientific information—neither have our opponents.

The proponent has reached this point happy to rely on a low standard of work in relation to noise monitoring and because of that we do support the recommendations that have come from the other committees that on-going monitoring of noise is required. We are pleased that those recommendations are there and we are reassured that our concerns about the on-going noise issues will be looked at down the track, but we are highly concerned that technical reports from so-called noise authorities have been around for so long when we believe they just do not meet basic and easily achievable scientific standards.

At this stage we continue with the request that you put aside all of the results of the noise modelling and do not pay any great attention to it. We also request that you pay as much attention to our views, which are that if you extend an airport half a kilometre towards people's houses, then there will be more noise; that the effect of that noise needs to be measured; that the likelihood that amelioration steps will be necessary needs to be acknowledged; and that budgets need to be set aside for those things. In fact, we would ask that you give greater credence to the views of residents who live in that area, who listen to the planes all the time, and who will be affected. We ask that you give greater credence to that than to the reports from the so-called noise authorities. That is the point that I came to make.

**CHAIR**—Thank you, Dr Tustin, you have come to the right team, may I immodestly say, because we have become specialists a bit in airport noise—not because we wanted to be. You surprise me when you say that the modelling has been less than adequate because—and FAC can respond to this later—my understanding was that the modelling has been done on the same basis as was used, for example, for Kingsford-Smith. In Kingsford-Smith we have been ultra fussy because it has been big bikkies of taxpayers' money that we have had to divvy out to account for the noise amelioration there. So I would have thought that FAC, who have not hidden the noise problem, would have a great deal to lose by being anything other than particular about their modelling.

**Dr Tustin**—We believe that the residents of Sydney have also been fairly disappointed

at the difference between the initial predictions about the noise and the reality they later experienced. Our information is that the initial predictions about noise issues greatly underestimated the problems that later emerged. The standards could very well have been the same. We, too, thought that the standards could have become quite reasonable, following the Sydney experience.

Let me say again that the reports I have are based on assumptions. Nowhere have I seen spelt out what those assumptions are. For example, where does the plane start the taxiing? The assumptions are just based on the modelling. They have not been brought forward to the public. I am sure somebody knows, but the person who knows did not bring it forward. We now have mini-model predictions, and the outcomes vary. We are simply told, 'You can't compare one with another because the assumptions have been changed.' But none of us knows what the assumptions are.

**CHAIR**—This is going to sound awfully immodest, but can I say that I claim to be familiar not only with aircraft noise but also with aircraft—principally at the taxpayers' expense, in that case. Where the pilot determines he is going to taxi depends largely on whether the windsock is horizontal or vertical, which is something that the FAC has no control over.

**Dr Tustin**—The person doing the modelling must have started the plane somewhere and had it take-off somewhere. If these things are all unknown—

**CHAIR**—All I am saying is that this is why I suspect there is some flexibility because of the wide range of conditions that they are operating under.

**Dr Tustin**—What I am saying is that the outcome of the modelling is quite variable, but people have confidently predicted the number of residents who will be affected by differing noise levels. My suspicion is, as you are suggesting, that the error of measurement in this modelling is so great that the number of people who will be affected will probably be several times larger, in which case they could have told us that. They could have told us that the modelling was so inaccurate that it could have been dispensed with and that the way to resolve this problem is to measure noise using noise meters.

**CHAIR**—As a resident South Australian, it would strike me that much of the housing arrived after the airport was in the Glenelg North area, as you call it, more so than some of the other areas where the housing was there before the airport took shape.

**Dr Tustin**—I am not sure. Both the airport and the housing were there when I came, so I am not sure which came first.

**CHAIR**—We can ask that question later.

**Dr Tustin**—I do agree that the residents of Glenelg North have accepted the airport as it is. They are concerned about the extension of half a kilometre towards their houses. They

basically believe that, if the airport is to be extended half a kilometre towards their houses, it is bound to be noisier.

**CHAIR**—That is a fair assumption, frankly an assumption that I would have made as well until we went through all of the evidence presented to us. I think noise is a problem, do not get me wrong, but I was reassured to discover that there are really very few additional flights that will be generated by this extension. We are talking about freight flights which, as you would have heard, only make up three per cent of the aircraft movement, at this stage anyway, and may make six if they double. So it would seem to me that the proposed extension is not of itself a major factor in the aircraft noise problem.

**Dr Tustin**—People in Glenelg struggle to accept that all of this expenditure and work are being done for a very low number of flights and that there will be no other changes in the airport operations. There is very little said about the operations. In fact, the first EIS states very clearly that there would be no restrictions on airport operations.

**Mr HOLLIS**—I think you are suggesting that there is a hidden agenda.

**Dr Tustin**—Not so much a hidden agenda. There is heavy reliance on the computer based modelling. In fact, like the chairman, we find it easier to follow the argument that there is only two per cent of flights and it might increase. That level of argument is easily followed and makes sense. Most of the argument that we are asked to follow is in terms of the computer generated modelling.

The computer generated modelling is used to pinpoint the boundary on which the noise goes from unacceptable to acceptable. That pinpointing puts it right on a road. We are certainly suspicious about that. We are asking that, instead of us all relying on a computer model of that, it be measured and that the noise authorities identify measuring noise as a sensible way to go. Do not us ask us all to go and accept a computer based model.

They have also counted, using the computer modelling, the number of people whom they predict will be affected by increased noise. They say, 'There are hardly any people; let's not worry about it.' We are saying, 'Let's not follow that line of reasoning; let's take measurements now and let's take measurements later. We will look at the measurements and if there are some people in some houses who are adversely affected by the noise, let's compensate them.' We have had a lot of difficulty getting that argument across.

**Mr HOLLIS**—Taking that point about your difficulty in getting that argument across, how much consultation have you had as a group with the FAC? Have you had any consultation? Have you met with them?

**Dr Tustin**—Since it became apparent that we would make submissions here, we have had very good consultation with the Department of Transport and the Rust PPK over the last period. This has been going on for a while. When we first made submissions to the EIS, we complained that there had not been sufficient communication with people who lived right

under the flight path. We have made a written complaint to that effect. I believe that was simply dismissed in the response document, but since then the communication has improved. I certainly think that, if our request for noise measuring had been listened to in the beginning, we would not today have come to a parliamentary committee to repeat the request that—

**Mr HOLLIS**—Sorry?

**Dr Tustin**—Had our request for the measuring of noise been listened to in the early stages, we would not have come to the parliamentary committee today to continue with the request. The strong assurances that noise would be measured have surfaced only in the last month.

**Mr HOLLIS**—Have you taken this up with your local federal member?

**Dr Tustin**—Yes.

**Mr HOLLIS**—What has been the consultation process with this proposal? This proposal was announced, what, two or three years ago? It would have been an announcement that there was going to be an extension to Adelaide airport?

**Dr Tustin**—Initially, there was contact with different groups, including ours. Originally, we had quite a few concerns. They were the diversion of Tapleys Hill Road, Africaine Road, the environmental impacts, and the noise. There were some meetings; one was held during the daytime and unfortunately we did not make that and because we did not make that I think that ended the communication at that phase. There were later public meetings when the first document appeared. We went and we spoke. We have certainly been listened to since that time. Our requests for measuring noise have really been agreed to only quite recently. Originally, they were rejected. There was a special meeting in the Glenelg Town Hall. A man was flown in from Melbourne to tell us that we should have confidence in this computer modelling, and that noise was not important in this issue.

We have been arguing that the measuring of noise is important to check the computer modelling from very early on. The widespread agreement that that has achieved has surfaced, in my view, only quite recently. We are concerned that authorities in Australia, who want to have such an influence on public policy, would go so far based simply on computer modelling—without backing it up with measuring noise at the time. We are really surprised at that and I ask the parliamentary committee to set a standard that unless people who want to be recognised as authorities produce measured base data, they will not be listened to any more than local residents.

**Mr HOLLIS**—There was a parliamentary inquiry a couple of years ago into airport noise which took evidence here in Adelaide. I do not know if you have seen a copy of that report. It might be a little bit dated now but it was not all that long ago—three or four years ago. I've just been told it was 1985. It is probably a bit dated now.

**Dr Tustin**—I was not that interested at that time.

**Mr HOLLIS**—I understand that there was already some monitoring. The FAC or someone said that there was monitoring of noise at the airport already.

**Dr Tustin**—I think that was in the airport grounds and not in the residential areas.

**Mr HOLLIS**—I am not saying that the sewage works is a residential ground but, from memory, they said—and it was in the evidence—that the monitoring was at either end of the runway and in the sewage works. Mr Chairman, we might ask them when they come back if there are any other areas. Dr Tustin, I am not unsympathetic to what you are saying but you face a classic dilemma that so many people are faced with. It has been put to us in very strong terms that this is an economic benefit for the state of South Australia. We have had various people saying that. We have not had a lot of evidence to say that it is not going to be an economic benefit. I am not even South Australian but I suppose it is all right for me to come from New South Wales and say, 'For the economic benefit of South Australia, you people who live in that area are going to cop this.' That is the basic dilemma. What would you propose—I know that you have mentioned noise amelioration or compensation—to this committee that we should recommend? That the work not proceed? Do you want the work to proceed, or what?

**Dr Tustin**—We are not trying to stop the extension of the airport. We are saying that budgetary considerations have been substantial and the cheapest option has been taken on this project in regard to one topic after another.

**Mr HOLLIS**—What was that?

**Dr Tustin**—The cheapest option was taken in relation to-

**Mr HOLLIS**—Thirty-eight million dollars is not all that cheap, though.

**Dr Tustin**—The tunnel was ruled out because it was more expensive than the road around the shore, and so on. We have accepted that, but we are asking that some of the money that has been saved be spent, firstly, on measuring the noise impact on North Glenelg. Secondly, if it turns out that there are some houses which have been adversely impacted by this extension, their owners should be compensated by whatever is the best means, whether it is noise insulation or whatever. We are asking that that, at this stage, be kept as a real option and not be dismissed.

**Mr HOLLIS**—Sure.

**Dr Tustin**—The report would have us dismiss it as an insignificant factor. We ask that it not be dismissed.

**Mr HOLLIS**—That is fair enough. This is no consolation to you at all but I have

actually—on this committee and others—stood under flight paths in various cities in Australia. We had a complaint in Brisbane. I remember going there and having a whole group of people coming out from their houses to harangue me, saying, 'Listen to the noise of the planes going over.' Living close to Sydney, I frequently go over there and the noise in Sydney—around Marrickville and that—is such that you shake on the street. It is dreadful. It is almost as bad as the old airport at Hong Kong.

I have had only one experience here. Perhaps, if we have got some time this afternoon, we might get out to stand in the streets of Glenelg North and listen to the noise. But we were there today and a plane went over. I heard it but it did not have the impact on me of the planes that go over me in Sydney, Brisbane and other places. I am not saying that it is not a problem here. The dimension of the problem does not lessen the extent of the problem for the people who are affected by it. I am just saying that you are a little bit better off than some other people.

**Dr Tustin**—We quite agree. We want to keep the North Glenelg area quite a bit better off than some other parts of Australia.

**Mr HOLLIS**—Sure, and fair enough.

**CHAIR**—You made just one comment, Dr Tustin, that I found myself uneasy about. That was your use of the term 'trade-off', suggesting that the FAC had felt that they could justify more flights because, if you become accustomed to noise, you go on being accustomed to it, as it were. I would have thought, and they might want to respond to this a little later, that it was reasonable for them to submit to us—this is my view while endeavouring to be impartial about it—that the older generation of aircraft were being phased out and that they were noisier. A newer generation of quieter aircraft was emerging, therefore the emerging generation will not be as uncomfortable from a residential point of view. I did not see that, I have to say, as a trade-off. I saw them saying, 'We recognise the problem and we believe the problem will be reduced rather than increased by the changed aircraft style.' They also did not hesitate to acknowledge that there will be more flights in Adelaide, as there will be in all airports, of course.

**Dr Tustin**—I know that the proponents are sensitive about the phrasing of this. If only the proponents had made a very clear unequivocal statement from the first EIS and followed it through: that they will monitor noise and if they find houses which are adversely affected due to the extension then there will be compensation. If they had said that, we would not be quibbling. But they did not. Every time they get near to talking about that, we keep hearing this phrase, 'There will be an increase in noise because of that, but it will be offset by quieter aircraft.' So it is hard to find sentences which do not link these two.

So, as we read through it, we believe the authors have written in a trade-off which they are trying to communicate to the readers. We are all now asking that there be no such trade-off, and we are really pleased to see that you are not expecting any trade-off. We have been suspicious about the way this point has been expressed in both written documents, but



we are really pleased that there is an understanding that there will be no trade-offs.

**CHAIR**—I am not sure what each of us mutually read into the term `trade-off', but I was saying that I felt the evidence the FAC gave was not inconsistent in that they were saying, `We welcome an aircraft that has a lower noise factor.' They have not suggested they propose to bring a squadron of F18s and place them in Adelaide, as they are in Darwin. They were not being dismissive of that concern. I am happy to talk to you about the term `trade-off', but I did not feel that they had been inconsistent with that.

The other point I wanted to make was that in our tour of the airport this morning there were a couple of sites where the FAC said, `We have noise monitoring units'—for want of a better word. That does not seem to be consistent with your comment about there not being any monitoring.

**Dr Tustin**—I am just going off what reports are in these documents. So, if the FAC has been doing their own noise monitoring and knows a whole lot more than the Rust PPK, then that could well be. With the Rust PPK document it is difficult to get a sense of measured noise. We are overwhelmed with the computer predictions. Even when figures are given for decibel levels, I am unsure whether somebody measured it or whether it is a computer prediction. We are saying that there is a heavy reliance on computer based predictions in the EIS documents. It is hard to know. I do not think I read anywhere that this measure of noise came from the FAC monitoring station at this point. I do not recall seeing a strong presentation in those documents about measured noise from the FAC.

**CHAIR**—It is certainly a question that we will put to them. As there are no other questions, Dr Tustin, I thank you for your evidence and for your answers to questions.

**Dr Tustin**—Thank you.

[1.03 p.m.]

**CHAIR**—I welcome the representative of the Australian Residents Association, Mr Johnstone. The committee has received two submissions from the Australian Residents Association. One is dated 19 January 1997 and the other one is dated 6 February 1997. Do you wish to propose any amendments to those submissions?

**Mr Johnstone**—No. I would just say that that submission was done very early—at 8.20 yesterday morning—so there might be some typographical errors. Other than that, no I would not like to make any changes.

**CHAIR**—It is proposed that those submissions as well as responses by the Federal Airports Corporation and the South Australian Department of Transport, dated 19 January, be received, taken as read and incorporated in the transcript of evidence. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

*The documents and responses read as follows—*

**CHAIR**—Mr Johnstone, do you wish to make a short statement to the committee before we proceed to questions?

**Mr Johnstone**—I do. Mr Chairman, thank you for giving me the opportunity to appear before the committee, which I understand is one of the oldest committees of the federal parliament. Before doing so, I want to thank Mr Michael Fetter, the assistant secretary, and Lyn Sebo, who have been very dedicated in helping us get the documentation that we received. I know, Mr Chairman, you are aware that we have been quite concerned about the period available for submissions. We only became aware of this while some of us were on holidays. Mr Fetter has been very helpful in ensuring that we get the documentation. So I would like to thank him for that on the record.

I want to reiterate that we do have some concern about this advertising. I do not think it is very suitable to have such an important inquiry of this nature after Christmas and New Year. This is a time when many people go on holidays with their family and friends. In particular, it is a time when people do not want to be alarmed or have anything to do with politics.

So I just wanted to say that we do have very strong concern about the advertising. Not many people that I have spoken to in the short time that I had to prepare for this have been aware of the reference, so I do not know how many submissions you have received from the general community. I would be very interested to know how many you have received. If you have not received many, I would indicate that might be that people do not really know that this inquiry is presently being considered.

We do wish to raise concern about the cost of this development. This is going to cost a considerable amount of money, as you all would be aware. From what the FAC said this morning, it looks as though very little is really going to be achieved from it. Can we really afford to spend \$100 million when, at the same time, the government has to fund the many community organisations and other areas throughout Australia? I understand that even the committee system is under attack as well. So can we really be looking at spending \$100 million on something which really may not have much benefit? I just want to say that this is a lot of money to be spent. Can we really justify it? I have grave doubts that we can.

In the short time that we have had to consider it, I wonder if the FAC has looked at totally relocating the airport to another area within Adelaide. Is the runway that is going to be considered—with the extra so many metres there are—really going to be useful? Could we not relocate to another area of land on the outskirts, where there is more land? It might be a lot more attractive to build another airport. I noticed in this submission that the FAC quickly dismissed that. They did not seem to want to consider that option. They wanted their consideration considered first and, hopefully, that would get up instead of a consideration from someone else. I do not know whether there has been any consideration of this, but maybe the relocation of the airport itself should be one of the things that you could be looking at.

Also, we just wondered why it is not possible that they could have looked at things like

improving the airport terminal. I know they mentioned something about a master plan. I went to the state library in the two weeks that I have had to prepare for this, and they could not find any reference to a master plan on the Adelaide airport on file. So apparently this documentation is very scarce and you cannot really obtain it.

It is our very express concern that Patawalonga Creek and Sturt Creek are going to be affected quite substantially by this runway. The people before you have indicated that there will not really be much interference and that there is not much to really be concerned about. I beg to differ. They may not think it much, but there are ducks and birds and koalas in that area. There are other species that are all going to be affected by this, but the FAC do not seem to care about that. They just want to have the runway put through as quickly as possible. They are not really concerned about that. I think that is wrong. It is the wrong attitude to take.

If the FAC preferred option is adopted, we ask: is it really going to be long enough for what they are trying to do? I know they have mentioned the sewage treatment works, but it has been suggested that it may not be long enough. You see, it is very good, isn't it? The FAC can say, in their response to your submissions, 'Privatisation has nothing to do with this.' Yet here they are speaking about the very thing they have said in their responses to us is a concern. They are going to lease the airport. I know you voted for it in the parliament, but that is another thing. This is a concern to us. I do not think it is right that we should be selling off our Adelaide Airport. What it is going to mean is more noise. The curfew will probably go. Residents will have a lot more to be concerned about. I think these things should have been in the submission because they are relevant.

Since we faxed you our submission yesterday we have had further discussions with our members and others. Many have said they like the country style airport that we have here in Adelaide at the moment. It is alright. It is quite peaceful. With the extension of the airport we could have something very much like a Los Angeles airport type of thing. We do not really want that. With Compass coming into the picture now—and I know Ansett and Qantas do not really want to know about that—it is going to mean even more flights. So I do reject, quite strongly, the two per cent extra inflights that the FAC is suggesting to you. I think there is going to be a lot more of an increase and there are going to be a lot more aircraft than are being considered.

I see your eyes are drooping, Mr Vice Chairman, so I will not hold you too much longer. I know you have been up at parliament until very late. I just want to ask—

**CHAIR**—My advice, Mr Johnstone, would be not to provoke the Vice Chairman.

**Mr Johnstone**—I wanted to ask whether any compensation has been considered for the residents in the area; whether or not they, like Sydney residents, can be assisted in that area. There are a lot of residents in the areas around there. I just thought of it because the noise has been of concern.

The FAC have told you they would want option No. 1, that is, the number one thing

they would like. We would like option No. 2 because it says in this document they have put together that it would extend the main runway in both directions. That way it would not affect Patawalonga Creek. But, for some reason, they cannot find reasons to support that. Someone actually said that all they did was put this on here to make it look very good that they had even considered the options. I do not know whether they have or not. I am just wondering why option No. 2 and perhaps option No. 3 have not really been given adequate consideration by the FAC. Perhaps this committee could be looking at them a lot more because they do look to be quite reasonable in their approach.

You did mention the roadworks and the tunnel. We support the tunnel because it is going to have less effect on the community. It is disappointing that, according to their own figures, it is only going to cost \$6 million more to do a tunnel than it would to do the roadworks. I was just wondering whether that could be looked at. It is only \$6 million more and they are building it anyway. I am not saying that we should throw money away but I am asking if that can at least be looked at. That was in the submission.

Members have also suggested that the redevelopment should require that environmental considerations be looked at as they are doing this. I know they have suggested quite substantially that that has already been looked at. We were very concerned to read, even before this committee has finished, that the FAC are already viewing works associated with the roadworks. They had not even waited for this committee to finish before they were saying, 'Let's get this done quickly.' I think it is wrong that the FAC is already looking at getting work started without waiting for this procedure to finish.

In the Sydney airport situation, things were said to be going to happen but we found out later that it was going to be a lot different to what we were told. Is it possible that what we are being told today, years or even months later, we will find out is going to be a lot different when the runway is built? They are saying only very minor things are going to be affected and there won't be much change to noise or whatever, but we could find out later that it could have a very big effect. I just hope we are all getting the truth here from the FAC and that we do not find later on that we have not really been told the whole truth.

**CHAIR**—In response to your last point, I should make the point, in fairness to the FAC and to all Australian citizens, that parliamentary committees have evidence given under oath. I think it would be quite improper to suggest that the FAC had been deliberately deceitful before this committee.

**Mr Johnstone**—I don't mean that.

**CHAIR**—You surprise me a little, if I may say, with your suggestion that you are worried about the expenditure of \$38 million. Do you not think it inconsistent to then suggest that we should relocate the airport or build a tunnel, given that the relocation would run into thousands of millions of dollars and the tunnel would be, on evidence given to us, \$30 million? Do you not think that seems inconsistent with your suggestion that we should not be spending \$38 million, which was the lower rather than the upper cost option which you have pursued?

**Mr Johstone**—With regard to the first point you mentioned, I am not suggesting they have misled in any way. But I do realise that, when the federal airports stuff went through in federal parliament a couple of years ago with John Howard, residents found that what was first told to them was quite substantially different later on.

Our submission is a range of views from a lot of people. What we have put into our submission, and what I have said to you today, is what people have suggested to you. While we are saying that it is a lot of money to be spending, some of the members and some of the people we have spoken to have said, 'Why don't they relocate the whole airport because of the inconvenience to residents, noise and other matters?' They are just some of the things that we have put to you in the very short time we have had to prepare it. While we are saying it is a lot of money—and it is a lot of money—is it not better that we relocate the whole airport? Then there would not have to be any worry about noise. It might be a lot easier for them: that is how we have arrived at that.

**CHAIR**—I should also comment—to put the *Hansard* record straight—that it is a little improper to suggest that the FAC cranked up the bulldozer when our backs were turned. In fact, the FAC are unable to move on any of these projects without first approaching either this committee or our state colleagues. So they have done it with our knowledge.

**Mr Johstone**—It says on page 8 of their own submission:

Works are currently underway on the West Beach Recreation Reserve in order to free up land so that Tapleys Hill Road can be diverted around the runway extension.

When that was read—and we were reading as quickly as we could—someone asked what they were doing there. That seemed to us that they were already going in with bulldozers. It may not be but—

**CHAIR**—No, Mr Johstone, they were. But they were doing it with the knowledge of Minister Laidlaw and Minister Jull and of myself and of the South Australia chairman—not in a cavalier way. That was a matter, frankly, not of us wanting to presume on the process but of making a decision that, in the interests of the national and state economies, it was better to allow superficial work to proceed in order to minimise the delay in getting what was thought to be a useful project ahead. It was not anticipating the outcome of this hearing. In fact, this hearing can still find against that work. Then it would be fair to say some money would have been wasted, but the wastage would be less than what would be lost through time delays if we were to proceed to give approval.

**Mr Johstone**—But you can see from reading that that people would say, 'Oh, look, they're already proceeding without even waiting.' So my instructions were, in representing the members, that I had to raise that because it does look as though they are already proceeding without really waiting for the outcome of this committee. If you did, as you said, it would be quite serious. I think that is something that should have at least waited.

**CHAIR**—I understand. I merely make the point that it is on the heads of the politicians that this decision was made, not on the heads of the FAC. It was a risky course to take, but it was taken because we deemed it to be the lesser of the available evils at the time.

You have expressed an understandable concern about the hearing being held at this time of the year. The committee has a number of hearings. There is some urgency about this if it is to proceed; that is why approval was given for incidental preliminary work.

There have been occasions, in the time that both Mr Hollis and I have been on this committee, that we have given approval for concurrent documentation so that steps can be taken ahead of an approval. As I have indicated, that has partially occurred here. But, in fact, far from this being a proposal that has been kept from the public gaze, as from July 1995 at least, all of this has been very much open to the public gaze, and the EIS reflects that. A great deal of opportunity has been given for people to participate in the EIS process. We regret that this is the first of the hearings that we have had in this parliamentary year—in 1997—but this was the next cab off the rank and it could only be achieved early in February by advertising over Christmas.

**Mr Johnstone**—The secretary did write and I know he is very experienced in the community affairs committee that he was secretary to, but the situation was that it was advertised the Saturday after Christmas/New Year, when people were away. That is when it appeared in the *Adelaide Advertiser* and that was when my attention was brought to it. It might have been advertised earlier or later—I was not sure. But it does seem to us to be an inappropriate time, particularly when community input was being sought, as it should have been, and we just felt that it was wrong.

**CHAIR**—I am sure Mr Fetter, who can do very little wrong, apparently, will be able to indicate how it was. Mr Hollis might have a question, too.

**Mr HOLLIS**—I just have a couple of general questions. What is the membership of the Australian Residents Association?

**Mr Johnstone**—We were established in November of last year and we became active in various issues. We were known under another name—the Concerned Citizens Association—but that was a bit too long, so we've made it a bit easier for people to say. Currently, we have got just on 100 members.

**Mr HOLLIS**—Are they local residents here?

**Mr Johnstone**—They are members within Australia.

**Mr HOLLIS**—So it is an Australia-wide membership?

**Mr Johnstone**—Yes.

**Mr HOLLIS**—And you meet regularly? Weekly? Monthly?

**Mr Johnstone**—We are in the process of being incorporated.

**Mr HOLLIS**—How many are in your local chapter?

**Mr Johnstone**—Approximately 30 to 40 members within this state.

**Mr HOLLIS**—And what do they do? They pay a membership fee? Can I join? Can anyone join?

**Mr Johnstone**—We are a private organisation.

**Mr HOLLIS**—But if you are Australia-wide, why can't I join?

**Mr Johnstone**—Because we want to make sure that the people who are involved have the same interests. We do not want—

**Mr HOLLIS**—You vet your membership, do you?

**Mr Johnstone**—We do not want developers becoming involved. We want to give a grass roots—

**Mr HOLLIS**—Do you have a constitution?

**Mr Johnstone**—We do, yes.

**CHAIR**—You have a question, Mr Johnstone, about the number of submissions we have received, and Mr Nordin has indicated to me that we have received 16 submissions prior to this inquiry. You also ask why Option 2 was not proceeded with, which surprised me a little, and I ask you to respond to this. I would have thought that Option 2 which, as I understand it, involves extending the runway each way rather than imposing into Patawalonga Creek, would be a greater burden on anyone living on the eastern end of the runway. It seems to me that would be something you would want us to resist.

**Mr Johnstone**—Option 2 says, from the picture that they have presented to us at Figure 1, there did not seem to be much—Option 3 did, but Option 2 seemed to be the better option because it did not affect Patawalonga Creek.

**CHAIR**—It would still put more aircraft landing closer to houses—or taking off.

**Mr Johnstone**—If they extended it a bit more towards the sea, it does seem that it would not affect the Patawalonga. A lot of people that we spoke to were very concerned about the creek and some of the suggestions were that that could be better. Some people were



saying that they were prepared to put up with the noise if the creek were not affected, and some said vice versa. But that was the suggestion that we had, that Option 2 or Option 3 be considered before Option 1.

**CHAIR**—Any other questions? Mr Hollis?

**Mr HOLLIS**—Do you disagree with the interpretation of the creek there? My understanding, from what we have been told, is that it was in a state of disrepair—if disrepair is the right word—and it was not a scenic or environmental gem.

**Mr Johnstone**—Some environmentalists say that it is, and some environmentalists say the present state government has not been looking after the creek as well as they could have—I know the previous Labor government did—but bird life and koalas and other animals have been found there apparently, and they were concerned. They say it is in disrepair but species still live in the area, so why should they be affected? Do we want to see koalas run over by aircraft?

**Mr HOLLIS**—The flights would have to be fairly low to hit a koala, would they not?

**Mr Johnstone**—No, I mean—

**Mr HOLLIS**—You said you did not want to see koalas run over by aeroplanes, but they do not fly that low.

**Mr Johnstone**—No, but we could find that, if the runway is extended as far as is proposed, that species that have been there for years could suddenly be wandering the runways. That would be very unfortunate.

**Mr HOLLIS**—When we are having these hearings, we write to a whole group of people, as well as advertising and promoting it. We wrote to the environmental people or the state environmental people, and they decided not to appear. It surprises me, if this is such an environmental gem, that we did not have more of the environmentalists from environmental organisations in South Australia and Adelaide—who are well aware of this—coming and appearing before this committee. I will check the records to see if they appeared before the South Australian public works inquiry into this, or before the EIS.

**Mr Johnstone**—On page 9 of the FAC submission they did say there was some consideration of different issues. Maybe the people who conducted these have not been aware of it, but environmentalists within the Adelaide area have said this to us, and we have said we would put their views. The Conservation Council of South Australia does not necessarily represent all conservationists. Some choose not to be involved in it. These are the concerns that they have about this airport being extended into Patawalonga Creek.

**Mr HOLLIS**—Have you actually sighted koalas there?

**Mr Johnstone**—No, but others have.

**Mr HOLLIS**—I would not mind them showing me sometime.

**Mr Johnstone**—I am only saying what other people have seen. It is my duty to bring that to your attention.

**CHAIR**—Yes. And what we can do is pursue the environmental question with FAC.

**Mr Johnstone**—We have only had a couple of days, but in that very short time I have rung people within that area, and that is what they have said to me. If that is true, it needs to be looked at.

**CHAIR**—I have no other questions, Mr Johnstone, and Mr Hollis has no other questions, so thank you for your appearance and for your submission.

**Mr Johnstone**—Thank you.

[1.30 p.m.]

**\DB\WLBHAYMAN, Mr Donald Malcolm, Manager, Projects and Consulting Services, Federal Airports Corporation, 2A Lord Street, Botany, New South Wales 2019**

**MUNCE, Mr Barry Roderick, Consultant, Airplan, Federal Airports Corporation, 2A Lord Street, Botany, New South Wales 2019**

**TREE, Mr John Laurence, Manager, Technical Services, Federal Airports Corporation, 1 James Schofield Drive, Adelaide International Airport, South Australia**

**MILLN, Mr Michael David, Senior Adviser, Aviation, South Australian Department of Transport, PO Box 1, Walkerville, South Australia 5081**

**ROBERTS, Mr Ian Noel, Airport Runway Extension Project Coordinator, South Australian Department of Transport, Head Office, PO Box 1, Walkerville, South Australia 5081**

**WALLACE, Mr Douglas Thomas, Manager, Planning, Consultant to the South Australian Department of Transport, Rust PPK Pty Ltd, GPO Box 398, Adelaide, South Australia 5001**

**TEAGUE, Dr Peter Fletcher, Senior Acoustic Consultant, Consultant to Rust PPK Pty Ltd, Vipac Engineers and Scientists, PO Box 2419, Kent Town, South Australia 5067**

**STEWART, Mr Terry John, Project Manager, South Australian Urban Projects Authority, Level 8, Riverside Centre, North Terrace, Adelaide 5000**

**CHUGG, Mr Alan Mark, District Sales Manager, Cargo, Singapore Airlines Ltd, Aviation House, Adelaide Airport, South Australia 5950**

**CHAIR**—I would remind the representatives of the FAC, the South Australian Department of Transport and their nominees that they are still under oath. I invite Mr Hayman or Mr Tree to make some remarks about the evidence presented to the hearing today.

**Mr Tree**—I might start off and request assistance a bit later from some of my colleagues. I would just like to address some of the points raised, particularly by the last two proponents. I will start off with the Australian Residents Association.

The cost of relocating the airport is, as I think you alluded to yourself, at least a billion dollars, probably more. It is a very expensive option. However, in saying that, the state government has reserved, and Mr Milln will be able to confirm it, an area of land to the north of the city for a future airport. From a planning point of view, the government is protecting the

option of a new future site. The cost of the runway extension project is not \$100 million. Current estimates put the works at around about \$48 million.

While it is not part of this exercise, I would just like to make a couple of comments with respect to improving the airport terminal. There is currently a feasibility study being carried out into the option of a new integrated terminal for the airport. That is being carried out as we speak. I know that copies of the initial master plan in 1982 were given out to local libraries. It is my belief that the West Torrens City Council Library, for example, has a copy of the original 1982 master plan.

I should say, though, that none of the master plan documents drafted have been through a formal public consultation process. They have been discussed with the likes of local government, state government and industry representatives, but there has never been a formal consultation process with the public.

With respect to the creeks and the koalas, I will leave Mr Wallace to take care of that. With respect to privatisation, privatisation is being undertaken by the government and the Assets Sales Task Force, and the FAC's involvement is really just to assist that process. With respect to the curfew, there is a curfew at Adelaide airport from 11 o'clock at night to 6 o'clock in the morning. Certainly, the FAC has no plans to change that or alter it. The state government also has a position that Mike Milln might comment on later.

**Mr Hayman**—The control of the curfew is really under the control of the minister for transport.

**CHAIR**—We are painfully aware of that because of the pressure that has been on over Sydney airport with the Olympics and the complete reluctance of the federal government to change that curfew, no matter what.

**Mr Tree**—I would also like to say that the FAC's position in this whole exercise is basically to assist the objectives of government. It is not an FAC initiated project. The revenue streams that would result from this project are not enough to commercially justify the project, as has been mentioned earlier. The FAC is assisting governments by providing technical advice and other airport expertise to facilitate the project.

In respect of option two to extend the runway in both directions, which I referred to earlier on, there would be significant community impact from that option, particularly on the residents in the vicinity of West Richmond, which is at the north-eastern end of the main runway, because of the requirement—and a lot of the public probably do not appreciate this—to knock down a lot of housing to achieve the obstacle clearance requirements that are needed to allow the aircraft to effectively use the length of runway they have available.

If you do not remove houses and obstacles to that extent, you effectively do not get any gain from the runway extension. There would be an additional noise impact which would be, in my estimation, a lot more severe than we are currently looking at, but Dr Teague may

want to comment on that later.

**Mr Hayman**—The extension to the south-west end would also still impact on the Patawalonga Creek marginally, but it would have avoided affecting the golf course. It still would have required a deviation of the Tapleys Hill Road. The other point is we would not have been able to achieve 3,100 metres of runway length. It would have been somewhat shorter than that. It would have been just under the 3,000 metre mark.

**Mr Tree**—In respect of the comment for \$6 million more for a tunnel, that probably referred to a very early option, which was the short tunnel option. That had operational problems associated with it.

In respect of the work that has been carried out, that is basically work being undertaken by the state government, and Ian Roberts would probably like to comment on that. I will finish there and let the others say some things.

**Mr Roberts**—In respect of Mr Johnstone's comments, I mention that we have done surveys again of the Patawalonga site looking for indigenous fauna. We have certainly not found koalas, but we do have to deal with frogs and turtles—the less mobile fauna.

In my response to the committee about the existence of the residents association, I was relatively apologetic that we had not discovered the committee. We put great store in searching for all appropriate stakeholders in the early stages of the project. I was somewhat relieved to discover that they were quite a new group. All of our efforts were done around October to December 1995 and, as Mr Johnstone said, they emerged just late last year. I am somewhat relieved that we did our best and they were not in existence at the time.

To comment on the work that is occurring up-front, I reinforce that that is totally at the state's risk. As you said, discussion has occurred with a variety of groups, involving myself, over the state's decision to take this risk with its own money to do things on what is state land currently—modifying the golf course, particularly—in advance of the final approval of the project to make sure we finish the project as early as possible and, therefore, derive the benefits for the state's traders as early as possible. What would happen if the project were not approved is one of those questions that has naturally been very carefully addressed. If that happened, we would end up with an improved golf course and the state felt that was a risk worth taking.

Moving to Don Tustin's comments, I would depend on Doug and Peter Teague to speak to some of the details in more detail than I, because they have provided the expertise in those areas. Can I say up-front that, from the time of the development of the EIS—that was released publicly in early June 1996—it was our proposal to undertake further monitoring of the Glenelg North area. It was a very early matter the project team decided was going to be necessary.

We cannot monitor things that have not been built, but the intention is to get into

monitoring the existing circumstance and maximise the use of that in predicting the future circumstance. I emphasise again 'predicting'. We are going to be dependent upon calculations that are going to try to model or predict what would apply, subject to this proposal's approval, in the future. There was reference to existing noise monitoring, which Airservices Australia—

**Mr Tree**—If I can interrupt there and say that there are five monitoring stations in place and they have been there for at least 12 months—certainly before this EIS process started. They are located in the sewage treatment works; in the university playing fields, which is actually our land; in the residential area at the other end of the runway at the Netley kindergarten; on Press Road, which is at the north-east end of the runway; and further out on the main runway alignment—I am not sure of its exact location, but it is in Medindie.

So there are five noise monitoring stations in place. Those noise monitoring stations are operated and managed by Airservices Australia. That has a very significant database of every operation of aircraft at Adelaide airport and it provides a mass of information, which is available and reported to the environmental committee on a quarterly basis.

**Mr Roberts**—Can I say that I have approval from my minister to proceed with an enhanced monitoring study. The company that Peter Teague represents is to undertake that work. It is a project that the state is going to fund again because the state has the money at the moment for this project—the up-front allocation of \$20 million—but it will be done cooperatively with the FAC. That proposal which was in the EIS has been supported by both the state and federal assessments.

We anticipate that that work will start late this month. Work is occurring at the moment preparing for the process of measurement. That will enable us to improve our predictions of both decibel levels with the change of the runway and the ANEC data that is being predicted as well.

Don made a variety of comments about consultation and the background data to the information that we have published. I think it might be useful if I passed over to Doug first of all as the leader of the EIS study and then to Peter to speak to those technical points.

**Mr Wallace**—I did want to say that I am little concerned representing the 45 consultants, including 14 people with doctoral qualifications, that the inference was that it was not a professional document. We have the substantial evidence and there has been considerable technical work undertaken, particularly in relation to noise.

I think philosophically one needs to recognise the requirements of the EIS guidelines—both Commonwealth and state EIA—were to produce publicly readable documents, which is justified by other scientific evidence. We have gone through that process and approached it to produce a readable document rather than fill the document up, which would have been very large. Notwithstanding that, the evidence and the substantiation that has occurred in a technical sense is there and we can demonstrate that. Dr Teague can talk about his work, particularly in relation to noise.

I just wanted to say, in relation to the consultation side of it, that we did go out of the way and there was a special consultation strategy that the minister approved as part of the total document. I draw the committee's attention to Section 2 of the response document, which outlines the process that we went through, including having an open telephone line available for telephone responses; including fliers sent to 8,000 households around the airfield on more than one occasion; including media releases; including workshops with a whole range of stakeholder groups, industry groups and residents groups; including specific meetings with the Glenelg Residents Association and the public hearing, et cetera, and subsequent discussions that we have had. An indicator, in terms of the level of that consultation, was that there were well over 100 telephone inquiries and a good percentage of those supported the project.

We had an open day—it was a joint open day with the Urban Projects Authority for the other works in the West Beach area—and that was attended by approximately 1,000 people. We gave a series of lectures as to what was proposed and how we were going through that process. The EIS has been on display for two months and we have received and responded to a number of submissions. So I, quite frankly, reject the assertion that we did not consult in that process.

In relation to the noise, I would perhaps just ask Peter if he could give a brief overview of his assumptions or his approach and the philosophy behind it. It has been a rigorous assessment. We did identify, contrary to what the residents association has said, in Section 10.6.2—and Figure 10.6 demonstrates—that there was a need for further assessment in those areas that were contained in the EIS. We did say we would do more monitoring. We referred to that again in this document and Mr Roberts has pointed out that that program is actually commencing within the next few weeks so that data can, in effect, confirm those predictions that were done, and there was not just reliance on one mathematical model, but a series of cross checks, and it was undertaken both with information from Vipac and Airplan. So perhaps Dr Teague can respond briefly.

**Dr Teague**—Yes, I would like to add to that, particularly in the noise area, and respond primarily to Dr Tustin's comments and queries. Many of the answers to his questions are given in the EIS document and also in the response document, and I would like to add to those or clarify some of those now.

First of all, yes, we did go through a very rigorous assessment for this EIS. It involved a range of people with very high level qualifications and using the best practice and standards available to us now. Of course, the queries relating to the ANEF system or ANEC procedure are given in the EIS document, and we outline what the method entails. It is a scientific method and it is based on calculations. It is a very comprehensive assessment or evaluation, incorporating a whole range of operational scenarios and conditions. Just briefly, it includes the intensity or maximum dBA noise level at any point in time, in any area, due to an aircraft movement. It takes into account all flight paths and operational scenarios, including takeoffs and landings and it of course also includes the duration of overflight events and the spectrum

of noise or, if you like, the tonality makeup of the noise. All of this is incorporated and it is a system which has been in place for many years. It is well-validated and has been verified with real data from all around the world by agencies from America and Europe through to here in Australia. It is also accepted and provided as a guideline by the Australian Standards Association and various Australian government agencies and aviation and environmental authorities.

We do note, though, that there are some misgivings with the system. No system is perfect, but we believe—and this is based on research that has been done over many years—that this is the best measure that we have for determining the cumulative noise exposure and the community reaction to that noise exposure, in the world today. It is based on up-to-date research by many bodies. Even though it is not a perfect system—one cannot have a perfect one—it is the best available system using best practice that we have available to us at this point in time. We, in fact, went further for this EIS assessment and incorporated other modelling techniques for looking at specific operational scenarios, like taxiing, and also looking at take-off events as individual events—separating them out of the ANEF system—and looking at that carefully. In addition, we used actual real data that is tabulated in the Australian Standard AS2021 that also gives you typical over-flight noise levels due to different types of aircraft at different locations. We have amassed all of this data and looked at it from various perspectives and run all of our models and incorporated the real data to come up with this rigorous assessment.

To cap that off, yes, this monitoring program will help to strengthen that and give us greater accuracy. Dr Tustin mentioned area estimates and so on. In the EIS document at the bottom of page 10.9, the error in the estimates of the number of people affected is given to plus or minus 20 persons. And it is rounded off to the nearest 10 persons. I would like to add that, yes, the system is not perfect. We cannot narrow it down to the actual individual person and those number of people quoted within contour levels are just the number of people residing there. We have research that tells us that some fraction of them might be moderately affected, some might be seriously affected and some might not be affected at all. It depends on individuals and the general community reaction which is very hard to predict. Noise is a very complex issue and it is very difficult to predict how individuals will respond to individual events or whatever. This system is the best possible one that we have in place to properly do this assessment.

I will also mention the project option No. 2 that Mr Tree brought forward again. Yes, there would be an increase in noise levels to the north-east of the airport and also a greater number of people affected in high noise bands due to that scenario going ahead and that, of course, has been looked at throughout the EIS process. I think that is all I would like to add at this moment.

**Mr Wallace**—Mr Chairman, I just want to point out a fact that I omitted in relation to the Patawalonga Creek. I think it would help explain the situation, if I could move to the plan in a minute. The northern portion of the Patawalonga Creek will be unaffected at all by this proposal remains as it has been for a considerable period of time since pre-European



settlement.

*Pointing to illustration.*

The whole of that area has subsequently been modified and the levels changed. In the days of the first landing here, that whole area was in a wetland and the drainage system was indiscriminate and in a flood plain. That has been substantially modified. I will now point out the area that remains unchanged. That is of significance and remains of significance. I will indicate this portion of Patawalonga Creek, in this area here, and you can see the data line—there are melaleucas around that area. From there, it has been variously modified and what you see today is simply a man-made construction. Otherwise it would look that way, as indicated. This whole area has been modified, so really what we are talking about is modifying a modified creek, for that portion of it, and actually trying to recreate a new creek system which reflects more of what was there in the past.

**CHAIR**—Native animals that are there will be encouraged or physically moved into the new area, I presume?

**Mr Wallace**—Yes, the recolonisation processes are naturally occurring and they are already recolonising that creek system.

**CHAIR**—I have one other question and I will invite any comment from the representatives present. It relates to the noise monitoring. I presume noise monitoring goes on 24 hours a day at these five stations, does it?

**Mr Hayman**—Yes, it does.

**CHAIR**—And it is expressed by way of computer print-out or graph or something?

**Mr Tree**—It actually records each noise event. It records the details of the aircraft—it is locked into the radar system. It records the time, the date, the noise level, even the aircraft registration number and the dBA level of that noise event.

**Mr Roberts**—It is fair to say, in respect to the noise monitoring and possible amelioration, which we have always flagged as a possibility, that we are committed to that and always were. But it has been reinforced by the process of the assessments by the state and federal agencies and they have required that process to be built into existing consultative mechanisms that already are run by the FAC, such as the airport environment committee. So that new step, enlarged monitoring, will be embraced within an existing—and, I would like to think, an accepted—consultative mechanism that the FAC has had running for some time.

**CHAIR**—There is an indication that Mr Milln would like to make a comment.

**Mr Milln**—The issue of Adelaide's curfew came up. I thought it might be useful to make a comment about that. As Mr Tree said, the curfew is not regulated by the state. It is

regulated by the Commonwealth and actually operates under the administration of the Federal Department of Transport. Nevertheless, the state government does have some input into the process under which the curfew operates, largely through the state government's membership of the Adelaide Airport Environment Committee but also directly between the State Minister for Transport and the Federal Minister for Transport. It is probably worth putting on the record that the state government has not advocated in the past, and does not now advocate, abolition of Adelaide airport's curfew. It recognises that an airport in a city location like this has to have a curfew. It is a fact of life and it is not going to go away.

Nevertheless, the curfew arrangements, under which the federal minister operates, allows him to make exemptions when there is clear benefit to the community with very little 'dis-benefit.' So it allows him, usually acting under recommendations from the FAC-chaired Adelaide Airport Environment Committee, to consider airline applications for various in-curfew operations and to say either yes or no. The federal minister has a record of rigorous assessment of those and they are given only under unusual circumstances. So Qantas's exemption to land four Singapore-origin flights in Adelaide during winter at 5 a.m. is an example of an operation that is barred by the curfew but exempted by the minister and a full community impact study was undertaken after six months of operation. The clear consensus is that it has extremely low community impact and very high community benefit. So the state government's position is that it would encourage the federal minister to continue assessing exemptions on that sort of basis.

**Mr HOLLIS**—I wish to ask a question about the relocation of the airport. I actually meant to ask before if any consideration was being given to that. You actually did outline that relocation was an option?

**Mr Hayman**—Yes, it was considered in the processes as one of the options. It was over a billion dollars.

**Mr Roberts**—That is right. The size of the net cost to the community, on present-value basis, was—as Don says—in excess of a billion dollars. That is taking into account all costs, not just infrastructure costs—travel costs to the community and all that sort of thing.

**CHAIR**—There was a reference made to koalas. Are there koalas there?

**Mr Wallace**—No. The surveys we have done and all the documentation reviewed have identified the species contained in the appendix at the back of the EIS. There are no koalas there.

**CHAIR**—No urban koalas?

**Mr Wallace**—No.

**CHAIR**—Mr Tree, you wish to make a comment?

**Mr Tree**—Thank you. You asked before about noise complaints. I have here some copies of noise complaint summaries, a sample covering some periods in 1995 and 1996 and as far back as 1994. Do you wish to consider them?

**CHAIR**—Given the real concern that there is, understandably, about noise in every airport location, particularly in an urban one such as this, it would be helpful. Is it the wish of the committee that the document be incorporated in the transcript of evidence? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

*The document read as follows—*

**Mr Cornish**—Mr Chairman, it would be remiss if I let the opportunity to comment pass. One of the speakers suggested that there was not any economic benefit that he could see coming from airport runway extensions. From a primary producer's point of view—and I would be so bold as to take that further into the full export community, including seafood—there is huge economic advantage to be gained by this proposal. South Australia has been limited in its market access capability because of our restrictions of freight and the like. It has enormous benefits other than just to producers—value adders, packing people and freight forwarders, as well as producers, would share in the rewards that would come.

In South Australia we will simply miss the boat very quickly if we do not seize on the opportunity. We repeatedly hear about this window of opportunity that exists in Asia. That window is not going to remain open for terribly much longer. There is no port of destination in Asia which says, 'This market space is reserved for South Australians once they get their act together.' If we do not act prudently, efficiently and effectively in the short term rather than the long term, we will spend a long time lamenting the fact that we sat on our hands. I commend the South Australian Department of Transport and the other government authorities that have been involved in presenting this project. I think it is a sustainable development that South Australia needs immediately.

**CHAIR**—Thank you, Mr Cornish. If there are no other questions and no other observations anyone wishes to make, is it the wish of the committee that the documents listed on the sheet that has been circulated, in this case to Mr Hollis, be incorporated in the transcript of evidence? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

*The documents read as follows—*

**CHAIR**—Before closing this public hearing, I would like to thank the witnesses who appeared before the committee today, particularly those who assisted with our inspections this morning. I am grateful to the FAC and the South Australian Department of Transport for their timeliness in meeting us this morning and for the frank way in which they showed us not only the things that they are optimistic about at the airport site but also the things that they were concerned about as well.

I would also like to express my thanks to the other witnesses who appeared before us. I would like to thank the public for their patience in what has been a wise but somewhat extended decision to delay the luncheon and run the proceedings to this stage. A special vote of thanks is due to the Speaker of the Legislative Council, the Hon. Peter Dunn, for making these hearing facilities available. Can I also thank, with more sincerity than you may have anticipated, ladies and gentlemen, my colleague Mr Hollis, without whom such a hearing would not have been possible today. On that note, I thank Mr Hollis, the secretariat and *Hansard*.

Resolved (on motion by Mr Hollis):

That, pursuant to the power conferred by subsection 2(2) of the Parliamentary Papers Act 1908, this sectional committee authorises publication of the evidence given before it and submissions presented at the public hearing this day.

**Subcommittee adjourned at 2.05 p.m.**