

CHAPTER FOUR

TECHNICAL ISSUES

4.1 This chapter considers a number of issues in relation to runway options and flight paths. It outlines the concerns which have been raised by residents in relation to both the current and the proposed runway configurations. It defines the differences between flight path and flight track information, and examines the limitations of the ANEF system as a means for measuring aircraft noise.

Runway options

4.2 Runway options at Brisbane Airport have been the subject of ongoing investigation since planning for the new Brisbane airport commenced. Initial planning for Brisbane airport began in 1970, with the formation of the Brisbane Airport Advisory Committee (BAAC), a committee which included representation from all three levels of government.

Previous studies

4.3 The original work in 1970-71 to identify a preferred runway configuration examined 17 options¹. These were then refined to form three main options for consideration by BAAC. BAAC concluded that a balanced design of two wide spaced parallel 01/19 runways, a cross-runway and a central terminal area with access from the south was adopted as the most appropriate design.²

4.4 The staged construction of a parallel runway system to the north of the existing Eagle Farm airport was initially recommended by BAAC in the early 1970's and formed the basis of a future Master Plan for Brisbane Airport.

4.5 In 1981 the Parliamentary Joint Standing Committee on Public Works also concluded that the proposed Master Plan for the Ultimate Redevelopment of Brisbane Airport was "broadly satisfactory".³

4.6 The first Master Plan for Brisbane Airport, which was made public in 1983 by the then Commonwealth Department of Aviation, contained a 01/19 parallel runway system. This was consistent with the BAAC's 1971 findings.

4.7 In 1991 the Federal Airports Corporation (FAC) published an update of the 1983 Master Plan. The review of the Master Plan included consideration of alternative runway configurations and focussed on aircraft noise, runway capacity and costs. The

¹ Brisbane Airport Corporation Limited, *Master Plan 1998*, p 96.

² Ibid, p 97.

³ Ibid.

options considered included a parallel runway 14/32 in recognition of the need to decrease noise exposure. The updated version of the Master Plan included a 01/19 parallel runway system and omitted the parallel 14/32 cross runway.⁴ No reasons are provided for the omission of the alternative runway option.

4.8 Between 1995 and 1996 further studies were undertaken on the development of the runway system to improve capacity to accommodate forecast traffic, particularly in peak hours. The studies concluded that capacity would be reached around 2007, and that a runway parallel to 01/19 and to the west of the terminal area was required.⁵

1997 Brisbane Airport Corporation Review

4.9 In 1997, the BAC conducted a review of runway configuration options. The review was led by Netherlands Airport Consultants (NACO), an independent firm of airport consultants. NACO undertook a review of a large number of previous reports and airport master plans, as well as conducting its own assessment of appropriate runway configuration options.

4.10 BAC's advisers also considered the earlier work, examining the option of a runway parallel to 14/32. The earlier reports state that to provide maximum operational flexibility both runways should be 3,600 m in length. The reports noted a significant part of the additional length for existing 14/32 would be reclaimed land in Moreton Bay and that the new parallel runway would be built completely on reclaimed land. The options examined are set out in more detail in the Supplementary Report to the Master Plan, 1998.⁶

4.11 The outcome of the NACO review indicated that a runway parallel to 01/19 was the best option for Brisbane Airport. The solution proposed by NACO formed the basis of the airport layout as described in the current Master Plan.⁷

4.12 Subsequently, BAC identified a modified version of a runway parallel to 01/19 by staggering the site of the runway to create a distance of some 6.5km from the centre-line to the nearest residences. BAC notes that "the Staggered Runway Concept is still preliminary in nature"⁸. BAC released the Staggered Runway Concept as a possible Master Plan development option for the parallel runway on 1 August 1999. BAC states that it is committed to evaluating other runway configuration options as requested by the Minister.

⁴ BAC, Submission No. 128, pp. 7-9, and Brisbane Airport Corporation Limited, *Master Plan 1998*, p. 20.

⁵ Brisbane Airport Corporation Limited, *Master Plan 1998*, p. 99.

⁶ Brisbane Airport Corporation Limited, *Draft Master Plan – (Supplementary Report)* p, 44.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ BAC, Submission No 128, p. 16.

4.13 The new runway concept continues to propose the use of a parallel runway solution to meet future needs, but the parallel runway is located a further 1.3 kilometres toward Moreton Bay, thus creating a staggered effect with the existing main runway.

Community views on the runway options in the Master Plan

4.14 There was general support for the development of the airport and its precinct because of the economic opportunities that a developed Brisbane airport presents for Brisbane and the south-east region of Queensland. Several parties in submissions to and appearances before the Committee supported the development of Brisbane Airport. For example, the Office of Economic Development for the City of Brisbane:

It is understandable that social issues which affect people must be of consideration in any economic agenda. On the other hand, in attempting to curtail the growth and service of an airport there is the real danger that you may affect forever the growth of a city.

Brisbane Airport is presently the leading Australian airport capable of competing both now and in the future on the international scene. Any actions designed to restrict this competitive edge can only prove to have serious national consequences.⁹

4.15 NACO state in their submission that:

We believe that the project management of BAACL has acted in a very professional and pro-active way and has performed all duties which were required to achieve a good and realistic Master Plan in which the commercial, operational and environmental considerations are well balanced.

In the investigation of the possible runway options, previous prepared reports has (sic) been studied and evaluated. Environmental aspects were assessed and public safety was addressed. Again we honestly believe that all possible options have been evaluated in a professional way and that the selected future runway development is fair and realistic.¹⁰

Opposition to the proposed runway option

4.16 Opposition to the proposed runway options came from two main sectors of the community:

- a) residents and schools opposed to present and expected levels of aircraft noise and pollution related to flight paths and tracks over built-up areas of Brisbane;

⁹ Office of economic Development for the City of Brisbane Ltd, Submission No. 13, p. 2.

¹⁰ Netherlands Airport Consultants, Submission No. 134, p. 2.

b) opposition by residents not currently affected by aircraft noise to the development of an extended runway 14/32 and a new runway parallel to 14/32, which may have the effect of shifting aircraft noise to areas not currently affected.

4.17 BAC's analysis of submissions in the Public Comment Phase shows the issues of noise and runways generated 4,110 and 3,931 responses respectively. It should be noted that many of these submissions were in the form of proforma letters.

4.18 Opposition to, or concern over, the parallel runway option identified in the Master Plan came from residents groups, schools and individuals. In many cases the opposition is based on a long standing perception that residents were misled when the airport was first developed and that any parallel runway development next to 01/19 would perpetuate that deception. AJ Gregory, advised the Committee that:

We were assured years ago when the present runway was proposed that no resident of the southside would be affected by aircraft passing over our suburbs but we have paid dearly for accepting that assurance ever since with lack of sleep, interruptions to conversations, tv reception, pollution and the ever present threat of a disaster just to name a few.¹¹

4.19 A central theme to many of the submissions and oral evidence was that the runway options considered by BAC were not dealt with in sufficient detail:

In the 240 pages of the Master Plan documentation only three meagre pages were dedicated to what steps had been taken to explore the other runway options. I see no evidence of any rigorous treatment of runway options other than the Western Parallel Runway.¹²

4.20 Ban Aircraft over Residential Brisbane is concerned that, without full information from the investigation of all four runway options, they are not able to compare the different options:

Information that was presented to us was purely and simply promoting the parallel runway option. When there is nothing to compare that with, we cannot make an informed decision as to whether this is the best for Brisbane.¹³

4.21 Rivermouth Action Group expressed the view that a second runway should not be built in Brisbane at all, suggesting that there was no capacity for the increased airport emissions.¹⁴

¹¹ Mr Arthur James Gregory, Submission No. 25.

¹² B, K & A Rowley, Submission No. 50, p. 1.

¹³ BARB, Evidence, RRAT, 15 November 1999, p. 16-17.

¹⁴ Rivermouth Action Group Inc, Evidence, RRAT, 15 November 1999, p. 45.

4.22 Educational institutions are concerned over the impact of noise levels in the areas likely to be affected. The Churchie Anglican Church Grammar School submitted:

A study of the impact of the effects of aircraft noise and other pollution on residents' health, lifestyle and well-being [needs to] be undertaken and published.¹⁵

4.23 Saints Peter and Paul's School, Bulimba, submitted:

Our school lies directly under the current flight path for Brisbane Airport. We are subjected to the usual nuisances of such a flight path . . . interminable noise pollution, aircraft pollution and the constant fear of disaster. Such a scenario will be savagely exacerbated if the Brisbane Airports Corporation has its way.

Finally, we believe that the mere three page dismissal of other option runways in the huge Master Plan documentation appears as an exercise in deception.¹⁶

4.24 Lourdes Hill College Ltd is concerned over the proposed placement of the parallel runway 01/19:

The proposed parallel runway is of concern to us as it is possible that this runway will bring the flight paths of many take-offs and landing directly over the school. This will have considerable noise impact upon the education process occurring in our school. The College has not been constructed to deal with this level of noise and the learning of students would be considerably disrupted.¹⁷

4.25 Bulimba State School P&C Association noted that:

As Bulimba State Primary School will be directly under the centre line for the proposed parallel runway, we have grave concerns regarding the impact noise will have on our students ability to learn.¹⁸

4.26 Mr Duncan Miller expressed his view that:

This parallel runway proposal is an assault on the future quality of our suburban environment.¹⁹

¹⁵ Churchie Anglican Church Grammar School, Submission No. 10, p. 1

¹⁶ Saints Peter and Paul's School, Submission No. 81, p. 1.

¹⁷ Lourdes Hill College Ltd, Submission No. 119. See also Cannon Hill Anglican College, Submission No.115, p. 1.

¹⁸ Bulimba State School P & C Association, Submission No. 104, p. 1.

¹⁹ Mr Duncan Miller, Submission No.111, covering letter

Impact of weather conditions

4.27 Many submitters were concerned that BAC had not adequately assessed all runway options or the impact the different options might have in terms of economic, social, environmental and public health and safety issues.²⁰

4.28 A concern expressed in a number of submissions is related to the necessity, in different wind conditions, for aircraft to take-off and land over residential areas, when the proposals envisaged such movements over Moreton Bay.

4.29 Frances Foley informed the Committee about a complaint made to Airservices Australia about aircraft crossing and re-crossing the Brisbane river as they approach the airport:

The only reason ever given by Airservices Australia in four years for their presence is 'wind direction'.

If 'wind direction' dictates where aircraft fly, and going by the reply to our complaints it looks as if this is so, obviously a runway should be built to suit these 'wind conditions' and to direct aircraft as much as possible over the bay rather than residential areas.²¹

4.30 Mr Spencer of BAC advised the Committee that during the day some 58 per cent of aircraft come in over Moreton Bay.²² The fact that such a percentage of aircraft come in and out over the Bay is relevant, but as Mr Rooijmans, the Managing Director and Chief Executive Officer of BAC, noted:

What is very important to realise is that this will be taking off over the bay and landing over the bay. The actual flight path is afterwards. Afterwards, they have to come over land as well, at a high distance of course.²³

4.31 The Nudgee Beach Residents and Supporters expressed concern over the potential environmental impact:

The proposed parallel runway will have significant impact on our community with regard to noise. However, the other discussed option of the cross wind runway and the extension of this to allow large planes to land upon it would be a catastrophic result for the whole community of Nudgee Beach and the surrounding Boondall Wetlands.²⁴

²⁰ See for example Mr & Mrs P & S Kirby, Submission No. 158.

²¹ Frances Foley, Submission No. 73.

²² BAC, Evidence, RRAT, 15 November 1999, p. 128.

²³ Ibid, p. 129.

²⁴ Nudgee Beach Residents and Supporters, Submission No. 94.

Runway separation

4.32 BAC claim one of the advantages of parallel runways is the ability to operate Simultaneous Opposite Direction Parallel Runway Operations (SODROPS). SODROPS enables simultaneous direct landing and take-offs over Moreton Bay. The concerns expressed to the Committee about meteorological conditions may need further consideration against the claim by BAC for SODROPS over Moreton Bay.

4.33 There was conflicting evidence presented over the minimum separation distance of the proposed parallel 01/19 runways. NACO recommends a minimum of 1035m; but BAC proposes 2000m to allow operation of SODROPS under instrument conditions.

4.34 The Department of Transport and Regional Services notes that the Civil Aviation Safety Authority Manual of Operating Standards requires a minimum of 860 metres for visual conditions. There is no CASA standard regarding SODROPS in other than visual conditions.²⁵

4.35 The Committee notes that adoption of NACO's recommended minimum 1035m has the effect of shifting the proposed runway almost a kilometre further away from residential areas, presumably with commensurate noise reduction.

Noise and the provision of flight path information

4.36 Airport related noise and runway location are closely linked. Noise at Brisbane has been an issue since the airport was opened. There was a community expectation that operators of the new airport would constrain, if not diminish, aircraft noise. The Department of Transport and Communications June 1991 Report "Brisbane Airport the Impact of Aircraft Noise" noted:

While the new Brisbane International Airport was being planned and constructed it was expected that aircraft noise would reduce considerably or disappear entirely in all areas of Brisbane when the new runway system was commissioned. Since the airport was opened the main issue to be addressed by the Task Force in response to complaints was the continued impact of aircraft noise in suburban areas and the means by which it might be minimised.²⁶

Provision of flight path information

4.37 BAC advised that an airport master plan is essentially a land use plan, and that design and publication of flight paths is not part of the information required in a Master Plan as required under the *Airports Act 1996*. They also advised that

²⁵ Department Transport and Regional Services letter 21 February 2000.

²⁶ The Report of the Task Force to Review the Operation and Planning of Brisbane Airport to Minimise the Impact of Aircraft Noise on Surrounding Communities, p. 7.

Airservices Australia, not BAC, is responsible for the design, release and administration of flight paths.²⁷

We have not released paths for two reasons: firstly, we do not have any, and, secondly, it is not our responsibility to release flight paths—it is Airservices Australia. But to the best of our knowledge there are no flight paths being constructed because they have not even designed the air space yet to be able to design the flight paths.²⁸

4.38 Clauses 71(2) (d) and (e) of the Airports Act require the Draft Master Plan or final Master Plan to specify:

- a) forecasts relating to noise exposure levels;
- b) the airport-lessee company's plans, developed following consultations with the airlines that use the airport and local government bodies in the vicinity of the airport, for managing aircraft noise intrusion in areas forecast to be subject to exposure above the significant Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) levels.²⁹

4.39 There is no explicit requirement under the Airports Act for an airport-lessee to provide an assessment of flight path outcomes from various runway options. However, BAC did indicate that it was necessary to make some assumptions about flight tracks³⁰ in order to assist Airservices Australia to construct ANEF contours, but, to the best of their knowledge, no flight paths had been prepared by any agency.³¹

4.40 BAC advise about responsibilities for flight paths in the Master Plan:

Brisbane airport is surrounded by controlled airspace administered by Airservices Australia through its Air Traffic Control System. The design of arrival and departure flights is also conducted in accordance ICAO and CASA requirements. Minimisation of aircraft noise is a key factor in the design and operation of flight paths. BACL is involved with Airservices Australia in the process of optimisation of these flight paths through the BAEC. This committee comprises membership from the community,

²⁷ BAC, Evidence, RRAT, 15 November 1999, p. 121.

²⁸ Ibid, p. 127.

²⁹ *Airports Act 1996*, Cl.71(2).

³⁰ Flight tracks are indicative of the direction an aircraft will take from lift-off at the airport including turning towards its destination and visa versa. Flight paths are three dimensional corridors through which aircraft fly ie a flight track with the added dimension of height. The height factor is critical because increasing height leads to reducing noise on the ground. The rate of height gain will depend on the safety and airspace management requirements, aircraft type, speed and load. Airservices Australia advise that until aircraft type, speed and load are known it is not possible to indicate the flight path.

³¹ BAC, Evidence, RRAT, 15 November 1999, p. 121.

BACL, the airlines, Airservices Australia and Local State and Federal Government.³²

Expectations of flight path information

4.41 There has been an expectation by people affected by aircraft noise to be provided with flight path or flight track information. As noted above, the Airports Act does not require this information to be provided. The Committee notes that it is problematic for precise information on flight paths to be developed at this stage. There is a risk that imprecise information prematurely released may adversely impact on interested parties. The Royal Australian Planning Institute noted that:

In reading the document, people had an expectation that there was a map of defined approach paths to the airport across to the greater Brisbane region, whereas I do not think any map like that would have had any veracity. It would perhaps show some indicative guidelines, but it is only at a particular point in time that a plane, as I understand it, locks into an approach path or a departure path.³³

4.42 The absence of flight path information was commented on by Mr Miller of Ban Aircraft over Residential Brisbane:

Basically, no flight path information was given in the documentation at all. They stated in the documentation that they had the information but it was not promulgated, so we cannot base any judgement on information not supplied.

.... It was continually asked for and continually not provided.³⁴

4.43 BAC stated the main reason flight paths were not prepared by Airservices Australia for inclusion in the Master Plan was because there is a high degree of uncertainty in various assumptions associated with the design of flight paths such as:

- a) Aircraft characteristics and mix;
- b) Aircraft volumes;
- c) Aircraft times of operation;
- d) Weather conditions;
- e) Modes of operation on the runway system.³⁵

³² Brisbane Airport Corporation Limited, *Master Plan* p. 66.

³³ RAPI, Evidence, RRAT, 15 November 1999, p. 5.

³⁴ BARB, Evidence, RRAT, 15 November 1999, p. 17.

³⁵ Brisbane Airport Corporation Limited, *Master Plan 1998*, pp. 67-68.

4.44 BAC also stated that, because the parallel runway is not likely to be required until 2006 or later, the development of flight path information would be premature:

...it is considered that flight paths prepared on the basis of today's assumptions would most likely be meaningless by the time the runway has become operational. Hence the preparation of flight paths now would not be reliable and would only serve to confuse and create unnecessary public concern as they are bound to change by the time the new parallel runway is in use.³⁶

Australian Noise Exposure Forecast

4.45 The Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) is a land-planning tool designed to take account of the impact of noise, in this case from aircraft, for the purpose of determining future land use. It is based on an analysis of community reaction to aircraft noise, and it is not intended to, nor can it provide, any indication of an individual's reaction to such noise.³⁷

4.46 Airservices Australia advised the Committee that from its perspective "the ANEF is in fact a land use planning tool in the vicinity of the airport".³⁸ If the ANEF is primarily a land use planning tool, it may have questionable value when applied to existing residential or built up areas. One witness advised that:

Another reason [that ANEF measure is inadequate] is that the very document on which ANEF measure is defined states that the land use recommendations ... which relate land use to ANEF zones, are most readily applicable to new development on undeveloped areas around aerodromes.³⁹

4.47 The Department of Transport and Regional Services has produced a discussion paper "Expanding Ways to Describe and Assess Aircraft Noise" as a response to problems of ANEF based approaches to communicating aircraft noise. The Department recognises the problem of using ANEF contour maps and considers they "should be used solely for planning purposes".

4.48 The Department advises:

Our preferred approach is for dialogue with the community on noise exposure patterns to be now carried out using alternative tools which are much more readily comprehensible and less open to misinterpretation than ANEF contours.⁴⁰

³⁶ Brisbane Airport Corporation Limited, *Master Plan 1998*, p. 71.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Airservices Australia, Evidence, RRAT, 10 December 1999, p. 189.

³⁹ BARB, Evidence, RRAT, 15 November 1999, p. 17.

⁴⁰ Department of Transport and Regional Services letter of 21 March 2000.

4.49 The Department notes that:

A particularly problematic aspect of the issues is that the majority of complaints and pressures to restrict airport operations come from persons living in areas which the ANEF system indicates are suitable for residential development- that is outside the 20 ANEF.⁴¹

Many Australian airports continue to only provide information on noise exposure patterns through the publication of ANEF contours. This may be a reflection of the fact that the production of an ANEF is formally required under the provisions of the Airports Act 1996 and State and Territory planning instruments....In the context of the arguments presented in this paper about the use of the ANEF as an information tool, an ANEF map is particularly deficient in that it provides no information on noise exposure patterns beyond the 20 ANEF.⁴²

Committee Comment

4.50 Aircraft noise over built up areas is a sensitive issue and one which all airport owners and/or lessees must be mindful of, particularly where further development is anticipated. The concern expressed by residents about the Master Plan in general and the runway options in particular, underlines the importance of full consultation on development options.

4.51 The Committee notes that the Department of Transport and Regional Services has now identified the failings of ANEF as a reliable noise indicator. The Committee welcomes the recent report of the Department and notes its intention to use alternative tools which are much more readily comprehensible and less open to misinterpretation than ANEF contours.

The Role of Airservices Australia

4.52 Airservices Australia was established in 1995 as a Government Business Enterprise under the Air Services Act 1995. Airservices Australia's functions include:

- a) Performance of activities to protect the environment from the effects of, and the effects associated with, the operation of Commonwealth jurisdiction aircraft.
- b) Provision of consultancy and management services relating to any of the above matters.

⁴¹ Department of Transport and Regional Services Discussion paper, 'Expanding Ways to Describe and Assess Aircraft Noise', p. 46.

⁴² Ibid, p. 54.

c) Airservices Australia may provide its services and facilities both within and outside Australian territory.⁴³

4.53 Airservices Australia was involved in three ways with the development of BAC's Master plan:

a) In 1997, Airservices Australia proposed that it undertake a range of modelling runways, taxiways and the capacity of ground infrastructure using its expertise in the assessment of operational problems and capacity of airports and airspace. The results of the consultancy were submitted to BAC in February 1998.⁴⁴

b) Airservices Australia Brisbane Centre Operations responded to a request for operational information from consultants appointed by BAC to prepare the Master Plan and the ANEF. Airservices Australia advise that this work was separate to the consultancy and no fee was charged.⁴⁵

c) As a result of a Ministerial Direction, Airservices Australia is required to endorse for "technical accuracy" a draft ANEF.⁴⁶ The Draft Master Plan submitted by BAC to Minister Vaile, MP, on 29 June 1998 was rejected by the Minister on the basis of Airservices Australia's concerns over technical aspects of the draft ANEF. Airservices Australia continued to liaise with BAC on the issue until Airservices Australia was satisfied on the "technical accuracy" of the data and the valid incorporation of the assumptions used in the model.⁴⁷

Community perception

4.54 There appears to be a community perception that Airservices Australia has a conflict of interest in providing advice to BAC as a consultant and then having been required to advise the government on the technical accuracy of the ANEF. This perception is heightened by the general expectation of flight paths having been constructed for the development of the ANEF and Airservices Australia having had a role in the ANEF. Mr Lindley informed the Committee that:

..it is interesting that they [Airservices Australia] apparently were consulted about flight paths which were used to help construct ANEF contour maps and these maps were used in the Master Plan.⁴⁸

⁴³ Airservices Australia, Submission No. 154, p. 1.

⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 5.

⁴⁵ Ibid, pp. 4-5.

⁴⁶ Ibid, p. 3.

⁴⁷ Ibid, p. 4.

⁴⁸ Mr James Lindley, Submission No. 85, p. 2.

4.55 Another submission stated:

We are also aware that Airservices Australia was BAC's paid consultant in preparing the draft Master plan and the same body provided advice to the Minister when he was considering the plan. Surely this is Caesar judging Caesar. No wonder the people have begun to question the Minister's objectivity.⁴⁹

4.56 The Morningside Ward Office raised Airservices Australia's dual role as a consultant to BAC and adviser to the Minister for Transport and Regional Services and noted "there would appear to be some grounds for a conflict of interest". The Ward also observed:

The question that needs to be asked is if Airservices Australia thought it was 'inappropriate' to address the community on the Master Plan, why did they not see it as inappropriate to be a paid consult to BAC whilst also being required to provide advice to the Minister and act as the people's 'watchdog' and meet its environmental responsibilities under the Act?⁵⁰

4.57 Mr Neil Bentlay of BAC informed the Committee that Airservices Australia was appointed because BAC judged they were the best party at the time to do the job:

Airservices Australia were engaged by BACL to assess peak hour capacity of the existing runway system. They did that by using data associated with the likely projected mix of aircraft in the peak hour, and this data was, in fact, prepared by other consultants we used, Tourism Futures International. This role of assessing capacity required specialist skills in terms of looking at existing and future aircraft operating scenarios and procedures in order to maximise that capacity on the existing system.

To do that they used a fairly sophisticated computer model, and there are only two or three parties in the country which actually have the expertise in running this model.⁵¹

Airservices Australia response

4.58 At a public hearing, Mr Kim Jones of Airservices Australia observed that:

A fundamental issue that has not been brought out, I suspect, is that the consultancy exercise that we went through was to do with the capacity of ground infrastructure, of runways and taxiways. It had nothing to do with flight paths for which ANEFs were subsequently assessed. It is as different as you could possibly achieve. Yes, we have done external consultancies for other organisations utilising the same tool. In some cases it has been with

⁴⁹ I A & D M Nowland, Submission No. 96.

⁵⁰ Morningside Ward Office, Submission No. 74, p. 3.

⁵¹ BAC, Evidence, RRAT, 15 November 1999, p. 140.

the capacity of ground infrastructure; in other cases it has been to do with flight paths.⁵²

Committee Comment

4.59 The Committee is satisfied that Airservices Australia did not have a conflict of interest in the development of the Brisbane Airport Corporation Master Plan. However, the Committee is concerned that Airservices Australia's dual roles of government advisor and external consultant has potential for a conflict of interest. The Committee notes that the Federal Minister for Transport and Regional Services should ensure that Airservices Australia prepare and publish a comprehensive statement on a protocol for separating (both in fact and as a matter of perception) its regulatory function under the Airports Act and its commercial fee-for-service function in relation to airport operators, which Airservices Australia has a statutory responsibility for regulating.

⁵² Airservices Australia, Evidence, RRAT, 10 December 1999, p. 196.