


# Minutes

---

<b>Subject:</b>	Meeting of the Aircraft Noise Community Consultative Group	
<b>Location:</b>	Meeting held in Person and via Microsoft Teams	
<b>Date:</b>	11 December 2023	<b>Time:</b> 1:03pm –3:09pm
<b>Members Present</b>	<b>In Person:</b> Catherine Harland, Independent Chair Ben Levesque, Auckland Airport Geoff Hounsell, Airways NZ Heather Haylock, Community Representative Kylie Higgs, Auckland Airport Malcom Bell, Franklin Local Board	<b>Via Teams:</b> Councillor Alf Filipaina, Auckland Council (till 2.57pm) Andrew Kay, Franklin Local Board (alternate) Bruce Kendall, Howick Local Board Cath O'Brien, BARNZ (till 2.59pm) Debbie Burrows, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board (alternate) Dr Ashraf Choudhary, Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board (till 1.25pm) Fiona Lai, Puketāpapa Local Board Garth Wyllie, Industry Representative Helen Futter, Community Representative Hugh Pearce, BARNZ (till 1.34pm) Jack Tan, Albert-Eden Local Board Joe Glassie-Rasmussen, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board (alternate, from 1.08pm till 3.07pm) Kelvin Hieatt, Papakura Local Board Mark Allen, Waitakere Ranges Local Board (till 2.09pm) Mark Easson, Community Representative Troy Churton, Ōrākei Local Board
<b>In Attendance</b>	<b>In Person:</b> Andrea Marshall, Auckland Airport Bianca Cresswell, Auckland Airport Community Trust Board Member James Miller, Auckland Airport (till 1.42pm) Jeremy Lo, Auckland Airport Jeremy Raphael, Airways NZ (till 2.15pm) Karl Taylor, Airways NZ Liz Patrick, Airways NZ (till 2.15pm) Steve Hardwick, Auckland Airport Stephanie King, Marshall Day Acoustics Steve Peakall, Marshall Day Acoustics Tieri Christopher, Auckland Airport Community Trust Board Member	<b>Via Teams (cont):</b> Libby Middlebrook, Auckland Airport David Wong, Auckland Council
<b>Members of the Public</b>	Nil	
<b>Apologies</b>	Maria Meredith, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Tauanu'u Nick Bakulich, Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board	

---

Auckland International Airport Ltd

 PO Box 73020, Auckland Airport, Manukau 5120, New Zealand

 [aucklandairport.co.nz](http://aucklandairport.co.nz)



 **Auckland  
Airport**

## 1. Opening Karakia, Kylie Higgs

## 2. Introductions and Apologies

The Independent Chair declared the meeting opened at 1:03pm.

The apologies were noted and accepted.

## 3. Public Forum

The Chair noted that no requests were received from the public to speak at or to observe the meeting.

## 4. Minutes of Meeting Held on 11 September 2023

No discussion and changes. The Chair moved and the ANCCG resolved that the minutes of the meeting held on 11 September 2023 be confirmed as true and correct.

## 5. Matters Arising from the Previous Minutes

Jeremy Lo spoke to the Matters Arising paper with the following additional comments or discussion:

- **Matters Arising Item 7:** Helen Futter sought clarification of the comment in the “Status” column that no Noise Mitigation Packages were installed this year, Andrea Marshall corrected that in fact 5 packages were installed in FY23 to June 2023.
- **Matters Arising Item 10:** The Chair asked if the updated Annual Report had been circulated yet? Jeremy Lo answered no, but that it would be.
- **Matters Arising Item 11:** The Chair asked if the monitor relocation [*refer discussion at the September 2023 meeting*] would mean that there were 2 monitors for this location running simultaneously? Steve Peakall of Marshal Day Acoustics answered yes and stated that one benefit of this would be allowing data from the 2 monitors to be compared for verification purposes.

**Actions** – Jeremy Lo to:

- 5.1. Circulate the updated Noise Mitigation Annual Report to the required recipients.
- 5.2. Correct the error in the Matters Arising Item 7 Status column.

## 6. Flight Schedules and Slot Coordination

James Miller, Auckland Airport Head of Airport Assets & Commercial, introduced himself and outlined his roles for Auckland Airport and on the Board of Slot Coordination NZ, then spoke to the pre-circulated slide presentation that included two IATA explanatory videos.

Troy Churton requested clarity between a “slot” and a “flight path” (and commented on allocated slots as potentially highly valuable “tradeable” assets for an airline, with James Miller citing Heathrow airport as an example of highly “sellable” slots). James Miller stated the two are not related; a 'slot' is a right (set months in advance) to fly into an airport at a specific time and to occupy physical space for a set duration. Airways manage the 'flight paths' of all aircraft physically enroute to and from Auckland Airport on any given day.

Troy Churton asked “if there is coordination between” these two notions? James Miller advised there is not; all slots form the day’s schedule, but any given slot may or may not “turn up on the day” – Auckland Airport monitors all airlines’ “on-time performance” (OTP), with 15 minutes either side of arrival and departure being the rule of thumb. Auckland Airport works closely with any airline that is not meeting that 15-minute requirement to try to improve their on-time performance, as lateness has detrimental flow-on effects for the airline’s ground handlers and other airlines’ allocated slots. Troy Churton posted another question online, if slots are not being met, are slots ‘lost’? James Miller answered, the airlines need to fly their filed slots 80% of the time in a season to retain them for the next season - this is the “80/20” or “Use it or lose it rule”. This doesn’t require airlines to fly on time, they just need to operate the service. The next level relates to OTP, where if an airline doesn’t meet OTP guidance set by the airport that the slot can be removed. Auckland Airport has a “three strikes policy” on this preferring to initially work with airlines to improve OTP.

Helen Futter questioned the words “suspended airlines” in one of the slides, and it was clarified that this was not suspended from a slot but referred to airlines still not yet recommencing services post-Covid.

Troy Churton asked if any of the community advocates in attendance had any comment on slots. No comments were received.

Geoff Hounsell added that slots are created months before the start of a season and that airlines are not hugely “off-slot” unless external factors cause delay (eg, wind issues alone can cause 1-to-1.5-hour delays on long-haul flights). James Miller added that for any given airline on ground handlers are an incentive to be on time, as the handler may need to prioritise a later slot if the first airline is running late.

Mark Allen: What are the implications for community representatives under flight paths “that are already ‘noisy’”; will more slots cause greater noise levels [Troy Churton also asked a similar question on-line]. James Miller answered that yes potentially, as airports grow busier, that means more flights.

Heather Haylock expressed her thanks for the presentation as it was an angle very interesting to hear about. James Miller concluded by inviting members to reach out to him directly if there were any further questions.

## 7. Missed Approach Procedure Change

Kylie Higgs, Auckland Airport Head of Operations Risk and Assurance, introduced herself and outlined her role for this procedure change, noting that Marshall Day Acoustics would present on data aspects, and that Airways staff were in attendance to answer questions of a technical nature.

Kylie Higgs then spoke to a slide presentation for this item which summarised the matters in the pre-circulated Memo. Items specifically noted were:

- Missed approaches are not common, accounting for only 0.08% of all arriving flights.
- Airways does by necessity assume all flights will require a missed approach process.

Bruce Kendall was “not interested in percentages”, asking what is the actual number of missed approaches? Geoff Hounsell stated it amounts to one in every 1200 approaches. [Note: numbers between Sept 2020 and Sept 2023 were included in a graph in Appendix A of the pre-circulated Memo]

Steve Peakall of Marshall Day Acoustics spoke to the pre-circulated “DMAPS Study” Report.

Kylie Higgs concluded by speaking to a slide in her presentation entitled “Next Steps” (corresponding to heading “6.0 Next Steps” in the pre-circulated Memo).

Heather Haylock asked if we should be using noise monitors in the areas now proposed to be overflown? Steve Peakall responded that Marshall Day Acoustics did take measurements in relevant locations and would also be doing measurements in areas affected after the proposal goes live.

Mark Allen asked the following:

- In relation to the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area, was aircraft height [of overflights] accounted for in the modelling? Steve Peakall responded yes.
- Was any modelling done in the South Waitākere/Titirangi area? Kylie Higgs responded yes.
- Would any modelling or monitoring locations be in the West Auckland area? Kylie Higgs responded yes, in future.

Geoff Hounsell added that flights are “usually turned earlier”, meaning flights would not necessarily adhere to the length of the lines shown in the diagrams in the materials presented. The Chair asked if, therefore, “the lines shown in the maps are not reflective of the true situation?”. Kylie Higgs responded no, the lines shown represent the published missed approach tracks, and Geoff Hounsell clarified that if an aircraft can safely be told to follow a more efficient line of flight, they will do so.

Mark Easson explained that from a pilot’s point of view, “it is a press-button method to fly the missed approach”. He questioned that since the system proposed has been in place overseas for many years, why has Auckland Airport chosen now to implement? Geoff Hounsell answered that its “separation by design”

to fly what is published. Airways at present has to intervene earlier, the other aspect is sustainability benefits, but the main reason is safety. Kylie Higgs added that airlines are now much more reluctant to continue without missed approach procedures being formalised and published, that is the main driver for the proposal. Mark Easson added that implementing the proposal would make things much safer.

The Chair asked;

- If the proposed path must be 30 degrees to the North; could it not be 30 degrees to the South?
- Why 30 degrees and not some other degree?

Geoff Hounsell answered that the current proposal is less complex than going to the south, as there are more turboprops going to southern destinations than to northern ones, and the south would raise “Ardmore Airport issues” as well. The 30 degrees is an accepted, longstanding, definition of separation and has long been regarded as amounting to a “deemed separation”.

Malcom Bell asked if there were any implications “further South for his constituency?”. Geoff Hounsell answered, ‘no’, that the proposal is the easiest solution.

Troy Churton commented on-line that it is not ideal to compare aircraft noise levels to that of, say, a truck, construction, and traffic noise, etc. Understanding the unique ways aircraft noise impacts communities is not just a matter of saying “it is not as loud as a truck”.

The Chair asked if there were any further questions, reinforcing to members that the proposal is an “inform only” / fait accompli item. Ben Levesque added there would be official communications on the proposal closer to the time of introduction.

The Chair asked if modelling had applied any “person/event index as is used in Sydney?”, adding that “if not, there would be no way to tell the change in numbers of people impacted given the change in flight paths?”. Steve Peakall responded that Marshall Day Acoustics did not apply this because the proposal “would not result in a huge impact and the key was the overall noise exposure”. He added that any given approach could consider only those households directly under the proposed path or could look at the effect on the whole of Auckland when calculating the likely effects; “person/event did not add value, because there were too many uncertainties”.

Andrea Marshall commented that in the future electric aircraft which are quieter would likely be introduced on regional routes to smaller destinations.

There being no further discussion, the two Airways personnel present for technical answers left the meeting.

## **8. Quarterly Aircraft Noise Report overview and questions**

Before Stephanie King spoke to the Marshall Day Acoustics pre-circulated 3rd Quarter (August to October) Monitoring Report, Steve Peakall spoke to his pre-circulated slides explaining ANC (Actual Noise Contours) and AANC (Annual Aircraft Noise Contours).

The Chair questioned how it was possible for modelling results to be lower than actual monitoring readings for the year? Steve Peakall spoke to his first slide “What MDA do” in an attempt to explain;

- The “measure aspect” occurs at specific locations:
- The 2nd of the 3 bullets refers to calculations that apply the actual measurements across the whole of Auckland.
- The 3rd of the 3 bullets refers to using the results of the calculations to inform the actual noise mitigation programme.

The Chair questioned what is the tolerance built into the modelling algorithm? Steve Peakall; about  $\pm 2$  decibels. Steve Peakall stated that the application of a “growth factor over the year” may have given a lower level in this case only, likely due to temporarily lower post-Covid flight numbers.

Helen Futter stated her firm belief that it is “a justice issue” that a calculated noise level should never be lower than actual recorded measurements, as the calculated noise contours affect people’s lives; it is not a

good fit with natural justice that contours be calculated as less than actual noise levels. Steve Peakall advised that there will always be some degree of modelling uncertainty. Helen Futter asked how the acceptable tolerances are set? Steve Peakall answered they are “best practice developed over time”. Andrea Marshall suggested nobody is missing out, as all within the contours are eligible for mitigation packages, but Helen Futter stated she had assumed the actual positioning of contours would be more influenced by actual readings.

In summarising the discussion, the Chair suggested actual readings are being used as a validation method for the modelling, which Steve Peakall agreed with, pointing out that the unusual wind direction over the past year must be factored into this discussion.

Jack Tan was prepared to accept that a calculated level could be less than actual readings, but asked if local non-aircraft noises like traffic, leaf blowers, etc, are rejected from the modelling process? Steve Peakall answered that part of the process is to “match” noise recorded with actual flights (information obtained from the Casper system) to ensure the noise level is “correlated to” actual flights, which is a means of “cleaning” the noise recording data.

Stephanie King spoke to the Marshall Day Acoustics 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter (August to October) Monitoring Report, commenting specifically on the following parts of the Report:

- Slide 4 (Tables 1 and 2)
- Slide 17 (Fig 12 Map of Noise Complaints)
- Slide 30 (Fig 25 – Measured 365-day Rolling...)
- Slide 35 (Fig 27 – Measured Monthly... Central...)
- Slide 36 (Fig 28 – Measured Monthly... Eastern...)
- Slide 37 (Fig 29 – Measured Monthly... Southern...)
- Slide 43 (Fig 34 – Engine Testing)

The Chair asked why the dotted blue “Wiri Limit” line in Fig 29 is not positioned on 65 [it is around 63]? Stephanie King answered that Wiri is not on the HANA contour, so we put the line on 63, but the Chair found the explanation did not help and suggested it could be better explained in the Report.

The Chair pointed out on Fig 31 that it is worth mentioning in the explanation that Flatbush is in the MANA, hence, have a higher average number of daily flights with events about 70  $L_{Amax}$ . The Chair also referred to Fig 12 noting that “Waiheke” is labelled incorrectly appearing above Rangitoto Island.

Helen Futter asked why the  $L_{Amax}$  levels in Fig 26 for Velodrome and Puhinui are higher now than in 2019, is it the aircraft type? Steve Peakall answered that yes it will be plus the greater Runway 05 [wind-direction-related] bias over the past year. Helen Futter asked whether these levels will only get higher, but Steve Peakall answered that this is not necessarily “a given”.

Mark Easson commented that at present aircraft are tending to be heavier or be carrying heavier payloads, therefore with the required longer/lower take-off configurations they will tend to be noisier.

Cath O’Brien added that the trend is going to be for a wider range of aircraft types to be arriving, and that the Pratt & Whitney engine issue may mean Air NZ relies more on turboprop aircraft.

The Chair expressed thanks to MDA for the Report.

**Actions** – Marshall Day Acoustics to amend the Quarterly Report in the following ways:

- 8.1. Include an explanation to clarify the Figure 29 point above.
- 8.2. Note that Flatbush is in the MANA on Figure 31.
- 8.3. Correct Fig 12, Waiheke Island and Rangitoto Island error cited above.

## 9. Auckland Airport Community Trust Annual Report

Tieri Christopher introduced herself and Bianca Cresswell and the role of the Trust and its recent history, then Bianca Cresswell spoke to the pre-circulated slide presentation on the Community Trust Annual Report.

Bianca Cresswell specified that in the most recent round of grants, 75 separate applications requested a total of about \$1.6 million, and a total of approximately \$400,000 was granted. Bianca Cresswell invited meeting attendees to encourage organisations in their constituencies to apply.

Troy Churton asked if the eligibility criteria had changed in the last few years? Bianca Cresswell answered no, but the Trustees have a reasonably broad discretion; they approach applications on a case-by-case basis, but they will look for evidence grants will benefit people who live in the South Auckland area of benefit (noting that if there are low application numbers, they might look at people who live further afield).

Helen Futter asked whether applicants for noise mitigation packages are told about the ability to apply for a grant from the Trust, and Andrea Marshall replied yes.

## 10. Quarterly Noise Mitigation Programme Report

Andrea Marshall spoke to the pre-circulated Quarterly (October to December 2023) Report. Points specifically expanded upon were:

- The November release detailed in the Report was the largest offer since the Programme's inception (1350 offers, involved 1,800 letters that also went to tenants at the properties).
- Feedback has indicated that a significant factor in property owners' acceptance or delayed acceptance of package offers was the need to have the work involved dovetail with their own renovation plans.
- Honouring any approaches from resident who had not been included in the initial offering.
- Auckland Airport wishes to facilitate the maximum uptake on offers and has an unofficial goal to at least double the current uptake levels.

Two residents have provisionally indicated they may be able to assist with input to a video outlining their experience with the Noise Mitigation Package. Helen Futter congratulated the team on the overall initiative.

## 11. Work Plan and Any Other Business

The Chair commented on the following and then opened up to member for any other business:

- The Marae as a venue for March 2024 was not yet certain.
- The June 2024 meeting would include an outline of the process for the first ever three yearly review of the Terms of Reference.

Mark Easson raised the issue of the large number of night flights over the city (citing suburbs such as Mt Albert and others). He stated that "we looked at it earlier in the year but didn't fix it". He requested that it be included in the work plan for next year, and Troy Churton voiced agreement. The Chair questioned what would be a good approach for the meeting to consider this issue, and Mark Easson agreed to present his ideas in writing before the next meeting for the group to consider.

### Actions:

- 11.1. Auckland Airport to confirm whether the Marae would be the venue for relevant 2024 meetings.
- 11.2. Mark Easson to provide his ideas in writing for an approach to considering night flights over central suburbs to Auckland Airport and Auckland Airport to circulate to members.

The Chair wished members and those attending all the best for the holiday season.

## Closing Karakia by Kylie Higgs

**Meeting closed:** 3.09pm

**Next meeting:** 11 March 2024