

**WILLIAMTOWN ADVISORY GROUP MEETING NOTES**  
**Thursday 15 March 2018**  
**1.30pm to 4.30pm**

**RAAF Base Williamtown - Hawk/Roulette Rooms**

**Attendees:**

Senior Australian Defence Force Officer (SADFO), AIRCDRE Heap, AIRCDRE Kitcher, Alex Morabito – Marshall Day; Mike Rickard-Bell – Bruel and Kjaer, Brenin Presswell – DE&IG, Sonya Dare – DE&IG, Ruth Lunney, Sue Hirsch, Bev Male, Margaret Cox, Tim Aberton – ANO, Bill George, Trevor John, Lindsay Clout, Mathew Borsato, Andrew Ashton – Port Stephens Council, Steve Khuen, Brendan Cook – NAPL, Tim McKay, John Donahoo, Richard Antcliffe, Dorothy Harland, Shirley Carthew – Banksia Grove; WGCDR Tim Ireland, WGCDR Ric Peapell, D-SADFO GPCAPT Peter Cluff

**Apologies:**

Sue and Barry Phillips, Robyn Thompson, Jo Erskine

**SADFO:** Welcomed attendees and advised the meeting today was going to focus on aircraft noise, specifically the consent conditions around the introduction of the F-35A Lightning II expected at the end of this year. SADFO advised this was a rare opportunity for the group to talk about noise as there were a number of specialists in the room.

SADFO commented there were a few extra residents in the room. SADFO stressed the importance of the WLM Advisory Group and how the WAG kept the Base informed and connected with local residents. SADFO reminded people to review meeting notes, make any relevant changes.

AIRCDRE Heap advised he would handover SADFO role at the end of March to GPCAPT Peter Cluff.

**Review of Meeting Notes 1Nov2017 and Action Items**

<b>Action:</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p><b>1.</b> Action Item: RAAF Base WLM look to provide information/documentation to outlines flying procedures and noise mitigation actions to increase community understanding.</p>	<p>Base/ACG</p>	<p>AF Aircraft Noise Management Strategy identifies a need for Aircraft Noise Management Plans</p> <p>As part of the F-35A EIS Consent Conditions – AF is to develop a Noise Management Plan. A draft based on current noise mitigation practices will be developed by end of 2018 for endorsement by the Department of the Environment.</p>
<p><b>2. Action Item:</b> Drainage Management</p>	<p>PSC – response attached –</p>	<p>PSC, PFAS Team and Department of OEH</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request information from PSC to increase understanding of the drains study and what areas it will involve?</li> <li>PSC to take on board the questions around drainage plans and issues. We need to have an understanding of the community, council, state government contribution.</li> <li>Group requested a separate meeting for drainage issues with PSC, OEH, Newcastle Airport, RAAF to talk drainage.</li> </ul>	<p>WLM CRG – 17Mar2016 – Page 4 #4 PSC outlined the drains they are responsible for.</p> <p>23Jun2016 – Page 5 #5 OEH outlined State drain responsibilities.</p>	<p>presented to PFAS Community Working Group – response and Docs attached.</p> <p>Defence funded Drains Study started late 2017. Completion date: Expected Q2 2018. SADFO advised this is the PFAS Community Reference Group’s area. But will provide links to reports when available.</p>
<p><b>3. Action Item:</b> Request to update the links on the Air Force, PFAS website.</p>	<p>Defence</p>	<p>PFAS Links – updated AF Website undergoing a review and upgrade – some pages can be down at times as part of the process. <b>AI closed</b></p>
<p><b>4. Action Item:</b> Defence commit to continue to update the group on new technologies/developments.</p>	<p>Defence/SADFO</p>	<p>Defence will update the Group on an ongoing basis as a standing agenda item. <b>AI closed</b></p>
<p><b>5. Action Item:</b> Base to upload information on the Medowie Progress Association community website.</p>	<p>SADFO</p>	<p>Information has been uploaded. Awaiting Admin login. Progressing. <b>AI closed</b></p>
<p><b>6. Action Item:</b> Group requested clarification of (DA) approvals from PSC; and what is the journey between the levels of approval?</p>	<p>PSC</p>	<p>PSC provided handout. <b>AI closed</b></p>
<p><b>7. Action Item:</b> All that concrete will put additional water into Moors Drain. .</p>	<p>Take as a statement</p>	<p>Need to review with Barry Phillips. <b>AI closed</b></p>

**Action Items:**

1. AF committed to developing a draft RAAF Base WLM Aircraft Noise Strategy by end of Dec2018 prior to the arrival of the F-35A.
2. As per outline
3. As per outline
4. As per outline
5. As per outline
6. Port Stephens Council Matt Borsato advised the 2025 map would now be used for planning purposes.

7. Defence response: Taken as a statement. Detention basins across the base – key aim is to keep water flow off the Base at the same level as in the past.

**John Donahoo** queried when will the old map 2012 ANEF fade away?

**Matt Borsato** advised there will be a transition period and will involve a new Development Control Plan.

**Sue Hirsch:** People don't know where they stand. All of this first started with Council – and now there are homes built without attenuation. I believe council has a duty of care towards residents. The ANEF 2025 put people in new noise areas and we have not gone too far from that situation.

Discussion ensued around the 149 certificate. Multiple homes have been approved over the past few years. The building code doesn't protect people.

PSC representative **Matt Borsato** advised fee is set by legislation.

**Sue Hirsch:** This is the only opportunity to raise concerns around PSC planning decisions.

**ACTION 1:** *Group requested information from PSC on an understanding of Council's Duty of Care of people who built in /an area where they were impacted by aircraft noise?  
Group requested information from council as to what is on the 149 certificate and its cost?*

#### **Overview of F-35A Program – AIRCDRE Kitcher**

Advised, based on current planning the only ACG aircraft operating at the Base will be F-35As and Hawks by 2023.

Media reports around the capability and it being a quantum leap from the Hornets are true. We have had the Classic Hornets for the past 30 years.

There are 280 aircraft operating around the world. There are 160 F-35A operating on 15 different bases in 12 different nations around the world. The 'A' models are the most widely used. A model is quieter than the B model.

There are currently 600 pilots and 6000 maintainers trained to fly the aircraft world wide. In the Australian program, there are 12 pilots, and 35 technicians training with USAF operating as part of a squadron. By the middle of December this year – 2 aircraft will arrive in Australia.

By January 2019, 3 Squadron will operate with two jets from Williamtown, and will gradually build-up to two squadrons and 33 aircraft. Ongoing validation/verification of jet aircraft operations will occur here, at Delamere range and Woomera.

Noise impacts are a part of the ongoing validation/verification of jet aircraft operations – we can measure actual noise versus the modelling.

- 2020 – 3 SQN stop flying the Classic Hornets and train/fly on the f-35A
- 2021 – 77SQN;
- 2022 - 75 SQN in Tindal near Katherine.
- All the classics Hornets will be stopped by 2022.

During 2019-2022 - Classic Hornet SQNs operations will scale down, and F-35A gradually scale up operations.

Group queried why don't we have validated noise levels as yet?

**AIRCDE Kitcher:** The noise modelling used for 2011-2013 documents were validated against actual noise in 2011-13 in the United States. However – Luke AFB is nestled in the desert, against a high mountain range in the middle of a city - Phoenix Arizona and conditions are different.

**Alex Moriato/Marshall Day:** Flight profiles for the EIS were modelled by measuring the noise that would be typically generated from an aircraft operating in a normal setoff conditions ie weather, wind etc. This is why the modelling needs to be validated when the aircraft arrives in the country.

**Bill George:** What about the cannons? That is the peak noise event that occurs on the range. The operation of the guns is what Salt Ash and Medowie residents experience as being the most annoying.

**WGCDR Ireland:** When we conduct gunnery operations – the aircraft are at a low power setting (400-450 knots) and at low altitude – so you can hear the guns. When we recover, the noise of the engines puts the guns noise into perspective.

**Bev Male:** So why wasn't the noise from the guns in the Environmental Impact Statement?

**Defence response:** The information was not in there because the cannons had not been developed for the F-35A.

**John Donahoo:** We need to get the noise data from the cannons. That was identified in my submission to the EIS.

**Bill George:** The tonality(?) and the frequency of the cannon is the most annoying for the ops on the range.

**AIRCDE Kitcher:** The noise from the cannons is not necessarily a higher noise level – but it does mean you hear a high number of short bursts. I imagine it is a problem to predict.

**Bev Male:** It's noisier.

**ACTION 2:** *AF Investigate the possibility of getting information from the US regarding the cannons.*

**AIRCDE Kitcher:** Not sure – but I imagine it is a noticeable spike in the noise. At Luke AFB, and Patch River – there is a 10,000ft standard runway. I am currently flying and every classic hornet take-off is in afterburner (A/B) out of WLM. We expect that up to 80-90% of take-offs for the F-35A will be in military power ie not using afterburner. The F-35A is noisier in military power compared to Classic Hornets in military power. However, the F-35A in military power is comparable but less than Classic Hornets in afterburner. The use of A/B for the F-35A will depend on the weather conditions – and due to the length of the runway, it is expected 80% + of departures will be flown in Military Power, < 20% of F-35 takeoffs will use Afterburner – the F-35A is not expected be in A/B when crossing the airfield boundary when we fly it.

**Fly Neighbourly** - The Fly Neighbourly program - put in place for RAAF Base WLM - will apply to the F-35A. The F-35A when departing to the NW will transit above Grahamstown Dam in about a 60-70% power setting before going to military power above 10,000ft whereby they will be well above the Bay.

Departures to the SE should track to the south of Banksia Grove and head off out over the ocean, or head off to the West.

On recovery at 2-3000ft, it can put us directly over the Banksia Grove.

**Dot Harland:** The jets appear to come in to land in over to the north and come into land - we used to miss a lot of it. Banksia Village is less than 2miles from the runway.

**AIRCDRE Kitcher:** Coming in on a visual approach to Runway 30 the point is on the coast, directly parallel to the run way and this is very close to Banksia Grove. When we recover on runway 30 – we come back to land and pitch overhead Banksia Grove. Air traffic control can direct aircraft into specific areas such as there might be 5 aircraft in the circuit, and jets will be directed as required.

It is about safety - Fast jet aircraft and other aircraft will be directed by ATC to land. Landing can be more complex than people appreciate - and the runway \extended centreline is very close to, and just South of Banksia Grove.

***ACTION 3:** Defence supply maps to demonstrate the approaches to the airfield.*

**Defence Response:** Residents should refer to the Noise and Flight Path Monitoring System where people can check for themselves where the aircraft (civilian and military) have flown in the past. Defence is happy to provide assistance for people to use the NFPMS as most of what people required is there. <http://www.defence.gov.au/AircraftNoise/NFPMS/Default.asp>

**John Donahoo:** This is why it is important to have flight paths identified. We need to be able to see the standard flight paths; the ILS flight paths, and visual departures. Flight path data needs to identify the standard routes and then present the three dimensional information.

***ACTION 4:** Defence to define and produce additional appropriate flight paths and power setting information to community.*

**Defence Response:** The Noise and Flight Path Monitoring System can provide information that clearly identifies the flight paths of all aircraft arriving and departing after the event - <http://www.defence.gov.au/AircraftNoise/NFPMS/Default.asp>

**Alex Moriato - Marshall Day:** The EIS did provide the 2D flight tracks, and flight paths as 3D images in the document. The EIS guidelines did require Defence to identify/produce flight paths. The instrument approaches are all identified.

**Bev Male:** I am concerned for residents of Banksia village when the F-35A start flying. How high will the aircraft be when they are overhead, or near the village when the F-35A depart from the Base. I know they are lower then what they supposedly are when they fly over Salt Ash.

**AIRCDRE Kitcher:** The F-35A is a high performance aircraft and it should be about the same as the Hornet. As we use the F-35A - all of that data will be collated. Local Base commanders are interested in community feedback around aircraft noise. The noise character for the F-35A is different to the Hornets. But each aircraft is different.

**WGCDR Ric Peapell/Amberley:** It is important to remember that although the level of decibels is as predicted, when the Supers replaced the F1-11 aircraft - comments from local residents was that the aircraft seemed noisier - but the sound is different not nosier. It is the different sound that people will notice.

**WGCDR Tim Ireland:** Noise decibels will be largely the same - but the difference will be what people notice. During the transition phase - people will notice the aircraft. We realise

we will need to advise people. The F-35A may not be noticeably different in noise levels - but it will sound different to other aircraft.

**Lindsay Clout:** Three years ago in the early discussions about the new aircraft, a former SADFO when questioned was the new aircraft noisier than the Hornet. He responded by saying the F-35A was a quieter aircraft. He said if the aircraft is noisier we will not fly it?

**Defence Response:** AF has continuously stated, depending on the phase of flight the F-35A has a similar noise profile to the F/A-18 Hornet. Like the F/A-18A/B Classic Hornet, the F-35A has an afterburner that can be used when more power is required. However, the majority of F-35A take-offs will not require the afterburner to be used. The RAAF will implement the noise mitigation measures agreed in the Department of Environment approval (July 2015) for F-35A operations. The extended runway allows the majority of F-35A take-offs at RAAF Base Williamtown to be conducted without the use of afterburner, which will reduce the noise

**John Donahoo:** LaMax maps need to show the whole story - and it can be done by developing a bunch of maps. We need a LAMax drawing for all flight paths. It is necessary for the community/LaMax is helpful. We need the altitude/power setting examples - every single aircraft flight path in the noise model.

**Defence response:** There were three standardised departure flight profiles - are modelled in the EIS as opposed to single events in maximum noise contours.

How many were developed for the F-35A TNIP? Take you through so you know how to access this formation.

**Defence response:** Acknowledges TNIP is not really user friendly - but it is what we have and what was requested from Dept of Environment.

**AIRCDRE Kitcher:** We will be collecting information all the time once the aircraft arrive. Monitoring will be happening - and you can access real noise data from the system. We will continue to look for a method of displaying noise information that people can understand.

**John Donahoo:** 95% of flight paths - what are the common ones? We need to identify 20-30 flight paths and provide LAMax for these. The issue is noise consultants can produce designs for attenuation between \$15,000 to \$75,000. There is a need for spectral information. Public pays for this 2025 noise zone and houses being built in those houses.

**Alex Moriato – Marshall Day Acoustics:** High level of encroachment on the airport -need information. Spectral information is in the EIS both for military power and afterburner. The EIS is designed to account for the worst case scenario, and design for the loudest events, and upper values so it future proofs.

**Mike Rickard-Bell/B&K:** Details for spectral data for every flight path produces an LA Max drawing. Goal is to predict detailed spectral information - but it is not going to work. Can't predict with complete accuracy – the modelling is an attempt to calculate it including all uncertainties and variations. Design - actually measured spectral importation.

Real data used in design to attenuation – then it is accurate and real. Trying to predict and it will not give you the outcomes you want.

**WGCDR Ric Peapell:** Modelling was done for the Super Hornets - the F1-11 aircraft only flew 2000 hours a year - but the new aircraft flies four times the numbers of hours.

Modelling predicted the noise levels and they were exactly as predicted. Got LA Max for Amberley - 70, 85, 100 dBa. N70/N85/N90 La Max maps - limited context and the maps were done as part of modelling. These can be run in TNIP.

**Alex Morabito – M/D:** La Max includes every single position/specific location on a map for a particular location once a year. This is a single event - which could occur once a year - rather than including 95% of flights eg 95dB.

**Lindsay Clout:** Grady said at the Golf Club at Medowie ‘We will not fly it if they are noisier’ - (sic - EIS process community meetings).

**AIRCDRE Heap:** AF will do everything we can do to manage the noise and do the best we can to minimise the footprint and impact of the jet.

**Defence response:** AF has continuously stated depending on the phase of flight the F-35A has a similar noise profile to the F/A-18 Hornet. Like the F/A-18A/B Classic Hornet, the F-35A has an afterburner that can be used when more power is required. However, the majority of F-35A take-offs will not require the afterburner to be used. In accordance with the Department of Environment approval, Defence will monitor and report actual noise profiles against those estimated in the F-35A Environmental Impact Statement.

**Lindsay Clout:** Concurred EIS and discussions around Fullerton Cove. Need the flight path information and noise monitors need to work.

**John Donahoo:** It is a big project. Department of Environment is not going to say no. ANO needs to be involved in tightening up some of the conditions.

**Sue Hirsch:** We do need clarification. LAMax - when is this going to be made available to us.

***ACTION 5:** A LaMax map - why can't one be available for RAAF Base Williamtown?*

**Steve Khuen:** F-35A - does it sound louder and a different noise - Airbus -whistle ; Boeing - roar.

**AIRCDRE Kitcher:** Character of the noise - measurements of noise - dB is largely the same ... but I believe people will notice it as it is different noise. We will need to deal with people's perspective of the aircraft. F-35A has the potential to be louder. Full A/B F-35A will be louder than A/B F/A-18 Hornet. An F-35A taking off in military power will produce an aerial noise footprint that will be similar or slightly less than a Hornet in afterburner. The modelling will need to be validated over the next few years and overall not any worse.

F-35A will use the Salt Ash Air Weapons range less than the Hornet. The use will be lower by at least 50% as it will not be used practised for dropping bombs. There will be no afterburner used.

**Lindsay Clout:** There is a fundamental element Defence is missing. Defence should be trying to be pro-active - but you appear to be comfortable in being reactionary. Noise could end up the same as PFAS.

**WGCDR Tim Ireland:** We are trying to be pro-active as we are attempting to manage the noise around the airfield.

**GPCAPT Cluff:** Based on concerns regarding noise Air Force had pilots utilise US simulators which assisted Defence's safety related case for an extension to the runway. The extension and modifying the planned flying operations resulted in a change to the ANEF. The Parliamentary Committee on Public Works agreed the need for the extra 2000ft to manage noise and safety.

**AIRCDRE Kitcher:** A fair bit of work has been done to manage noise, and the arrival of the F-35A. We have been pro-active in managing the issue. The issue that remains is the noise data.

**John Donahoo:** What is the purpose of the 10,000ft runway?

**AIRCDRE Kitcher:** A 10,000 ft runway gives pilots far more reaction time - F-35A landing speed is higher. Landing speed is higher due to the higher approach speed - so safety is a considerable factor. 10,000ft runway also allows for MIL power take off for > 80% of the time.

**Tim Mackay – DE&IG Environmental Branch of Defence.**

Approval was granted in July 2015, and the principals that were applied were not about avoiding nose impacts of the F-35A, but managing them.

One of the conditions was to develop an Air Craft Noise Management Plan - whereby Defence produces and is accounts to there document. It is published documents and is open for people to review and Defence can be held accountable to this.

The major components/intent of the consent conditions are: - conditions must be assessed for the transition period, and requires monitoring of operations. If there are issues Defence has to notify the Department of Environment and work towards a solution.

The conditions hold Defence to account - 44 individual commitments - this includes 60% thrust over 80% of the departures out of WLM. It also applies across all other forward operating bases ensure consistency.

Active monitoring will be progressed against the conditions. Defence will take measurements, and then take actions required to bring its performance close to the predictions in the EIS.

Annual requirements include: - Noise Management Plan and use the real data from the noise and flight path monitoring system, and any changes/refinements of the Plan are open and transparent.

(3F) is about the consultation activities - there are to be consultation processes, but also it is about the current activities that are undertaken now ie notifications of activities over SAAWR, advice to residents on non-routine flying activities; notifications of after hours specified.

(4) Fauna Management Plan - monitoring pre- and post the arrival of the F-35a aircraft.

The Administrative Conditions include Annual Compliance Reports - will be drafted - hereby multiple responses to '3' will be detailed.

**Tim Abberton – Aircraft Noise Ombudsman representative:**

All plans will be published on websites will reviewed/modified etc as required to be reviewed by the Federal Department of Environment.



It has been recommended from Department of Environment that an independent audit be conducted. ANO was appointed to conduct independent audits for the Super Hornet - quite straight forward – so it will happen for the F-35A as well most likely.

**John Donahoo:** Defence has to assess what the noise generated in the EIS. They need to look at the flight paths - there are not enough flight paths modelled - so how real is this?

**Sue Hirsch:** Brought in 2025 ANEF - but the Council continues 2012/2025 ANEF. All the planning at council - not affected representing residents of a big area - some people have moved. Aircraft Noise/LA Max - discussed it because we need it. All of this has an impact.

Three levels of government need to work to gather to get the best outcome. Get to 2025 - seen many people at the head of committee - here when best started.

Protect ourselves/protect the people who buy the land

**ACTION 6:** *LaMax – Can Defence have a look at what is possible? Refer earlier action item*

**Heap:** Where Defence can get answers we will make the effort to do so.

**Ruth Lunney:** What is going to be the monitoring process - will it conduct baseline monitoring as well as monitoring during the transition period. How extensive will the monitoring be and when is it? Who is responsible for testing the recordings?

**Tim McKay:** Noise monitoring system for WLM is extensive, and the location of the monitors can possibly be adjusted. Noise monitors will validate the noise overhead. Attended noise monitoring can be done at single locations.

**Bev Male:** Noise monitors need to be more around the range - closer to the noise.

**Brenin Presswell:** There are 15 noise monitors around the base. In 2012 - extra monitors were put around and we asked community reps to provide suggestions. There is one on the range where the noise will be the loudest.

**Bev Male:** Discussion centred around the differences in the noise recordings ie 95dB at my house; and it is 75db at the school - request more monitors to better monitor the noise and get it right.

**Brenin Presswell:** Mike's team have worked very hard and the noise monitoring system is good. We do know what the long term noise levels are and that is useful information.

**Sue Hirsch:** LaMax - can you record the sound each time an aircraft comes in? The effects on residents ie increase in new houses, are increasing since we started these meetings.

**Mike Rickard-Bell:** NFPMS has been in place since the Hawk was introduced and it was one of the conditions put in place as a response to the consent conditions - increased the number of monitors since then.

Discussion around the room centred on the location of noise monitors especially to record the F-35A.

**Mike Rickard-Bell:** Understand the group want to check the modelling/prediction look to Defence to make commitments/changes/adjustments to the system. Take the model and look at all of the locations and look at what flies past. B&K/Defence collect data every day for each flight. We have built a strong degree of confidence in the system now. People might

think monitors may need to be closer – as it is more comforting, but the return on the spend is not good.

**ACTION 7:** *Group requested review of attendant monitoring Vs current monitoring program. Request review of noise monitoring program - and look to place monitors in specific areas. Defence has noted that part of the EIS conditions require a biennial review of monitoring locations and this will be undertaken as part of the overall noise management strategy.*

**Sue Hirsch:** People who live at Riverview Ridge don't have Raymond Terrace representatives.

**Defence response** – Air Force will put an advertisement in the paper for Raymond Terrace representative.

**John Donahoo:** For Riverview Ridge –the noise from the F-35A is an ongoing discussion - more low frequency noise - ie 4dB greater due to reverberation – this could put 8dBA of additional noise for people living in the area.

**Defence Response:** Mr Donahoo was advised he was using old noise data for that analysis. This data reflects the first 2025 ANEF factorings - which was reviewed for the second 2025 ANEF in August 2011. The data used to change the second ANEF 2025 - August 2011 - is what underpins the EIS modelling.

**John Donahoo:** If you extend the centreline runway - you don't overfly Riverview Ridge. Might get extended - instrument approach which is practiced in good weather. 2000ft - f-35A and F/a-18 normal visual recovery - don't fly over River ridge.

**ACTION 8:** *Defence needs to upgrade the data/information to council so people are able to design attenuation for their homes/developments.*

**Defence Response:** The information people request is contained in the EIS. The EIS modelling was based on noise data obtained from in situ measurements of the F-35 in the US. The noise data from measurements, coupled with proposed flight profile formed the basis of input to the modelling for the EIS. In terms of model validity, a noise model for 2011 (existing operations) was prepared by MDA and compared output with actual measurements from the NFPMS monitors. The findings supported the use of the model as a reasonable tool for comparing the change in noise levels between existing classic Hornet and predicted future F-35A operations. That is, since the future operations of the F-35A were modelled in the same standardised manner as the classic Hornet, the difference between the two in the model provided for a reliable indication of the change in noise with the F-35A fully operational.

Group discussed the need for the local, state and federal levels of government need to work together. Can you put monitors on 4 corners of Banksia Grove.

**Sue Hirsch:** We speak on behalf of the residents of Port Stephens - so Defence doesn't get an influx of people who don't understand the Base operations.

**AIRCDRE Kitcher:** Defence provides information/advice to Council all the time - can't control how Council/councillors use that information.

**Matt Borsato:** NSW State Government has ultimate say over re-zoning of land. Defence raises concerns about aircraft noise; Council staff make recommendations - but the councillors make the planning decisions/approvals. PSC allows for aircraft noise planning - ANEF standard, the DCP, S.149 are all used. It is council policy to combine the maps. New

councillors no longer want to account for the 2012 and the 2025 ANEF; only the 2025 ANEF Map is to be used.

Council does not produce acoustic reports - it expects people/developers to recruit qualified acoustic engineers. If a property falls in the Aircraft Noise Planning Area - council personnel will tell you if you are in dotted line. 149 certificate has additional information. People outside the line don't want to be advised they are near the line, or going to be inside the line.

Discussion around Defence providing a letter that advises the data from 2010 council is using has been superseded by the EIS/ and the ANEF.

**WGCDR Ric Peapell:** Engagement/discussion at Williamstown is a much higher level than what happened in Amberley.

There are subtle differences in each aircraft. People thought they noticed the new aeroplane - it must have been louder. It is a perception thing. - We changed the way we flew the aircraft once it was introduced - and it was anticipated that changes had to be made. Same conditions of consent were applied – and we prepared Noise Management Plans and worked to find a balance of ops/capability and managing noise. We do it all the time.

Fast jet operations are noisy - not imposing a buffer. Weekend and non-routine flying specifically approved - RAAF Base AMB. Changed the flight paths slightly and minimised noise footprint where possible. We joined in with council discussions and open forums.

**Lindsay Clout:**

Did you get community feedback saying the aircraft sounded different? Over time you get less feedback. People get used to it. The base needs to be pro-active and need an anticipation of a change. Heightened awareness of the aircraft arrival –could minimise impact to the community.

**Matt Borsato:** The NFPMS is a good thing. So much information can be gained from the system.

**Lindsay Clout:** As part of the EIS review - Aircraft Noise Management Plans - will that involve a review of existing noise management plans. Do we get to review the Plan?

**ACTION 8:** *Can the WLM Advisory Group review the WLM Aircraft Noise Management Plan?*

**Defence response:** AF will provide the draft document for your consideration/suggestions with sufficient time for comment prior to submission to the Department of the Environment. Defence will consider suggestions with respect to operational requirements/base operations and air traffic control limitations.

Document is to be drafted by end of 2018 - in time for the aircraft arrival, and then will be reviewed annually for the first three years of operations in accordance with the EIS.

**AIRCDRE Kitcher:** It is important for people to remember - we can't change the rules to land ie we need to land in the wind; environment conditions ie cloudy; hot weather; pilots need to be able to fly at night; and we need to get to and from the base in the most efficient manner.

Noise is minimised with respect to there being minimal impact on operations and capability. There is still going to be noise and aircraft operating from the Base. I can't negate it.

**John Donahoo:** 2 Halloran Way - doesn't comply with the council's own rules. Defence needs to take out advertisements in newspapers to promote Defence did not agree with this. Next time a developer might think twice because the land will not be able to be developed.

Queried what is the max tail wind for landing?

**AIRCDRE Kitcher:** 5 knots is the maximum acceptable if we have to land - BUT - fast jet aircraft always take-off and land into the wind. Instrument approaches are used for both runways..

The Noise Management Plan for WLM will reflect the noise abatement procedures currently being employed at the Base. Planning to have a draft developed by the end of 2018 – just prior to the aircraft's arrival, given to the Minister for the Environment.

**John Donahoo:** Can you consider changing the 3 degrees slope to 3.5 degrees for residents at either end of the runway? It is done elsewhere.

**AIRCDRE Heap:** Safety is the paramount reason why this will not be changed. It would make WLM the only airport in the country with a 3.5degree slope and that is dangerous – because it's different and young pilots should not have to do that, or commercial aircraft as well.

**Tim Abberton – ANO:** It is done around the world in a few airports and this is for terrain reasons. It is risk-managed on that basis.

**John Donahoo:** All these issues can be resolved if the State Government put in place a state Environmental Planning Policy to protect the Base, and local residents, and PSC followed their own development control plans.

**AIRCDRE Kitcher** thanked everyone and believed the frank discussions were a positive sign of the robust relationship within the group.

**Sue Hirsch:** Thanks for your efforts. It has been a real positive having AIRCDRE Heap as SADFO. Thanks to AIRCDRE Kitcher – welcome back.

**AIRCDRE Heap:** We will get the notes out for review and posted on the web within a month. Please keep up the continuing engagement. Thanks to everyone including the state and local government department reps. To the community representatives – thanks for taking the time to assist us as you aren't being paid to contribute and to give us some help find solutions.

Next meeting – still to be determined but I will handover to Group Captain Peter Cluff as he will be the Senior Australian Defence Force Officer for RAAF Base Williamtown the next time you all meet.

**Meeting concluded 4.45pm**

#### **Action Items”**

<b>Action</b>	<b>Who</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Action 1:</b> Group requested information from PSC on an understanding of Council's Duty of Care of people who built in /an area where they were impacted by aircraft	PSC	

noise?		
<b>Action 2:</b> AF Investigate the possibility of getting information from the US regarding the cannons.	JSFDIV	
<b>Action 3:</b> Defence supply maps to demonstrate the approaches to the airfield.		<b>Defence Response:</b> Residents should refer to the Noise and Flight Path Monitoring System where people can check for themselves where the aircraft (civilian and military) have flown in the past. Defence is happy to provide assistance for people to use the NFPMS as most of what people required is there. (see body of document for web link)
<b>Action 4:</b> Defence to define and produce additional flight paths and power setting information to community.		<b>Defence Response:</b> The Noise and Flight Path Monitoring System can provide information that clearly identifies the flight paths of all aircraft arriving and departing after the event (see body of document for web link.)
<b>Action 5:</b> A LaMax map - why can't one be available for RAAF Base Williamtown?		
<b>Action 6:</b> Group requested review of attendant monitoring Vs current monitoring program. Request review of noise monitoring program - and look to place monitors in specific areas. Defence has noted that part of the EIS conditions require a biennial review of monitoring locations and this will be undertaken as part of the overall noise management strategy.		
<b>Action 7:</b> Defence needs to upgrade the data/information to council so people are able to design attenuation for their homes/developments.	SADFO?	In body of text.
<b>Action 8:</b> Can the WLM Advisory Group review the WLM Aircraft Noise Management Plan?	ACG	AF will provide the draft document for your consideration/suggestions by (date). Defence will consider suggestions with respect to operational requirements/base operations and air traffic control limitations.

## **Important Links:**

### **For past WAG and WCF Minutes:**

<https://www.airforce.gov.au/about-us/bases/new-south-wales/williamtown-advisory-group>

### **Aircraft Operations and Noise information, and F-35A project**

<http://www.defence.gov.au/aircraftnoise>

<http://www.defence.gov.au/AirCraftNoise/Environment/Default.asp>

### **Noise and Flight Path Monitoring System**

<http://www.defence.gov.au/AircraftNoise/NFPMS/Default.asp>

### **PFAS Related:**

For more information about the PFAS Remediation Research Program please visit the ARC website on <http://www.arc.gov.au/pfas-remediation-research-program>.

Defence findings of the 2017 Environmental Site Assessment and 2017 Off Site Human Health Risk Assessment. A summary of the findings can be accessed via the following link:

<http://www.defence.gov.au/environment/pfas/Williamtown/publications.asp>

Community updates can be accessed via the following link:

- [www.defence.gov.au/environment/pfas/Williamtown/communityupdates.asp](http://www.defence.gov.au/environment/pfas/Williamtown/communityupdates.asp)

Further information is available by visiting the following links to relevant information:

#### Management Activities

- <http://www.defence.gov.au/Environment/PFAS/ManagementActivities.asp>

#### Health Based Guidance Values (HBGV)

- <http://defence.gov.au/Environment/PFAS/docs/Williamtown/Factsheets/DefenceWilliamtownHHRAFactsheetAug16.pdf>

#### Department of Health voluntary blood testing and epidemiological study

- [http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/1BD420CE5651940ACA2580790004DF7D/\\$File/FAQ-Blood-testing-advice-consumers.pdf](http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/1BD420CE5651940ACA2580790004DF7D/$File/FAQ-Blood-testing-advice-consumers.pdf)

#### PFAS Media coverage

The RAAF Base Williamtown PFAS contamination issue continues to receive widespread local and national media coverage and I encourage people to be aware of the facts. The link to the PFAS Investigation website for the Williamtown is:

- <http://www.defence.gov.au/environment/pfas/williamtown/default.asp>

The website above also contains Media coverage, including Defence's response to specific articles. In addition the website also contains links to NSW Government agencies such as NSW Health and the NSW Environment Protection Authority.

#### Points of contact

Further details can be obtained from the Defence Regional Representative – Michelle Butler on (02) 4034 7237 or email [michelle.butler@defence.gov.au](mailto:michelle.butler@defence.gov.au)

Residents and members continue to be encouraged to contact the project team on 1800 011 443 should they have any questions, or via email on [williamtown.defence@aecom.com](mailto:williamtown.defence@aecom.com) to seek further information.