

Question on notice no. 8

Portfolio question number: SQ26-000161

2025-26 Additional estimates

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

Senator Steph Hodgins-May: asked the Airservices Australia on 18 February 2026

—

Context:

The Aircraft Noise Ombudsman's 2021 report identified fundamentally flawed methodology in AirServices' assessment of New Parallel Runway (NPR) flight path noise impacts.

AirServices uses internal criteria based on percentage/numerical increases in flights, regardless of cumulative exposure or international safe noise standards.

1. Is AirServices proposing to reassess noise impacts for all affected areas (existing and new flight paths) due to traffic increases or operational changes, using EPBC Act significance criteria to determine referral needs?
2. What evidence base or research informed the development of AirServices' internal significance criteria (e.g., AA-NOS-ENV-2.100), and why rely on percentage increases (e.g., <20%) rather than cumulative exposure or absolute levels exceeding WHO/ICAO health thresholds?
3. How does AirServices measure cumulative impacts or health/social costs without defining "noise impact" and validating against ground monitoring data?