

# Meeting Mins #10



<b>Glenorchy Airstrip Consultative Governance Committee Notice of Meeting</b>	
<b>Where:</b>	MS Teams
<b>Time:</b>	11.00am
<b>Date:</b>	Tuesday 18 October 2022
<b>Who:</b>	Jamie Waaka (QAC), Tom Butler (Blanket Bay) Jeannie Galavazi (QLDC), Tiana Prudden (QLDC), Nick Nicholson (Operators), Christina Lister (GCA), Niki Gladding (Councillor), Quintin Howard (QLDC), Mark Samways (QLDC)
<b>Apologies</b>	Peter Campbell (Wyuna Preserve Residents Association), James Stokes (Operators)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Meeting Minutes</b>
<b>ITEM 1:</b>	<b>Welcome to new Committee Members (James Stokes)</b>	- JS not present – action moved to next meeting
<b>ITEM 2:</b>	<b>July Minutes</b>	- NG stated that she could not yet vote on minutes - NN motions acceptance of minutes from July CGC meeting. Moved NN, seconded TB
<b>ITEM 3:</b>	<b>QLDC update (QLDC and Committee Member input)</b> Any committee member queries Licencing process and flight allocations Skydive Resource Consent AIMS update	- MS stated JS has not signed on yet and QLDC are looking to amend concession agreement. JG added that JS was seeking assurance that there would be a special approval process and that there was room for additional flights. JG noted that we are at the end of the year and we are due to issue new licences. MS claimed that NZONE weren't using the licence and that reassessment on the situation would be made in 2023. - JG added that we will be assessing numbers for next year based on this years' data. When QLDC sort through licences at the end of this year QLDC will be looking at available flights to inform totals for next year. - NG questioned whether operators could apply for additional flights more than once. JG responded operators could apply more than once and would check to see if the concession agreements acknowledge this. - TB questioned how the process will work next year with numbers, based on this year. JG responded QLDC have a use it or lose it methodology. Operators who have been using flights are in a good position to retain flights and be assessed to increase. It may be difficult for operators who haven't used flights but wish to achieve previous or additional numbers.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TB questioned if NN will have opportunity for more flights should they not be used. JG responded in principle yes, QLDC understands he has support from the community.</li> <li>- TB asked how licences will be looked at next year. JG responded that it is sustained growth and will be reviewing this years' data, working on what the operators are currently doing and be able to consider new scenarios.</li> <li>- JG - Skydive resource consent (just for structures) has just been approved – QLDC has given landowner approval for structures activity and issued a letter stating that it is not an agreement for number of flights – flights still yet to be agreed. TB asked if they were applying for flights. MS said they are unsure when their operation on flights will return to GY. NZONE suggested that it may come back sooner and bracketed 2-3 years in their last meeting with QLDC.</li> <li>- QH asked if there had been formal application on numbers. MS responded NZONE have CA with allocation of flights, but they weren't prepared to sign so it has been held until next year.</li> <li>- MS said that AIMS data capture was updated through new antenna installation, but it may have been too strong, and some landings are being credited. QLDC are working with AIMS to further define this but can expect improvements in the future.</li> </ul>
<p><b>ITEM 4:</b></p>	<p><b>Reserve Management Plan Workshop</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- JG establishes a short workshop discussion to obtain committee thoughts (after going through policies) on RMP before going to next steps.</li> <li>- JG provides update on where we are now (Licences have been issued, perhaps changing way flights are managed? What do we do once annual cap is reached? Upgrade of airstrip – are these things that are appropriate and what the community wants? We have direction from env court that des conditions and RMP are the documents that would inform any changes.)</li> <li>- JG provides high level overview on policies (30% of policies are still relevant, 40% are no longer relevant (as they spoke about establishment which has already been done) and 30% need a lot of work. OR start again?)</li> <li>- JG opens table outlining policies in the 2016 plan.</li> <li>- NG asked about key vision and objectives and how they are managed through the consultation process. JG responded that new council members will need to be informed and that a survey needs to be constructed and sent out to community. We have 2019 results. Regarding growth – 77.9% indicated support for growth but 62.3% of these was for limited growth.</li> <li>- NG stated we need to be clear with what levels of growth mean in terms of more growth and costs. NG also noted that we haven't talked about climate and emissions and what that means for operators. NG believes there is a much more detailed conversation needed on what preferential flight allocations will look like.</li> <li>- JG asked - what do we want to ask the community and what are the questions for the survey? 2019 is a good indication but a better conversation needs to take place (ie: on noise and what that means). NG stated we need to be open about what the issues are, and what are the objectives need to be, then we develop the policies. NG added this may be a long process and there is some urgency on this.</li> <li>- JG said that a workshop could be held for vision and objectives but because we have the committee, we could work on that with this group, followed by development of questions for survey. JG questioned - what do we want to test with the community? She added we need to put options out there that are more in favour of operators as well – in order to gather as much information as possible.</li> <li>- <i>What's your interest and where do you come from?</i> To understand where responses are coming from NG added specifically where they live (up the valley or in township).</li> <li>- QH suggested <i>a question around built form and hangars</i> + more specific options to trigger thinking eg: a few private hangars, or a few hangars to be leased. QH added that who is wanted on the strip needs to be a</li> </ul>

		<p>different question. QH questioned ownership and whether we lease should be part of a commercial strategy and not consulted on at this stage. NG added that there might be a bit more to that question. JG responded maybe <i>who is using the built form and for what activity?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- JG moved to climate and emissions – NG said it comes down to flights and movement allocations – does community and operators agree on movements and charging to drive down emissions? Do we balance community efforts with emissions reductions? Council will need ability to allocate and charge to meet objectives. Policy about equitable charging – how do we drive this to meet objectives in the future? JG added that it also applies to noise – it was difficult in hearing to distinguish noise and movements – RMP needs to better define benefits from activity and impacts from those activities to help council allocate movements down the track. JG added the issue is that we can't dictate what happens in the air if it doesn't come from the airstrip.</li> <li>- JW claimed that he supported NG's statements - do we want rec flights in? do we want commercial flights in? use of hangars – do we need hangars? TB added that ranking of use was in previous survey and NN added these could be expanded on. JG suggested to drill down on those questions that we have responses on.</li> <li>- NN suggested emissions could be a new question - how emissions will be managed – infrastructure, what it is going to look like, controls eg. TB said this would be important for likes of hangars and airstrip use (strip was important for fires recently)</li> <li>- NN added that maintenance is limited to repair if there is a breakdown on site and the RMP controls that. Maintenance is more minor to get you going.</li> <li>- JG stated RMP was rewritten to meet des conditions and env court said that des conditions were developed with help from RMP. If there are any changes this should be reflected in the RMP – to trigger any potential des condition changes. How far does the RMP review need to go to set position for airstrip for next 10-15 years? What happens when we reach cap? This is where we need to be thinking – in 3-4 years when operators are using max numbers what do we do? NG added we need to know what community thinks down the track.</li> <li>- JG stated a lot of these actions will be short term actions but in future the tools council will have to change the way the airstrip is managed is through charging, noise, emissions, types of aircraft. Perhaps a question could be <i>what type of operation do you support and why?</i> TB said landscape is going to look different in next few years – it will get to a point when flights are being used and new operators want to operate – obtaining the community's opinion on whether emissions and other impacts are important to community members will be key.</li> <li>- JG stated that RMP may refer to preference being given to operators that provide services in x,y,z. Community will likely back this as it may be ways that give back to the community eg: emergency services. NN said they provide emergency work as offset to commercial.</li> <li>- QH – <i>question to flesh out to see what type of operators the community wants to see.</i> Highlighting benefits for community.</li> <li>- JG questioned do we indicate in management plan, noise management plan or concession agreements – emergency services/pest control etc? In order to better inform the community on benefits.</li> <li>- JG suggested for committee members to head away and think about some ideas as to what the community will be interested in for that survey QLDC will formulate a list amongst the group and revisit. JG requested members to send through thoughts and QLDC will develop draft survey for community and redistribute via email. Next steps are to agree on survey. JG suggested having the draft questions completed before the next GCA meeting for feedback from this group.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

		- JG confirmed that a survey to test community is a good next step.
<b>ITEM 5:</b>	<b>Complaints</b>	- No complaints (confirmed by JG)
<b>ITEM 6:</b>	<b>Airstrip Operations Update</b>	- JW - maintenance was carried out as scheduled, no safety reports. Wildlife management on rabbits (rabbit shoot) was successful – issue with rabbit holes on runway but team are filling in which is a seasonal exercise. Monitoring through inspections. Aerodrome conditions of use document – JW is working through amendments before passing onto council for review – which will then go into aeronautical publications. QLDC met with QAC to table the report. Report to be put on website.
<b>ITEM 7:</b>	<b>General Business</b>	