



**PORTSTORONTO**

**BILLY BISHOP TORONTO CITY AIRPORT**

**COMMUNITY LIAISON COMMITTEE  
MEETING #36**

**MEETING MINUTES**

November 27<sup>th</sup>, 2019  
627 Queens Quay W. (Waterfront Neighbourhood Centre)  
Toronto, Ontario

Minutes prepared by:





These meeting minutes were prepared by LURA Consulting. LURA is providing neutral third-party consultation services for the Ports Toronto Community Liaison Committee (CLC). These minutes are not intended to provide verbatim accounts of committee discussions. Rather, they summarize and document the key points made during the discussions, as well as the outcomes and actions arising from the committee meetings. If you have any questions or comments regarding the Meeting Minutes, please contact either:

**Gene Cabral**

EVP- Billy Bishop Toronto City  
Airport

**PortsToronto**

Phone: 416-203-6942 ext. 16  
[GCabral@torontoport.com](mailto:GCabral@torontoport.com)

OR

**Alexander Furneaux**

Meeting Notetaker

**LURA Consulting**

Phone: 416-410-3888 x708  
[afurneaux@lura.ca](mailto:afurneaux@lura.ca)



### Summary of Action Items from Meeting #35

<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Action Item Task</b>	<b>Who is Responsible for Action Item</b>
M#36-A1	Receive and review Meeting Minutes from CLC #35 by Monday December 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2019.	<b>All</b>
M#36-A2	Identify any major conflicts with the proposed CLC meetings for 2020 by December 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2019.	<b>All</b>
M#36-A3	Determine the best way to publish the CLC meeting index on the Ports Toronto CLC webpage.	<b>LURA &amp; Ports Toronto</b>
M#36-A4	Share additional noise models comparing the old and new procedures for commercial aircraft.	<b>NAV Canada</b>
M#36-A5	Provide population projections for the Portlands to NAV Canada for future modelling exercises	<b>Bryan Bowen</b>
M#36-A6	Provide an update on the City of Toronto Noise By-Law	<b>Bryan Bowen &amp; Brent Gilliard</b>
M#36-A7	Add 'Noise By-Law' and Ports Toronto construction noise to the next Noise Management Sub-Committee Meeting agenda, scheduled for January 7 <sup>th</sup> , 2020.	<b>LURA</b>
M#36-A8	Circulate the 'Toronto Development Assessment Process' presentation slides with the CLC Meeting #36 minutes and defer this item for presentation at a subsequent meeting.	<b>LURA</b>
M#36-A9	Provide a 5-year capital plan update at the next CLC meeting.	<b>Ports Toronto</b>
M#36-A10	Share the Master Plan Feedback Index with the CLC when it is published.	<b>Ports Toronto</b>
M#36-A11	Provide an update on renewable energy opportunities on Eireann Quay and at BBTCA.	<b>Bryan Bowen &amp; Ports Toronto</b>

## List of Attendees

Name	Organization (if any)	Attendance
<b>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</b>		
Brent Gilliard	On behalf of Councillor Joe Cressy, Ward 10 – Spadina-Fort York	Present
Nicole Waldron	On behalf of MP Adam Vaughan, Spadina-Fort York	Absent
Bryan Bowen	City of Toronto – Waterfront Secretariat	Present
David Stonehouse	City of Toronto – Waterfront Secretariat	Absent
Michael Perry	Air Canada	Absent
Brad Cicero	Porter Airlines	Present
Matthew Kofsky	Toronto Board of Trade	Absent
William Peat	Ireland Park	Absent
Chris Glaisek	Waterfront Toronto	Absent
Joan Prowse	Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association (BQNA)	Present
Bev Thorpe	Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association (BQNA)	Regrets
Hal Beck <i>(and stand-ins during start of meeting: Angelo Bertolas and Ed Hore)</i>	York Quay Neighbourhood Association (YQNA)	Present
Sarah Miller	Toronto Island Community Association (TICA)	Present
Jonathan Bagg	Nav Canada	Present
Dave Purkis	Nav Canada	Present
Oliver Hierlihy	Waterfront BIA	Absent
Tim Kocur	Waterfront BIA	Present
<b>PORTSTORONTO REPRESENTATIVES</b>		
Angela Homewood	PortsToronto	Regrets
Gene Cabral – Chair	PortsToronto	Present
Chris Sawicki	PortsToronto	Absent
Mike Karsseboom	PortsToronto	Present
Michael Antle	PortsToronto	Present
Bojan Drakul	PortsToronto	Present
Deborah Wilson	PortsToronto	Present
Gary Colwell	PortsToronto	Absent
<b>FACILITATION</b>		
Jim Faught	LURA Consulting	Present
Alexander Furneaux	LURA Consulting	Present

Guest(s)		

Contents

- 1. Welcome and Introductions .....6
- 2. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes .....6
- 3. Community Updates.....6
- 4. NAV Canada – Update on the Implementation of Airspace Enhancements.....8
- 5. City of Toronto – Waterfront Secretariat Updates .....11
  - Eireann Quay Projects ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
    - a. Dockwall Rehabilitation .....11
    - b. Taxi Corral Redesign .....11
    - c. Canada Malting Head Office Renovations (Ireland Park Foundation Headquarters) ...12
    - d. Public Realm Improvements .....12
    - e. Canada Malting Silos Stabilization.....12
  - Noise By-Law Updates .....13
- 6. Ports Toronto / City of Toronto – Toronto Development Assessment Process .....15
- 7. Ports Toronto - Billy Bishop Airport 2018 Master Plan.....15
- 8. Business Arising.....17

**Appendices:**

- Appendix A: Airspace Improvements at YTZ
- Appendix B: Billy Bishop Airport Eireann Quay Redevelopment Staging Plan
- Appendix C: Toronto Development Assessment Process

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

Jim Faught (LURA Consulting) welcomed members of the Billy Bishop Airport (BBTCA) Community Liaison Committee (CLC) to the 36<sup>th</sup> committee meeting. Mr. Faught facilitated a round of introductions and provided an overview of the agenda.

## 2. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes

Mr. Faught noted that meeting minutes are now current to CLC Meeting #34 on the Ports Toronto website, and that the minutes from CLC Meeting #35 were circulated for review by the CLC on October 16<sup>th</sup>, 2019. No comments were received on these minutes prior to CLC Meeting #36 prompting Mr. Faught to suggest that the deadline for comments be extended to Monday December 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2019.

The BQNA representative noted that she did not have an opportunity to look at the meeting minutes as she was called last minute to attend in place of another representative and inquired whether the CLC Meeting #35 minutes were from the September 25<sup>th</sup>, 2019 meeting. Mr. Faught confirmed that CLC Meeting #35 occurred on September 25<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

### **Action:**

M#36-A1 CLC to receive and review Meeting Minutes from CLC #35 by Monday December 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2019.

Mr. Faught also suggested extending the deadline to provide further opportunity for CLC members to raise any conflicts presented by the proposed 2020 CLC meeting dates. These proposed dates are: February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2020; May 27<sup>th</sup>, 2020; September 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2020; and November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2020.

### **Action:**

M#36-A2 CLC to identify any major conflicts with the proposed CLC meetings for 2020 by December 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2019.

Mr. Faught added that the CLC Meeting Minute Index prepared by LURA Consulting will be published online eventually. Ports Toronto and LURA Consulting are still in the process of determining the best method of sharing the index online so that it can be updated regularly.

### **Action:**

M#36-A3 Ports Toronto and LURA to determine the best way to publish the CLC meeting index on the Ports Toronto CLC webpage.

## 3. Community Updates

The BQNA representative informed the CLC that a meeting was held on October 24<sup>th</sup>, 2019 to discuss the formation of a community working group tasked with supporting the development of an air quality study in the area. The meeting was also held to discuss potential funding

opportunities for the study. The BQNA representative informed the CLC that the following individuals agreed to participate in the working group:

*Table 1. Air Quality Working Group Membership (Proposed)*

Affiliation	Working Group Members
Ports Toronto	Angela Homewood
Office of Councillor Joe Cressy	Brent Gilliard
Toronto Public Health	Barbara Lachapelle
Waterfront Secretariat	Bryan Bowen
Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association	Joan Prowse Bev Thorpe Diane Jameson Marie-Monique Giroux
Toronto Island Community Association	Sarah Miller
University of Toronto	Dr. Marianne Hatzopoulou Dr. Greg Evans 2 additional researchers

The BQNA representative added that several organizations have committed or are considering committing money to fund the development of the study including Toronto City Planning, Ports Toronto, and Toronto Public Health. During the meeting, members determined that Neighbourhood Associations such as the BQNA and TICA should not be expected to contribute money. The BQNA representative added that the working group is exploring additional funding options through the Toronto Atmospheric Fund (TAF) and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC). Currently the proposal meets some of the criteria for a TAF qualifying grant. Specifically, the BQNA representative highlighted that these grants often wish to understand the outcome related to a specific program. The next meeting of the working group is scheduled for December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2020 and will discuss the Terms of Reference, communication strategy, group composition, and governance model in coordination with the University of Toronto research team.

Gene Cabral (Ports Toronto) requested clarification on the difference between the TAF and NSERC grants. Mr. Faught responded that TAF provides municipal grants while NSERC provides federal grants. Tim Kocur (Waterfront BIA) added that he felt the NSERC grant would be a better fit. Bryan Bowen (City of Toronto – Waterfront Secretariat) highlighted that he is unclear on the timing of these grants and needs to follow up with the University of Toronto research team to address the issue of whether money committed in 2019’s budget for this research can be rolled over to 2020. If not, Mr. Bowen suggested exploring items that could begin as soon as possible, and that it would likely be easier to secure funding for next year if something can start this year. Mr. Cabral added that he assumed the money would be allocated this year, and requested an update following the December 12<sup>th</sup> meeting. In response to Mr. Bowen, the BQNA representative stated she would get in contact with Marianne Hatzopoulou (University of Toronto) tomorrow morning.

Mr. Cabral inquired whether the purpose of the upcoming meeting is to finalize the Terms of Reference. The BQNA representative indicated the working group will look at the Terms of Reference but won't finalize it. As a follow-up, Mr. Cabral inquired whether the Terms of Reference need to be finalized before funding is secured. Mr. Bowen explained that the Terms of Reference do not need to be finalized before the start of data gathering but must be finalized before any results and findings are communicated publicly. Mr. Bowen added that he believes the University of Toronto team has their own process for finding graduate students to do the research.

#### 4. NAV Canada – Update on the Implementation of Airspace Enhancements

Dave Purkis and Jonathan Bagg (NAV Canada) provided an update on airspace improvements at BBTCA, including additional detail on the satellite-based Performance Based Navigation (PBN) and Required Navigation Performance – Authorization Required (RNP-AR) procedures that will be implemented at BBTCA from December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2019 onwards. During the presentation, Mr. Purkis and Mr. Bagg shared a [video](#) on Space-Based ADS-B navigation being deployed domestically by NAV Canada. The full presentation by Mr. Purkis and Mr. Bagg can be found in **Appendix A**.

Mr. Bowen inquired what elevation the LMAX contour noise measurements are taken at, furthermore Mr. Faught asked what the contours signify. Mr. Bagg answered the measurements are taken at runway level and that each contour represents a 5 decibel (db) increase. The LMAX models the peak noise during overflight not the duration of the noise.

The TICA representative inquired whether models for all flight paths on the eastern gap were created. Mr. Bagg explained that NAV Canada has created noise delta models for all flight paths (past and present) but is only showing the models associated with the new flight procedures. The TICA representative asked how many aircraft would follow this approach and whether this approach is required by all aircraft approaching BBTCA from the east. Mr. Cabral responded that approximately 40% of commercial approaches occur on this flight path, and that these new procedures are exclusively for commercial operators (Porter and Air Canada).

The BQNA representative observed that as you get closer to the runway the noise level increases, and requested to see the other noise models for comparison between the old and new approaches. Mr. Bagg added that NAV Canada can bring the old and new models to the next meeting, however Mr. Purkis noted that the biggest changes don't occur near the airport.

#### **Action:**

M#36-A4      NAV Canada to share additional noise models comparing the old and new procedures for commercial aircraft.

The most significant changes associated with the RNP-AP procedures will be reductions in track distance over land on the approach minimizing the number of people impacted by aircraft fly-over when following a landing procedure. These new procedures may create modest

reductions in noise during landing as the procedures do not require additional thrust when levelling-off, allowing the aircraft to idle as it descends. The TICA representative noted that these models do not account for the “explosive” noise generated by landing. Mr. Bagg clarified that the flare illustrated in the model graphic at the end of the runway is representative of the noise generated through slowing the aircraft when it lands. The YQNA representative added that he disagrees with the assumption that tracking over water reduces noise, advocating that water can help disperse noise. Mr. Bagg clarified that by tracking the path over water, fewer households are exposed to overflight noise by keeping exhaust and mechanical noise directed away from people longer. Mr. Cabral noted that the CLC have had long discussions both in the CLC and the Noise Management Subcommittee (NMSC) about how NEF contour assumptions are quite different than reality at BBTCA due to environmental factors such as water and wind direction.

Mr. Bowen inquired why the measure of 55db was chosen for the model. Mr. Bagg responded that any threshold lower than 55db would struggle to show the difference relative to background noise, although most airports use a threshold of 60db to 70db as per NAV Canada standard methods. Using 55db provides a useful threshold for showing the changes in noise impact associated with reducing the amount of overflight area. Mr. Bowen inquired whether LMAX contours can be modified to show lower noise levels. Mr. Bagg indicated that they have never gone lower than 55db as it reduces accuracy.

Mr. Bagg noted that the current procedures for Runway 26 (eastern approach) are unique due to the Hearn’s smokestack requiring special training. With the new RNP-AP approach, pilots will be able to fly closer to the smokestack more safely and reduce their glide slope from 4.8 degrees to 4 degrees. While this won’t have a huge impact on noise, it makes the approach much safer and removes the need for special training to fly the approach.

Mr. Bowen inquired what population assumptions are in place for the Portlands, specifically Villiers Island where there is projected and planned growth in the future. He expressed a willingness to provide population projections for the area if NAV Canada is interested. Mr. Bagg indicated that NAV Canada typically uses the most recent population census data when modelling population exposure but is open to a conversation on the projections.

**Action:**

M#36-A5      City Planning to provide population projections for the Portlands to NAV Canada for future modelling exercises.

Mr. Bowen suggested that a footnote be included in future models showing noise impacts that acknowledges that development on Villiers will happen in the future exposing these residents to some degree of noise. Mr. Cabral inquired whether Mr. Bowen sees the LMAX as an important tool for City Planning as the noise impacts on these newly developing areas could be regulated to ensure these developments have noise mitigation measures built into newly constructed buildings. Mr. Bagg interjected that the usefulness of the LMAX for planning should be carefully considered given that it models one type of aircraft following one procedure which

will not be representative of all aircraft. Acknowledging this information, Mr. Bowen indicated that there is a longstanding incorrect assumption that there are not conflicts between aircraft and the Airport Regulation Zoning (AZR). Having the LMAX data with the ability to adjust the elevation where noise is measured would have a huge impact on residential development near the airport.

Mr. Cabral suggested that Mr. Bowen take the LMAX contour diagrams back to City Planning staff to discuss their usefulness in promoting awareness of waterfront noise impacts, adding a final point that there should be a legend that shows the value of each contour. The YQNA representative noted again that the LMAX contours do not account for environmental limitations and that the contours could be stretched to the Portlands, and that at places along the waterfront he has measured 70db. Mr. Cabral wished to clarify whether measurements have come from the Noise Management Terminals (NMTs) or measurements by residents. The YQNA representative clarified that they were his measurements and that he challenged Ports Toronto and NAV Canada to prove him wrong.

After viewing the RNP-AP video, the BQNA representative wished to congratulate NAV Canada on the innovative technology. The BQNA representative then inquired about how to provide feedback if there is significant noise after the December 2019 implementation. Mr. Bagg indicated that it is still best to go through Ports Toronto's noise office.

The YQNA representative wished to clarify that the RNP-AP procedures will only impact descents into BBTCA. Mr. Purkis confirmed that this is correct and that departures follow their own noise abatement procedures. He added that aircraft follow two potential take-off procedures: a low angle and long ascent, or a high angle and short ascent. The YQNA representative added that he knows of photographers who have taken pictures of aircraft landing and calculated descent angles above and below those outlined in the procedure and inquired about the tolerance for angles achieved versus designed in the procedures. Mr. Purkis explained that as a pilot approaches the airport the RNP-AP procedure guides the pilot in safely to a point where they can establish line of sight with the airport to take control of the aircraft fully and make the landing. A pilot can therefore decide the angle of descent based on their judgment once they have line of sight with the airport. If the pilot does not have line of sight with the airport, such as on a cloudy day, the pilot will follow the procedure until they can establish line of sight. Mr. Cabral noted that if possible, pilots will try to fly at a lower angle on the Runway 08 approach if conditions permit. Michael Antle (Ports Toronto) inquired whether the new approach is the Flight Management System (FMS). Mr. Purkis confirmed that they fly on FMS with an RNP-AP approach to ensure consistency, then the landing is done by the pilots with small adjustments which is where you will see slightly different approaches. The YQNA representative inquired whether there is a maximum target up or down. Mr. Purkis replied that it's a divergent angle, but he doesn't know off-hand. Mr. Bagg added that it depends on whether the pilot is in procedure or not. If it's a clear day and there is line of sight to the airport the procedure may not be needed. Mr. Bowen inquired whether the slope goes below the AZR or whether the AZR is the lowest limit. Mr. Cabral and Mike Karseboom (Ports Toronto)

confirmed that AZR is the very lowest a plane will fly on its approach depending on where it is on its approach.

Mr. Bowen asked whether the Hearn has impacted the new approach. Mr. Bagg explained that the Hearn is a criterion of the procedure however with on-board tracking of aircraft it's easier to know exactly where the aircraft is allowing a closer approach to the Hearn. The approach is just as safe as before given that the tolerance is better and is complemented by more accurate survey data.

Mr. Cabral delivered the closing remark for this agenda item thanking NAV Canada and commercial aircraft operators at BBTCA for their significant investment and leadership on this new technology which is industry leading. Mr. Cabral added that Mr. Bragg will deliver this presentation to the BBTCA board of directors as well.

## 5. City of Toronto – Waterfront Secretariat Updates

### Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Plan Update

Bryan Bowen (City of Toronto – Waterfront Secretariat) provided an update on City of Toronto projects underway or planned to begin soon. These projects include:

#### a. Dockwall Rehabilitation

- Groundbreaking occurred on October 25<sup>th</sup>, 2019.
- Reconstruction began on October 28<sup>th</sup>, 2019.
- The demolition phase will continue through November into 2020 with an anticipated completion of the noisiest portions of work by May 2020.
- Noise vibration controls are in place. Contact Bryan Bowen if there are noise issues related to this project so the City can speak to the contractors.
- The project will ultimately involve laying paving units with a similar design to the rest of the waterfront with a granite bench running the length of the dockwall.
- The contractor is Summerville Construction who have been involved on multiple waterfront construction projects and have good relationships with the community

#### b. Taxi Corral Redesign

- Ports Toronto is redesigning the taxi corral and shared parking area.
- Construction should begin in March 2020.
- The project completion date should be close to that of the dockwall rehabilitation.

Bojan Drakul (Ports Toronto) added that the timing for this project is being changed slightly due to weather. The plan is to complete as much construction prior to summer as possible.

c. Canada Malting Head Office Renovations (Ireland Park Foundation Headquarters)

- The Ireland Park Foundation will be moving their head office to the former Canada Malting Head Office at 1 Eireann Quay following the renovation of the building. Last week the Foundation held a fundraising event for the construction.
- Waterfront Toronto's Design Review Panel is currently reviewing the planned design for the office.
- The renovation project is on-track to begin early next year.

d. Public Realm Improvements

- Various public realm improvements are planned throughout the park property and on the streetscape of Eireann Quay.
- A RFP for a landscape architect to conduct this work is in development for 2020 with design work being conducted throughout 2020.
- Construction on this project is anticipated to begin in early 2021 continuing to completion before the end of 2021.

e. Canada Malting Silos Stabilization

- The conditions assessment for the silos has been updated.
- The City is leaning on other projects currently planned or underway on Eireann Quay to secure funding for engineering and State of Good Repair (SoGR) upgrades.
- Plan to begin engineering work in 2020 through to 2021.
- Scope of work involves stabilizing loose elements to enable removal of the fence that currently surrounds the site. Interior maintenance is not being considered as part of the scope of work. The City will look to a development partners who can put forth a proposal highlighting the cultural importance of the site.
- Work would also involve the installation of a power swing crane to assist in the ongoing exterior maintenance of the site.

The BQNA representative inquired about when a RFP would be issued for the interior of the Canada Malting Silos. Mr. Bowen indicated that the City is intentionally moving ahead on improvements to Eireann Quay without a partner to redevelop the interior of the silos given that in the past too much time has been invested into adaptive reuse projects that did not materialize. The City's strategy emphasizes waiting for the right partner to work on the interior revitalization and to proceed with other improvements to the surrounding area in the meantime. Mr. Kocur inquired whether the City is considering reaching out to potential partners such as Harbourfront Centre and Artscape. Mr. Bowen indicated they hear from interest partners constantly but have consistently seen these ideas falter given the cost of renovation and the limited development potential due to the historic significance and small footprint of the site. Mr. Kocur inquired how much it would cost to maintain the structure. Mr. Bowen replied that the cost of SoGR is lower than initially anticipated given that the previous conditions assessment assumed maintenance of both the interior and exterior of the structure. It was determined that over the next 15 years the City can undertake exterior stabilization that

would sufficiently address hazards posed by the site while waiting for a partner who is capable of undertaking the interior renovations.

Mr. Cabral wished to know whether the SoGR assessment for the silos is ongoing. Mr. Bowen replied that SoGR has a 15-year horizon and that part of the rationale for the swing crane at the top of the silos is to perform this ongoing maintenance at a lower cost and greater convenience.

Brent Gilliard (Office of Councillor Cressy) added that as an example of process to reach a mutually beneficial partner, the experience of the Wellington Destructor serves as a good precedent. Mr. Gilliard explained that over several years community meetings were held to determine what the procurement process for the Destructor site would look like and what qualities the community expected of the development partner. Mr. Bowen reaffirmed that the City has been through the process of considering the revitalization of the site several times, none of which came to fruition prompting the City to take a new approach. As the City undertakes the various projects on Eireann Quay the hope is that these make the site an increasingly valuable asset. In the meantime, the City is happy to take its time on this site and wait for a strong proposal for the site.

The YQNA representative inquired what the staging plan is for these projects and whether these projects will disrupt the taxi corral activities citing that unless efforts are made to accommodate disruption caused by construction staging, there may be wider impacts on the community caused by displacement of mainland airport activity. Mr. Bowen responded that as part of the taxi corral redesign the site plan approval has a detailed staging plan attached to mitigate the impacts the YQNA representative raised. The site plan approval and staging plan is included in **Appendix B**. Furthermore, the construction activities are sequenced to take advantage of staging efficiencies. For instance, the dockwall rehabilitation will require the largest amount of staging space. As the dockwall project is finished, this will open up new staging areas for subsequent projects.

#### Noise By-Law Updates

The BQNA representative advocated strongly that an update on the City of Toronto's Noise By-Law should not be deferred as residents need to know how the City is handling noise. The BQNA representative expressed their frustration that there seems to be a continuous series of construction projects occurring at the airport or nearby adversely impacting the sleep (and health) of residents. The TICA representative inquired whether these concerns were being raised in connection to shoreline armoring on the west side of the airport to which the BQNA representative indicated this was not what she was referring to, rather she was referring to construction generally. Mr. Cabral noted that Ports Toronto is still dealing with deficiencies at the airport and that unfortunately they were unable to utilize a barge for transporting construction materials for this project. He noted that this serves to highlight the importance of measures taken by Ports Toronto such as barging construction material to reduce disruption to the neighbourhood. Mr. Antle indicated that there may be a few more nights of runway related

work, however the asphalt work has been completed which should reduce the amount of disruption

The BQNA representative inquired about the details of the new noise by-law and how it can protect people from noise disruptions caused by overnight work. Mr. Faught noted that on November 26<sup>th</sup>, 2019, City of Toronto council adopted a Noise Action Plan with Councillor Holyday adding that greater consideration should be made by City Planning for “greater transportation, and specifically aircraft, noise mitigation solutions as part of the [development] application review process”. Read the [Noise Action Plan agenda item](#). Mr. Bowen indicated that he is not involved in this discussion specifically but suggested that he and Brent Gilliard take the lead on a follow-up in the next meeting.

**Action:**

M#36-A6 Bryan Bowen and Brent Gilliard to provide an update on the City of Toronto Noise By-Law

Mr. Cabral wished to reassure the CLC that Ports Toronto takes noise very seriously both in its operations and with its contractors undertaking capital projects. Mr. Drakul added that Ports Toronto monitors noise over the course of construction projects in accordance with the City’s by-law and has not exceeded the 85db at source levels specified in the by-law. Mr. Cabral continued that he does not wish to diminish the impacts felt by residents and understands that the ferry is one of the principle concerns. The YQNA representative noted that he struggles to sleep at night due to the noise, agreeing with the BQNA representative that constant construction at the airport presents adverse impacts to residents. Further, the YQNA representative inquired whether the City follows its own by-law when it leads projects. Mr. Gilliard indicated that a by-law officer would not issue a ticket to a city project that is not compliant to which the YQNA representative indicated that he felt was a significant issue. Mr. Gilliard expanded that while the by-law officer would not ticket the project, noise management is laid out in tendered contracts and that the city enforces these noise guidelines. In short, noise is still monitored by the City but the relationship looks slightly different.

The YQNA representative expressed that he feels the City of Toronto as a signatory of the Tripartite Agreement is allowing the airport to expand generating construction and overnight noise. The YQNA representative expressed that at the next opportunity to renegotiate the Tripartite Agreement, this issue should be at the forefront of discussion. Mr. Cabral sought to clarify that not all work is overnight, and that Ports Toronto makes a concerted effort to avoid overnight work when possible. The BQNA reiterated that terminal expansion and other construction projects have occurred back-to-back disrupting peoples’ sleep. Mr. Faught suggested that in the interest of time that these concerns be brought to the NMSC at their next meeting for discussion and that a member of the NMSC provide an update on the discussion at the next CLC meeting.

**Action:**

M#36-A7 LURA to add 'Noise By-Law' and Ports Toronto construction noise to the next Noise Management Sub-Committee Meeting agenda, scheduled for January 7<sup>th</sup>, 2020.

**6. Ports Toronto / City of Toronto – Toronto Development Assessment Process**

Gene Cabral (Ports Toronto) indicated that members of the CLC requested a presentation on the relationship between Ports Toronto operations and Toronto City Planning. Mr. Cabral suggested that in the interest of time this presentation should be deferred to a future meeting but that the slide deck which was prepared for the presentation could be shared. The presentation slide deck can be found in **Appendix C**.

**Action:**

M#36-A8 LURA to circulate the 'Toronto Development Assessment Process' presentation slides with the CLC Meeting #36 minutes and defer this item for presentation at a subsequent meeting.

The BQNA representative inquired whether the development assessment process is a plan or a current practice, and whether its scope covers construction associated with the airport. Mr. Cabral explained that this is a process that is currently in practice by Ports Toronto and Toronto City Planning dealing with properties outside of the airport but within the airport's area of influence. This primarily concerns how new developments impact airport approaches. Mr. Bowen added as a short primer that the City of Toronto circulates development applications for comments by organizations such as Ports Toronto to identify impacts caused by new development. Mr. Bowen noted that currently the process is not as clear as it should be on when items should be circulated, and that this is a new process which is being continually refined for procedural improvements.

**7. Ports Toronto - Billy Bishop Airport 2018 Master Plan**

Mr. Cabral provided an update on the Billy Bishop Airport 2018 Master Plan which was published on the project website on November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2019. Mr. Cabral noted that this was the most comprehensive consultation on BBTCA to-date, something he and Ports Toronto colleagues felt was necessary given the context. The plan sets a 20-year horizon for expectations, studies, goals, and projects to come in the future. Some immediate items include a Ground Noise Study and exploring stormwater and environmental risk assessment. Ports Toronto is currently going through its budget cycle. At the next CLC meeting, Mr. Drakul will provide an update on the five-year capital plan for the airport. Mr. Cabral noted that the Master Plan process was a great opportunity to reflect on lessons learned from various projects to apply best practices to mitigating concerns.

**Action:**

M#36-A9 Ports Toronto to provide a 5-year capital plan update at the next CLC meeting.

The TICA representative inquired whether the Toronto Island Parks Master Plan was considered in the development of the plan considering the airport's relationship to the rest of the Island. Deborah Wilson (Ports Toronto) indicated it is referenced in the plan.

The YQNA representative inquired whether any recommendations from the City of Toronto letter were rejected. Mr. Cabral indicated that he would have to check. Ports Toronto is in the process of finalizing a table showing where feedback came from and how it was integrated into the final Master Plan document. This should be available in mid-December 2019.

**Action:**

M#36-A10      Ports Toronto to share the Master Plan Feedback Index with the CLC when it is published.

The BQNA representative asked how the publication was publicized noting she was not aware it had been published. Ms. Wilson noted that the publication of the Master Plan was delivered in a press release, a note to the CLC, and through various social media channels. The BQNA representative indicated that she did not receive these updates, however other CLC members noted they had. The BQNA representative noted she can follow-up with Ms. Wilson to ensure Ports Toronto have the correct email for the general email for the BQNA given that they recently changed their email address. Ms. Wilson also encouraged CLC members to follow the BBTCA and Ports Toronto twitter feeds as announcements are consistently publicized through these platforms along with press releases and direct email contact.

The YQNA representative noted to Mr. Gilliard that at the last Billy Bishop Master Plan (2015) update around the time of the Porter No Jets discussion, nothing that the late Councillor Pam McConnell and John Livy hosted a community meeting to discuss airport growth matters. The YQNA representative indicated that he feels two components have been missed in the latest Master Plan process: airport capacity and constraints of growth sections. The YQNA representative inquired whether there is the possibility for a similar meeting including a presentation on material related to airport capacity and growth constraints to members of the YQNA and BQNA. Mr. Bowen sought to clarify whether the YQNA representative was referring to the last Master Plan update or the No Jets discussion. The YQNA representative explained it was the Porter No Jets discussion just prior to the 2015 Master Plan process, it was a meeting at City Hall which the YQNA representative felt was very helpful to understand constraints. Mr. Gilliard explained he cannot make the commitment at this time but if there is a gap that YQNA, BQNA, Waterfront For All, etc... have identified that's something to discuss outside of the CLC to determine the appropriate measure to take. Mr. Cabral reaffirmed that Ports Toronto has a commitment in the updated Master Plan to a managed growth strategy and does not want the perception to be that this was not concerned in the process. Ports Toronto has consistently looked to advancements in policy and technology to better manage airport operations.

The TICA representative requested that a report on high water levels be discussed at the next CLC meeting as this is a pressing issue being faced by TICA, and a common issue faced by the airport as the International Joint Commission (IJC) has been releasing less water near Cornwall.

The TICA representative also requested a discussion on the application of renewable energy on-site at the airport, such as solar panels on the terminal roofs. Mr. Cabral noted that Ports Toronto is always looking for greener opportunities. Mr. Drakul added that if approved Ports Toronto is looking to complete a solar power study in 2020. Mr. Cabral suggested that Chris Sawicki (Ports Toronto) and Bryan Bowen would likely be the best candidates to lead this discussion. Mr. Bowen added that the on both renewable energy and water levels, the City along with its partners including Ports Toronto, Waterfront Toronto, the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, and Harbourfront Centre all have a role in this work. Mr. Bowen added that the City is exploring covering the entire roof of the Waterfront Neighbourhood Centre in solar panels and would be happy to share the results of this to learn about the potential application of solar energy technology at the airport.

**Action:**

M#36-A11 Bryan Bowen and Chris Sawicki to provide an update on renewable energy opportunities on Eireann Quay and at BBTCA.

**8. Business Arising**

Alexander Furneaux confirmed that he will circulate the CLC meeting dates for 2020, the meeting minutes for CLC Meeting #35, the BBTCA 2018 Master Plan, and the presentation slides from CLC Meeting #36 in an email on Thursday November 28<sup>th</sup>, 2019.

Jim Faught thanked all the CLC members for attending and adjourned the meeting at 8:30pm.