



# CENAC Minutes

**Date:** December 2, 2015 at 6:30 p.m.

**Location:** GTAA Administration Building, 3111 Convairst Drive, Pearson Rooms A & B

**Chair:** Lorrie McKee, Director, Public Affairs and Stakeholder Relations

**Committee Member Attendees:** David Bishop, Mississauga Resident  
Brian Maltby, Brampton Resident  
John Davidson, Halton Region Representative (alternate)  
Craig Van Spall, Mississauga Resident  
Vincent Crisanti, Toronto Councillor  
John Connolly, Durham Region Representative  
Stephen Holyday, Toronto Councillor  
Johan Van T'Hof, Toronto Resident  
Armando Sanchez, Toronto Resident

**Absent :** Brad Green, Brampton Resident  
Pat Fortini, Brampton Councillor  
Chris Fonseca, Mississauga Councillor  
Tina Rizzuto-Willan, Mississauga Resident  
Jeff Knoll, Halton Region City Councillor

**Technical Members Attendees:** Dr. Colin Novak, President Acoustician, Akoustik Engineering Ltd.  
Greg Cross, Transport Canada  
Adam Biffin, Transport Canada

**GTAA Staff:** L. Barrett  
K. Bochan  
D. Grey  
B. Maxwell  
C. Woods  
R. Connelly  
L. Petrie  
S. Desroches  
C. Cumberland

**Secretariat:** I. Pringle

**Public** R. Donatelli, Etobicoke  
S. Best, Toronto  
K. Gennatos, Halton Hills  
H. Ivanic, Oakville  
R. Boehnke, Etobicoke  
S. Caltsoudas, Toronto  
M. Voegel, Etobicoke  
J. Williams, Toronto  
D. Suchon, Toronto  
J. De Mone, Toronto  
C. Cizmar, Georgetown  
L. Vander Hoeven, Toronto  
X. Zheng, Vaughan  
C. McKerracher, Toronto  
P. Ivanic, Oakville  
K. Crouse, City of Mississauga  
D. McLeay, NACC

**Attachments:** CENAC Information Update

**Next meeting:** Wednesday, February 24, 2016 at 6:30 pm.

Item	Details
<b>1.0</b>	<b>PRELIMINARY ITEMS</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<i>Welcome and Roll Call conducted by K. Bochan.</i>
<b>1.2</b>	Review and approval of Agenda: J. Connolly moved and B. Maltby seconded.
<b>1.3</b>	Review, approval of September 9, 2015 minutes. J. Connolly moved and S. Holyday seconded. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Minutes were amended to reflect Mr. Slatter's feedback. They could be found <a href="#">here</a></li></ul>
<b>1.4</b>	Matters Arising from previous meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Presentation later in the meeting will address the issue on Webtrak from previous meeting.</li></ul>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>REGULAR ITEMS</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b><i>CENAC Committee Information Update (handout was received for info.)</i></b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b><i>CENAC Stats on Runway Movements and Noise Complaints</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Due to a full agenda the regular CENAC stats update was not presented at the meeting, but members and the public were advised that the full presentation could be found <a href="#">here</a>.</li><li>National Airlines Council of Canada (NACC) requested to seek membership on the committee. As a follow up, NACC will be formally invited to make a presentation to the CENAC committee.</li></ul>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>DISCUSSION ITEMS</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b><i>Presentation: Air Quality Study</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A. Barrett, Golder Associates gave an overview on the <i>Air Quality Study</i>. The study was broken down into four phases:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Phase 1 – Airport emissions inventory</li><li>Phase 2 – Regional emissions inventory</li><li>Phase 3 – modeling of the dispersion of the airport and regional emissions</li></ul></li><li>As a follow up to the Air Quality Study G. Ferguson, Intrinsic presented the Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) of the Air Quality Study.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Phase 4 - HHRA of modeled air quality results from phase 3</li></ul></li><li>Overall, the purpose of this work was to quantify and assess the current and projected air quality to understand the potential for adverse health effects for those who live, work and play in the vicinity of Toronto Pearson.</li><li>The study found that the general population is not likely at risk of adverse health effects due to Toronto Pearson's operations, based on the highly-conservative nature of the assessment and the infrequency of any exceedances.</li></ul> <p>Both presentations and full reports along with communications information will be made available on the Toronto Pearson website before the next meeting.</p>

Item	Details
------	---------

**3.2 Update: Community Engagement & Consultation re: Toronto Region Noise Mitigation Initiatives, Stakeholder Roundtables**

- C. Woods shared an update on the GTAA and NAV Canada joint three-phase Noise Mitigation Initiatives, WebTrak and the Noise Monitoring Review. The full presentation can be found [here](#).

**Update: Toronto Noise Mitigation Initiatives**

- This is a GTAA and NAV Canada joint initiative,
- The Regional Engagement Meetings were completed late summer and the GTAA and NAV CANADA now have entered the Technical review phase
- The materials from the Stakeholder Roundtables, including a full list of community suggestions, were made available on the website September 30, 2105 and can be found here: [Noise Mitigation Initiatives](#)
- NAV Canada is preparing a Request for Proposal for third party assistance on the analysis.

**Update: WebTrak**

- The Noise Office has received ongoing feedback from residents about some difficulties with the on-line WebTrak complaint form.
  - The feedback received was forwarded to the vendor for review. In addition the Noise office conducted testing to determine the issue.
  - The vendor recommends that residents ensure that “cookies” are enabled in the web browser of their computer.
  - These improvements will be listed on the complaint form and the help guide will be updated on the Toronto Pearson website.
- S. Best congratulated C. Woods on the respectful and thoughtful way she works with the residents, and acknowledged C. Woods’ great service.
- At the last CENAC meeting, Toronto resident, R. Slatter requested that additional information be added to WebTrak:
  - Ground speed;
  - Airline information;
  - Change aircraft labels; and
  - indication of runway centre lines with two mile distance marks.
- C. Woods confirmed that as a result of this request:
  - A request was made with the vendor to add groundspeed to WebTrak
  - Due to contractual obligations with NAV Canada, the Noise Office cannot add airline details to WebTrak.
  - The request to change aircraft labels and to add runway center lines with two mile distance marks is still under review.
- C. Cizmar, Georgetown resident requested an added feature in WebTrak that allows complainants to register one complaint with multiple incidents times.
  - L. McKee stated due to the way information is received and tracked the Noise office currently correlates every incident time to an individual flight track and complaints therefore must be individually entered.
  - C. Woods suggested rather than having to submit the form multiple times, residents can instead manually enter additional incident times in the comment section of the complaint form and advised the Noise office will manually input the additional times as complaints.
- R. Boehnke inquired if decibel levels have decreased because of WebTrak.
  - C. Woods stated no.

Item	Details
------	---------

### 3.3 **Update: Noise Monitoring Terminal Review**

- A review of NMT locations in surrounding communities was identified as one of the 2015 initiatives of Toronto Pearson's Noise Management Action Plan.
- The working group completed its criteria review for NMT site selection and has conducted portable monitoring in Halton Hills, Mississauga, Oakville, Toronto and Vaughan. Information about the NMT Review including a video and FAQs, have been posted on the Toronto Pearson website. Additional communication will be made available in early 2016.
- S. Caltsoudas, Toronto resident inquired why the Noise Monitoring Review only captured arrival and not departure flight paths
  - C. Woods responded that the Working group determined that departures and arrivals on final approach are well captured by the current 17 permanent noise monitors. However, the group identified 10 areas for portable noise monitoring that would capture noise from arrival traffic on the downwind flight path.

### 3.4 **Update: Night Flight Budget**

- L. Barrett provided an update on the 2015 Night Flight Budget and the 2016 Night Flight Forecast. The full presentation can be found [here](#).
- R. Slater inquired what the percentage for cargo operation vs. passenger movements were during these restricted hours
  - L. Barrett stated in 2014 cargo operations accounted for 16 per cent and passenger traffic accounted for 78 per cent of movements
- Toronto resident inquired whether the Night Flight Budget was calculated by touch down and takeoff and whether it was possible to hear noise from an aircraft outside the restricted hours.
  - L. Barrett stated yes, aircraft could be over a community during the restricted hours but land outside the restricted hours and this flight would not count against the night flight budget.
- Toronto resident questioned whether the Night Flight bump up approved by Transport Canada was as a reward for Toronto Pearson.
  - L. McKee stated that in a year when the number of night flights reaches more than 95 per cent of the budget, beginning in the next year will be increased by 10 per cent, plus the percentage passenger increased. We know that while nighttime operations are required to meet the needs of our community and region, they also impact some of our neighbours. We believe the updated budget permitted by Transport Canada is fair and allows for responsible growth over time. Since the formula was changed by Transport Canada night flights have not exceeded 95 per cent of the budget, therefore a 10 per cent increase has not been triggered.
- S. Best asked if any airlines have been fined for flying in the restricted hours.
  - L. McKee stated no. The process in place is the GTAA educates the pilots and airlines after a first violation, which has been proven successful in changing behavior.
- K. Gennatos asked if there is any way to find out where the portable NMT took place in Halton Hills. Halton Hills is in a very different location from Georgetown that experiences a different level of aircraft noise.
  - C. Woods advised that a map can be provided.

Item	Details
<b>4.0</b>	<b><i>Public Comments</i></b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• R. Slatter, reported on the formation of a new residents group in Oakville, called Residents Air Noise Group of Oakville (RANGO), and that of its members are airline captains, retired airline captains and residents who will work with TANG and other residents groups towards reducing the impact of aircraft noise in Oakville.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ L. McKee stated that she hopes the new group will work with the CENAC and the other technical members of the committee.</li></ul></li><li>• L. Vander Hoeven, Mount Pleasant resident, expressed disappointment that no representative from NAV Canada was present at meeting.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ L. McKee stated that NAV Canada has normally attended all meetings and due to scheduling issues was not able to attend today's meeting.</li></ul></li></ul>
<b>5.0</b>	<b><i>Adjournment - Meeting is adjourned.</i></b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ L. McKee stated that the CENAC meeting dates have been selected for 2016. <a href="#">2016 CENAC dates have been posted on the website.</a></li><li>○ The next CENAC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February, 24, 2016. For additional information, please contact Ingrid Pringle at (416) 776-3035.</li></ul>