



Minutes

Date: February 26, 2014 at 4:00 p.m.

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

Chair: Toby Lennox, GTAA Vice President, Strategy Development & Stakeholder Relations

Member attendees: Brad Green, Brampton Resident
 Charles Gonsalves, Brampton Resident
 Richard Poersch, Brampton Resident (on behalf of Brian Maltby)
 Tina Rizzuto-Willan, Mississauga Resident
 Gordon Stewart, Mississauga Resident
 Vincent Crisanti, Toronto Councillor
 Sheldon Rokin, Toronto Resident

Absent : Maja Prentice, Mississauga Resident
 Johan Van T' Hof, Toronto Resident

Technical Members: **GTAA:** R. Connelly, L. McKee, D. Dolezal, F. Donaldson D. Gray, K. Bochan, L. Hindocha, **NAV Canada:** Sam Ghobrial, **Transport Canada:** Greg Cross, **City of Mississauga:** Karen Crouse,

Secretariat: K. Stefanazzi

Also Present – Residents R. Boehnke, Toronto
 K. Burford, Toronto
 M. Conacher, Toronto
 A. Pearson, Toronto
 G. Crymble, Mississauga
 S. Kapur, Mississauga
 T. Skiland, Oakville

Attachments: CENAC Information Update, February 26, 2014

Next meeting: Wednesday April 30, 2014 at 4:00 p.m.

Item	Details
1.0	Preliminary Items
1.1	<i>Welcome and Roll Call conducted by K. Bochan.</i>
1.2	<i>Review and approval of Agenda: B. Green moved and C. Gonsalves seconded.</i>
1.3	<i>Review, approval of November 27, 2013 Minutes: S. Rokin moved and C. Gonsalves seconded.</i>
1.4.0	Matters Arising from previous meeting of November 27, 2013. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action Items arising from previous meetings were reviewed and can be found

Item	Details
	on the website. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• K. Burford inquired if the TP308 guidelines were sent directly to TANG.• The document can be found here
2.0	REGULAR ITEMS
2.1	CENAC Committee Information Update (handout was reviewed)
2.1.2	Extreme Cold Weather Event at Toronto Pearson
2.1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• T. Lennox provided the committee with an update on the extreme cold weather event at Toronto Pearson which took place from January 5 to January 9th<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A review is being conducted and will be completed by mid-April, and the findings will be shared with the public.• Airports Council International named an international expert panel to assess Management's review.• During the weather event, 7 per cent of flights were cancelled. Chicago cancelled 16.8 per cent of flights, LaGuardia cancelled 13.2 per cent of flights, and Newark cancelled 10.6 per cent of flights.• B. Green asked how Montreal and Ottawa performed during the cold weather event.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ T. Lennox responded that Montreal cancelled 6.1 per cent of their flights and on January 9th. Montreal eventually closed, diverting a number of their flights to Toronto Pearson.• G. Stewart noted that a B777 aircraft came in from the Middle East and caused the baggage area to overflow.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ T. Lennox responded there is a number of factors that contributed to the baggage challenges. Decisions were made to get passengers off planes, leave baggage on the plane, and empty the baggage when it was possible. The weather conditions were difficult to operate under. Toronto Pearson never closed, it was a North American ground stop, and therefore any flights already enroute to Toronto Pearson were still arriving, international flights continued to depart enroute to Toronto Pearson and departing aircraft continued to leave, but at a much slower rate.• R. Poersch noted that safety has always been very important in air navigation. This was an extreme day and the weather made it impossible to work on tarmacs.
2.1.3	CENAC Stats on Runway Movements and Noise Complaints
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• K. Bochan gave a presentation on Runway movements and noise complaints by runway operations. The full presentation can be found here.• A. Pearson noted that peak periods in his neighbourhood occur from 5:30 a.m. to 6:30 a.m., and 7:00 p.m. until 11:00 p.m. and then again from 11:00 p.m. to 1:30 a.m. Mr. Pearson resides in South Hill which is in the St. Clair and Avenue Road area, and has noticed a significant increase in flights since Windsor

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

Toronto Montreal Airspace redesign (WTM).

- T. Lennox responded Toronto Pearson does have peak periods during the day, and stated all airports operate on a series of peak periods and quiet times.
- A. Pearson requested a breakdown of complaints by aircraft type.
 - R. Connelly responded that a report will be provided at the next CENAC meeting.
- A. Pearson asked whether there are modifications that can be made to aircraft to reduce noise.
 - We have discussed previously with CENAC the changes in airframe design, changes in aircraft design, changes in engine design, and would be happy to share this information. (Please see action items from February 26, 2014)
- A. Pearson stated they are not able to read the decibel levels that aircraft make in their area, because the noise monitoring terminals are all within 6.5 kilometers of the airport. An NMT in Winston Churchill Park or Leaside Park would be ideal.
 - The GTAA Noise and Flight Track Monitoring System is currently equipped with 17 permanent noise monitoring terminals (NMT) and two portable NMTs. The goal is to maintain an up-to-date noise monitoring and flight tracking system that provides an accurate history of measurable aircraft noise events. NMTs are tools to assist with the analysis and correlation of a noise complaint with an aircraft operation.
 - On May 2010, A CENAC sub-committee was critical in the determination and review of the locations for these new noise monitors. Details of the selection criteria can be found [here](#)
- A resident inquired why complaints are registered only within 10 nautical miles (NM) of the airport.
 - T. Lennox responded that Toronto Pearson's ground lease with Transport Canada mandates that complaints within 10NM are the responsibility of the GTAA and complaints outside the 10NM are Transport Canada's responsibility. All calls received in the noise office – regardless of location -- are addressed and discussed with the caller; however they are not registered by the GTAA if outside the 10NM area of responsibility.
- A resident noted the statistics are misleading, as the complaints outside the 10 NM areas are not included in the GTAA's statistics.
 - T. Lennox responded the GTAA does not have access to the complaint statistics from Transport Canada.
- T. Rizzuto-Willan stated that being a citizen representative for ten years, CENAC has not seen many complaints outside the 10 NM area until the recent WTM changes, and inquired if Transport Canada could provide a monthly report of

Item	Details
	<p>complaints to CENAC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ G. Cross responded that Transport Canada will provide this information. (Please see action items from February 26, 2014)● K. Burford noted “health concern” is not an option on the complaints menu of WebTrak, can it be added.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ R. Connelly responded it can and will be added. (Please see action items from February 26, 2014)● A. Pearson noted that an A320 flew over a ravine in his neighbourhood at 4:45 p.m. on Tuesday February 26, and when he checked WebTrak, the aircraft from his perspective did not show up in the same location.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ T. Lennox responded that the data feed the airport receives is from Nav Canada.○ S. Ghobrial noted NavCan’s system is flight checked, on the radar itself, and it’s one of the most accurate systems in the world.
2.2	<p>Environment Services - Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● D. Gray noted that Phase 1 of the Air Quality Study on airport emissions has been delayed. It will be completed in March 2014. The GTAA will be in discussion with the Region of Peel on Phase 2 of the emissions study. The study should be completed by March 31, 2014 and Phase 3 by April 30, 2014.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ [Please note, this timeline has subsequently been delayed; the study is now scheduled to finish in Fall 2014]
2.3	<p>Community Outreach - Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● R. Connelly noted a meeting will be scheduled the week of March 17, 2014 to report back on findings of Phase 1 and an update will be provide to CENAC members who are on the Community Advisory Air Quality committee.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ [Please note this meeting was delayed to April 24, 2014]● WebTrak was launched December 11, 2013 and had more than 800,000 visits to the site, and more than 1,800 users logged in.
3.	<p>DISCUSSION ITEMS</p>
3.1	<p>Introduction to Performance Based Navigation</p>
3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● David Deere, Standards Pilot, with Flight Technical Operations of WestJet provided a presentation on Performance Based Navigation. A summary of the presentation can be found below:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The Instrument Landing Systems (ILS) was initially designed in 1938. The system has shifted from a sensor based system to the current Performance Based Navigation (PBN) system, and contributes to reducing greenhouse gas emissions worldwide.○ PBN is a very robust GPS satellite system. PBN flight tracks are more accurate vertically and laterally, decreasing emissions, greenhouse gases and noise. PBN is very accurate and used in mountainous terrain.○ The implementation process for PBN is guided, directed and monitored by the NAV Canada PBN Working Group.

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

- The request to implement has to be identified, a business case and safety case analysis needs to be conducted, and it then goes to consultation meetings which include all major stakeholders including GTAA. S. Rokin inquired of PBN could be introduced at Toronto Pearson and not delayed by implementation of other airlines.
 - D. Deere responded that a business case is required, separation standards must be resolved as well as the complexities of operating at an airport with parallel runways. There would also need to be a great deal of consultation between Nav Canada and the airline and airport operators before implementation could occur.
- D. Deere stated that Nav Canada is looking at implementing PBN at three or four airports per year, which is consistent with the industry's approach elsewhere. It's expected that PBN would not be implemented at Toronto Pearson for at least 3 to 5 years.
 - S. Ghobrial reiterated it would be at least 3 to 5 years before this would be adopted in Toronto, and what can be done in Montreal, Calgary or Vancouver is not easily repeated at Toronto Pearson. The volume of traffic and the complexity of the operations is a consideration, and consultation with the GTAA will take time. The number two airport in the country, deals with half the air traffic of Toronto Pearson.
- B. Green inquired what percentage of operational aircraft is able to make use of PBN.
 - D. Deere responded 100 per cent of WestJet aircraft use PBN. Air Canada's Embraer aircraft and the 787's are capable of PBN.
- T. Rizzuto-Willan inquired if this will affect early turn procedures.
 - D. Deere stated that currently it affects arrivals only; in the future departures will be involved.
- T. Rizzuto-Willan inquired if the consultation team is national.
 - D. Deere responded it is national from a Nav Canada perspective, and local from an airport authority perspective.
- T. Rizzuto-Willan noted she would like timelines and inquired about the downwind leg that is affecting communities to the east, and if the design options could be altered slightly.
 - D. Deere responded anything can be altered in the design component but there are air traffic management challenges that still have to be met.
 - D. Deere stated the complexities include the separation standard. When you have parallel runways you cannot have one descend within 1,000 feet of another, so this will have to be resolved. High density is also a factor.
- S. Rokin noted the downwind leg that residents are complaining about is much further out than five miles. When we first heard about this technology there was a suggestion the downwind turns would be much closer in.
 - A five mile curve is typical and you're not going to get any closer than 5 miles for the downwind leg. .

4.0

Public Comments

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

- TANG resident noted Nav Canada has a very precise navigation system, because they have aircraft flying over their neighbourhood every 2 to 3 minutes.
 - S. Ghobrial stated Nav Canada responded to the airline community's request to make routes in southern Canada more efficient for their operations. The decision makers were Nav Canada, Transport Canada, GTAA, and stakeholders such as the airlines. It was also discovered that some of the previous procedures did not meet proper criteria so changes were made to meet the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) criteria. Nav Canada took ads in several newspapers.
- A resident from TANG noted he has lived in his residence for 24 years, and inquired what we can do now to affect change.
 - G. Cross responded throughout WTM noise was consistently raised as an issue, and what the impact was going to be. Where there was going to be an impact in one area, there would be a relief in another area. It is a very complex issue and it's not easily managed.
 - T. Lennox noted this is a very difficult issue. Presentations were done at CENAC by Nav Canada on WTM beginning in 2011. Issues about public consultation were consistently raised at CENAC. It is a difficult to achieve the right balance to reach everyone. The decision of changing flight paths is a regulatory matter and a Nav Canada matter.
 - S. Rokin noted the noise issues the TANG residents are experiencing, other neighbourhoods experienced before the WTM changes.
- A resident commented that the noisiest aircraft are not WestJet or Air Canada. He also travels to the U.S. frequently, and noticed the descent is a lot faster as opposed to the Canadian aircraft descent which is more gradual.
 - D. Deere responded in the U.S. they have a different rule when they have to achieve during a visual approach.
 - T. Lennox responded that aircraft technology combined with aircraft-type and flight procedures at various airports are varied and have different noise impact on the surrounding communities.
- Oakville resident T. Skiland, stated her neighbourhood is affected by the downwind descent of aircraft at 3,000 feet, and she is concerned about her health.
- Ms. Skiland inquired why Oakville has no representation on the committee.
 - T. Lennox advised that the concerns she had raised are not limited geographically, and the GTAA can address many of her questions regarding flight paths, and why routes aren't flown over the lake etc.
- A resident from TANG asked Nav Canada and Transport Canada representative at the meeting today to go back to their bodies with a request that a working group be formed with citizens representatives to talk about what can be done to help residents better understand the processes and decisions around WTM, and why changes had to occur to accommodate the ICAO guidelines.
- A. Pearson inquired what a preferential runway is.
 - D. Dolezal responded preferential runways for night time hours minimize

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

noise impacts over residential communities. Details can be found [here](#)

- S. Rokin stated as a Don Valley resident, it is very important to safeguard the current preferential runways.
 - T. Lennox responded the preferential runway system was put in place in 1974. When the GTAA assumed control of the airport in 1996, they were required to adopt the same preferential runway system that was in place under Transport Canada. It has never been reviewed, and as part of a 5-year noise review we are going to be looking at preferential runways.

5.0

Adjournment - Meeting is adjourned.

6.0

The next CENAC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday April 30, 2014. For additional information, please contact Kim Stefanazzi at (416) 776-3941.

DRAFT