



CENAC Minutes

Date: April 30, 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
Brian Maltby, Brampton Resident
Tina Rizzuto-Willan, Mississauga Resident
Gordon Stewart, Mississauga Resident
Johan Van T' Hof, Toronto Resident
Vincent Crisanti, Toronto Councillor
Sheldon Rokin, Toronto Resident

Absent : Maja Prentice, Mississauga Resident

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

Technical Members Absent

Secretariat: K. Stefanazzi

Also Present – Residents R. Boehnke, Toronto
M. Berger, Toronto
A. Pearson, Toronto
S. Kapur, Mississauga
C. VanSpall, Mississauga
E.J. Mohammed, Brampton
D. Caltsoudas, Toronto

Attachments: CENAC Information Update, April 30, 2014

Next meeting: Wednesday June 25, 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: S. Rokin moved and B. Green seconded.</i>
1.3	<i>Review and approval of February 26, 2014 Minutes:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pearson inquired why the minutes weren't issued prior to April 30, 2014 as it didn't allow time to review and requested minutes be published two weeks prior</i>

Item	Details
	<p><i>to the meeting. E. J. Mohammed noted the GTAA's mandate stated the agenda and minutes should be published a week prior to the meeting.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>T. Lennox apologized, and noted the minutes will be issued one week prior to meeting and approval of February 26 minutes will be deferred to the next meeting.</i>• <i>For the full CENAC Terms of Reference, please see here</i>
1.4.0	Matters Arising from previous meeting of April 30, 2014. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Action Items arising from previous meetings were reviewed and can be found here• A. Pearson asked why the WebTrak complaint form provides a drop down list of aircraft types and why this information is not published.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ R. Connelly responded this information helps with analysis. For example, when a resident chooses prop departure, it helps Noise Management staff analyze the complaint and correlate it to the operation.
2.0	REGULAR ITEMS
2.1	CENAC Committee Information Update (handout was reviewed)
2.2	CENAC Stats on Registering a Noise Complaint and Noise Complaints and Callers <ul style="list-style-type: none">• K. Bochan gave a presentation on how complaints are registered and provided a breakdown of noise complaints and callers. The full presentation can be found here
2.3	CENAC Night Flight Budget – Update <ul style="list-style-type: none">• D. Dolezal gave a presentation on the night flight budget. The night flight budget is based on actual passenger growth in the previous year.• In February 2014, the projected budget for 2014 was 14,855; once the 2013 final passenger count for 2013 had been submitted, the final 2014 Night Flight budget was revised to 14,893. This reflects a 3.47 per cent passenger growth in 2013 over 2012.• D. Dolezal noted the GTAA is currently half way through the budget calendar year. The full presentation can be found here
2.4	Environment Services - Update <ul style="list-style-type: none">• D. Gray reported that Phase 1 of the Air Quality Study on airport emissions has been completed.• Two meetings have been held with the Air Quality Community Advisory Committee to discuss the scope of the study and review Phase 1.• Dates going forward:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Phase 2 - an offsite inventory will be completed in June 2014.○ Phase 3 - emissions and dispersion modeling system will be completed in September 2014.

Item	Details
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Phase 4 – a Human Health Risk Assessment will be contracted, and is projected to be completed by year end.○ The full presentation can be found here● A. Pearson inquired why the study looks at an 8-kilometre radius of the airport property.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ D. Gray responded the 7.5-kilometre radius was selected to mirror the original study in 1991.○ In addition, R. McGill stated the radius was selected because outside this radius, aircraft altitude is too high, and the dispersion of molecules would be too far, and too weak to model.● A. Pearson noted there is a much more concentrated corridor of aircraft flying over central Toronto on the downwind leg, and the study should consider this change and to include neighbourhoods outside the 8 kilometer radius.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ T. Rizzuto-Willan noted that to be able to compare the current information to the previous study, it needed to use the same criteria. As distance from the airport increases, information becomes difficult to measure.● G. Dunbar, a resident of Mississauga, inquired if the study takes into account the engine run-ups for serviced aircraft.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ A. Barrett responded that engine run-ups are not included in the emissions inventory.○ D. Gray noted the percentage of run-ups compared to overall flights is quite low.○ T. Lennox indicated the GTAA will provide what the percentage is at the next meeting.
2.5	2014 Construction Season
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● L. Hindocha gave an overview of planned summer 2014 airside construction projects, and associated potential noise impacts. The full presentation can be found here● A. Pearson inquired if aircraft on Runway 23 will be diverted to Runways 24L/R during night time hours.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ L. Hindocha responded that during construction, the possibility for non-preferential runway use on Runways 24L/R does exist.● A. Pearson inquired if the winds from the west are strong at night, would there be more traffic on the downwind leg.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ L. Hindocha responded it is a possibility.
3.	DISCUSSION ITEMS
3.1	90 Day Weather Review
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● T. Lennox stated that on April 10, 2014 the GTAA released a report with the results of the 90-Day Weather review that occurred at Toronto Pearson January 5 through January 9, 2014.● As a result of the review, twelve recommendations were made, categorized in three areas,<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Prevent or mitigate impacts of a disruption○ Require plans and tools to better communicate to the media, passengers

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

- and employees
- Address needs of passengers when disruptions occur
- This information was put into a report, which can be found [here](#)

3.2 **10 Nautical Mile Assessment**

- | | |
|-----|--|
| 3.2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● T. Lennox noted the 10 Nautical Mile (10NM) constraint is present in the GTAA's ground lease with Transport Canada.● Reviewing the 10NM constraint is part of the GTAA's 5 year noise management action plan.● C. Woods gave a presentation on the 10 NM complaint restriction. The full presentation can be found here.● In summary, the benefits in extending GTAA acceptance of noise complaints beyond the 10NM include:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Increased transparency particularly for those currently excluded by the 10 NM restriction;○ Ability to provide better statistics and analysis to those elected officials with concerned residents living outside the 10NM;○ Better understanding for the impact of operations and provision of more complaint data; and○ Enhanced community stakeholder relationships and demonstrates the GTAA is responsive to issues raised by communities.● B. Maltby inquired if the committee would be expanded to include residents from areas beyond the 10NM radius.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ T. Lennox responded the mandate of CENAC is under assessment as part of the noise management review.● B. Green stated he had reservations about extending the 10NM restriction, and felt that by opening up the complaint process, we are raising expectations with the public that changes will be made.● S. Rokin noted he is very supportive of the initiative. The 10NM distinction was the reason he became involved in the committee and congratulated the GTAA on the decision to lift the restriction.● J. Van T' Hof noted he agreed with the decision to lift the 10NM restriction however, he was concerned that it may raise expectations with the public that the GTAA can affect change as a result of receiving these complaints.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ People expect change from their complaints, and because of regulatory structure the GTAA cannot make changes. If the GTAA are to extend the 10NM restriction, they should reach out to Nav Canada, Transport and ICAO to discuss alternating corridors.● A. Pearson stated he is in agreement with removing the 10 NM restriction, but was concerned about the noise complaint procedure itself. He would like to know what happens with the noise complaints and analysis of noise over 60 dBA<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Mr. Pearson was referencing the noise thresholds set to capture a noise event at a noise monitoring terminal.○ A noise event is what is captured when the sound level and duration exceeds a predefined threshold. The sound thresholds at NMTs are set according to the ambient background noise level at each location; the lower threshold at night accounts for the lower ambient background |
|-----|--|

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

- noise.
 - The sound level threshold is set at:
 - 65 dBA during the day (6:30am to 11:59pm)
 - 60 dBA during the night (12:00am to 6:29am)
 - The event time duration is set at 5 seconds
- A. Pearson inquired what the acceptable ambient noise level would be for an aircraft.
 - R. Connelly responded that currently there are no noise by-laws pertaining to aircraft noise. The GTAA can however do some portable noise monitoring in Mr. Pearson's community.
- T. Rizzuto-Willan stated that the committee is all in favour of lifting the restriction, but recommended in camera discussions regarding the intricacies of implementation.
- S. Kapur, resident from Rockwood, noted the perception seems to be that Transport Canada will be "off the hook" if they don't receive any more noise complaints. There is value in having Transport Canada speak directly with residents so that resident complaints are not simply reduced to statistics.
- E. J. Mohammed commented that it is better to have a single source to file a complaint. Mr. Mohammed also inquired why there was hesitancy to increase membership of the committee.
 - T. Lennox noted that that the CENAC membership of the committee is being looked at.

4.0 Public Comments

- A resident noted that when flying into the U.S. the aircraft has a faster rate of descent than in Canada where a more gradual descent is used.
 - T. Lennox stated that within a certain distance on the final approach, there is a consistent 3 degree approach between the American requirements and Canadian requirements.
 - S. Ghobrial responded it is exactly the same in Canada and the U.S., unless there is terrain, considerations such as mountains.
- M. Berger, a resident from the area of Bayview and Finch, asked about the increase in aircraft over his residence since June 2013.
 - T. Lennox responded a change in the airspace occurred and was introduced by Nav Canada in February 2012.
 - S. Ghobrial responded that the 2012 airspace review was changed to increase efficiencies and reduce delays and also to meet ICAO safety standards.
- M. Berger inquired what he can do to change it.
 - T. Lennox responded there has been a great deal of discussion at CENAC about the airspace redesign. The function of the CENAC committee is both to discuss issues, and to ensure issues are brought to different decision makers, and decisions like these are not easily reversed or made quickly.
 - S. Rokin noted that prior to the airspace redesign the noise impacted other neighbourhoods and if it was moved it would still affect other

Item	Details
	<p data-bbox="430 279 634 310">neighbourhoods.</p> <ul data-bbox="285 325 1344 745" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="285 325 1344 430">• A. Pearson noted this change has had an impact on the property values. Some of the most highly valued real estate in North America is in the midtown area of Toronto with Forest Hill, Leaside, and The Bridle Path.<ul data-bbox="381 441 1344 514" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="381 441 1344 514">○ T. Lennox noted that flight paths are based on repeatability, safety, efficiency, and impact.<li data-bbox="285 525 1344 598">• E. J. Mohammed inquired if compensation for changing the routes is an option, given the impact on property values.<ul data-bbox="381 609 1344 745" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="381 609 1344 745">○ T. Lennox responded that this concern has never been raised at CENAC before, and he is not sure if this matter is for Nav Canada or if it would be through a civil action lawsuit. In the U.S. homeowners own the airspace above their home and in Canada they do not.
5.0	Adjournment - Meeting is adjourned.
6.0	The next CENAC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday June 25, 2014. For additional information, please contact Kim Stefanazzi at (416) 776-3941.