

Clause embodied in Joint Report No. 2 of the Planning and Transportation Committee and the Economic Development and Parks Committee, as adopted by the Council of the City of Toronto at its regular meeting held on November 26, 27 and 28, 2002, and its Special Meeting held on November 28 and 29, 2002.

**2****Toronto City Centre Airport**

*(City Council, at its regular meeting held on November 26, 27 and 28, 2002, and its Special Meeting held on November 28 and 29, 2002, amended this Clause by:*

*(1) amending the report dated October 22, 2002, from the Chief Administrative Officer, as amended by the Joint Planning and Transportation Committee and Economic Development and Parks Committee, by:*

*(a) deleting the following Part (g) from Recommendation No. (1)(i):*

*“(g) limit parking facilities on the airport lands to a maximum of 200 for employee, taxi and transit use;”;*

*(b) adding to Part (c) of Recommendation No. (1)(ii), the words “and that the TPA be responsible for any additional costs resulting from the implementation of the protocol”, so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:*

*“(1)(ii)(c) the development of a comprehensive protocol for Emergency Medical Services (to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services) that includes traffic and bridge management procedures for emergency situations, the provision of EMS facilities on the TCCA site, and a direct line from TCCA to EMS dispatch for crash alarm notification and that the TPA be responsible for any additional costs resulting from the implementation of the protocol;”;*

*(c) amending Part (e) of Recommendation No. (1)(ii) to now read as follows:*

*“(1)(ii)(e) a community advisory committee being established which would meet at least twice a year with the TPA to provide feedback on the impact of TCCA operations on the surrounding neighbourhoods and report directly to City Council, and that Terms of Reference be developed for the committee;”;*

(d) *amending Part (g) of Recommendation No. (1)(ii) to now read as follows:*

*“(1)(ii)(g) the design of the fixed link be amended to include a street car track, designed in a manner that will not require a widening of the bridge or an additional environmental assessment, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services;”; and*

(e) *adding the following new Part (h) to Recommendation No. (1)(ii):*

*“(1)(ii)(h) car parking facilities being limited for airline passengers to a maximum of 450 spaces on the airport lands, excluding the existing vehicle parking spaces that are required to support employees for airport uses pursuant to the Tripartite Agreement;”;*

(f) *adding the following new Part (i) to Recommendation No. (1)(ii):*

*“(1)(ii)(i) no casino being built on the Toronto Islands;”,*

*so that the recommendations embodied in the report dated October 22, 2002, from the Chief Administrative Officer, as amended by the Joint Planning and Transportation Committee and Economic Development and Parks Committee, and City Council, in their entirety, shall now read as follows:*

*“(1) Council support expansion to the Toronto City Centre Airport (TCCA) to a maximum cap of aircraft movements as allowed under the NEF 25 contour, and authorize the Toronto Port Authority (TPA) to construct the fixed link subject to:*

*(i) the Tripartite Agreement being amended to:*

*(a) require that the TPA retain the services of a qualified consultant to monitor all of the traffic-related factors, including environmental factors, identified in this report, that the results of the monitoring exercise be reviewed to determine the need for changes to the timing of the bridge operation or the access control (along with other mitigation measures as may be required), and that the TPA report on these issues to Council on an annual basis;*

*(b) require that a review of the Tripartite Agreement be conducted 25 years after the fixed link has been completed;*

*(c) continue the ban on jet aircraft;*

*(d) formalize curfew hours as currently exists;*

*(e) establish noise abatement procedures; and*

- (f) *continue the ban on expansion of existing runways and construction of new runways; and*
- (ii) *the following additional conditions being met:*
- (a) *the TPA providing all necessary guarantees that any infrastructure improvements at the TCCA, including the construction of a fixed link and terminal, will be completed at no cost to the City. This should be done through a performance bond that specifically outlines such a guarantee to the City, or an alternative instrument that eliminates financial risk to the City;*
- (b) *the TPA providing an MOU shielding the City from any shortfall in the projected cash flows available for financing infrastructure investments (the fixed link and terminal);*
- (c) *the development of a comprehensive protocol for Emergency Medical Services (to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services) that includes traffic and bridge management procedures for emergency situations, the provision of EMS facilities on the TCCA site, and a direct line from TCCA to EMS dispatch for crash alarm notification and that the TPA be responsible for any additional costs resulting from the implementation of the protocol;*
- (d) *the TPA providing details with respect to the transit strategy required to encourage half of all airport trips to be made by transit (an assumption identified in the additional transportation information submitted by the TPA) to the satisfaction of Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, the Medical Officer of Health and the Chief General Manager of the TTC;*
- (e) *a community advisory committee being established which would meet at least twice a year with the TPA to provide feedback on the impact of TCCA operations on the surrounding neighbourhoods and report directly to City Council, and that Terms of Reference be developed for the committee;*
- (f) *the TPA agreeing to be held liable for the cost of any damage attributable to the construction of the bridge to the dockwall on the north side of the Western Gap; and*

- (g) *the design of the fixed link be amended to include a street car track, designed in a manner that will not require a widening of the bridge or an additional environmental assessment, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services;*
    - (h) *car parking facilities being limited for airline passengers to a maximum of 450 spaces on the airport lands, excluding the existing vehicle parking spaces that are required to support employees for airport uses pursuant to the Tripartite Agreement; and*
    - (i) *no casino being built on the Toronto Islands;*
  - (2) *the approval of Recommendation No. (1), above, be conditional on the legal dispute between the City, TEDCO, and the TPA being resolved;*
  - (3) *the TPA be requested to fund streetscape improvements along the water's edge and to work with staff of UDS to develop improvements that address pedestrian and parks issues along Bathurst Quay;*
  - (4) *staff be instructed to forward this report to the TPA, with a request that it confirm with the Commissioner of Urban Development Services acceptance of the above conditions;*
  - (5) *following satisfaction of Recommendation No. (4), the Commissioner of Urban Development Services and the City Solicitor report to Council on the necessary amendments to the Tripartite Agreement and the terms of the proposed resolution of the litigation;*
  - (6) *taxi service to the new air terminal be by way of an open taxi stand available to all licensed Toronto Taxis and Limousines;*
  - (7) *the Terminal building be constructed in a manner that will provide for direct streetcar access; and*
  - (8) *the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.”; and*
- (2) *adding thereto the following:*
- “It is further recommended that:*
- (a) *the Toronto Port Authority be required to:*
    - (i) *enter into a binding agreement with the City of Toronto which stipulates that the planes to be purchased will be built in Toronto by unionized workers, as long as the prices are competitive; and*

- (ii) *complete a storm water management plan for the Toronto City Centre Airport;*
- (b) *the Toronto Port Authority and its partners or tenants, be requested to:*
  - (i) *prepare, at their own expense, a detailed urban design plan for the improvement of the pedestrian environment at the approaches to the new fixed link and along both shores of the Western Gap, such design to include pedestrian areas, a multi-modal waterfront trail, aircraft viewing areas and public art, such plan to be prepared to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Urban Development Services; and*
  - (ii) *construct all the elements of this urban design plan at their own expense, once it has been approved by the City;*
- (c) *the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, the Chief General Manager of the Toronto Transit Commission and the Medical Officer of Health be requested to submit a report to Council every three years, commencing in 2005, on the traffic, transit and environmental factors related to the operations of the Toronto City Centre Airport;*
- (d) *Council adopt the confidential joint report dated November 26, 2002, from the City Solicitor and the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, entitled 'Toronto Port Authority Litigation', subject to confidential instructions issued to staff at the in-camera portion of this meeting of City Council, such confidential joint report and confidential instructions to remain confidential, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act, having regard that they relate to litigation or potential litigation, save and except the following recommendations embodied in such confidential joint report:*

*'It is recommended that:*

- (1) *City Council approve the proposed settlement of the litigation between the TPA, TEDCO, the City, certain individuals and the Federal Government, substantially on the terms contained in the Draft Minutes of Settlement attached hereto;*
- (2) *City Council instruct and authorize the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, the Chief Administrative Officer, the City Solicitor and the Commissioner of Urban Development Services to negotiate and conclude all necessary agreements and documents to give effect to the proposed settlement; and*
- (3) *City staff be instructed to report back to City Council on their discussions with respect to the unresolved issues of the harbour-user fees and the payments in lieu of taxes.';*

- (e) *the Chief Administrative Officer be directed to submit a report to City Council, through the Policy and Finance Committee, for approval on any substantive changes to the Minutes of Settlement; substantive changes to include items such as financial arrangements, terms and level of subsidies, lands, the City of Toronto's future liabilities, etc.;*
- (f) *all final lease documents be presented to City Council for final approval, along with any federal government consent to the terms;*
- (g) *the Chief Administrative Officer be requested to meet with Mr. Rahul Bhardwag, the City of Toronto's representative on the Toronto Port Authority, in order to brief him on the details of the City's perspective with respect to this Agreement; and*
- (h) *the Federal Government, through appropriate channels, be requested to consider creating legislation that would transform the Toronto Port Authority back to a Harbour Commission or City of Toronto agency.”)*

**The joint Planning and Transportation and Economic Development and Parks Committee recommends that:**

- (1) the report (October 22, 2002) from the Chief Administrative Officer be adopted subject to the following amendments and that this matter be forwarded to City Council for consideration at its meeting on November 26, 2002:**
  - (a) amending Recommendation (1) by deleting the words “to a maximum passenger level of 600,000 per annum” and replacing with the words “to a maximum cap of aircraft movements as allowed under the NEF 25 contour”;**
  - (b) deleting Recommendation (1)(i)(b) and replacing with the following:  
“(1)(i)(b) require that a review of the Tripartite Agreement be conducted 25 years after the fixed link has been completed”;**
  - (c) amending Recommendation 1(i)(d) by deleting the words “and limit night flights” and replacing with the words “as currently exists”;**
  - (d) amending Recommendation (1)(ii)(b) by deleting the last sentence which reads: “This MOU should include the details of any airline deficiency agreements that the TPA has entered into with any potential carriers at TCCA.”;**
  - (e) deleting Recommendation (1)(ii)(e);**
  - (f) amending Recommendation (1)(ii)(f) by adding the words “and that Terms of Reference be developed for this Committee” and renumbering this as (1)(ii)(e);**

- (g) **adding the following additional Recommendation (1)(ii)(g) and renumbering Recommendation (1)(ii)(g) as (1)(ii)(f):**

**“(1)(ii)(g) the design of the fixed link be amended to include street car tracks”;**

- (h) **renumbering Recommendation (6) as Recommendation (8) and adding the following additional recommendations:**

**“(6) Taxi Service to the new air terminal be by way of an open taxi stand available to all licensed Toronto Taxis and Limousines;**

**(7) the Terminal building be constructed in a manner that will provide for direct streetcar access;” and**

**so that these recommendations now read:**

**“(1) Council support expansion to the Toronto City Centre Airport (TCCA) to a maximum cap of aircraft movements as allowed under the NEF 25 contour, and authorize the Toronto Port Authority (TPA) to construct the fixed link subject to:**

**(i) the Tripartite Agreement being amended to:**

- (a) require that the TPA retain the services of a qualified consultant to monitor all of the traffic-related factors, including environmental factors, identified in this report, that the results of the monitoring exercise be reviewed to determine the need for changes to the timing of the bridge operation or the access control (along with other mitigation measures as may be required), and that the TPA report on these issues to Council on an annual basis;**
- (b) require that a review of the Tripartite Agreement be conducted 25 years after the fixed link has been completed;**
- (c) continue the ban on jet aircraft;**
- (d) formalize curfew hours as currently exists;**
- (e) establish noise abatement procedures;**
- (f) continue the ban on expansion of existing runways and construction of new runways; and**

- (g) limit parking facilities on the airport lands to a maximum of 200 for employee, taxi and transit use;**
- (ii) the following additional conditions being met:**

  - (a) the TPA providing all necessary guarantees that any infrastructure improvements at the TCCA, including the construction of a fixed link and terminal, will be completed at no cost to the City. This should be done through a performance bond that specifically outlines such a guarantee to the City, or an alternative instrument that eliminates financial risk to the City;**
  - (b) the TPA providing an MOU shielding the City from any shortfall in the projected cash flows available for financing infrastructure investments (the fixed link and terminal);**
  - (c) the development of a comprehensive protocol for Emergency Medical Services (to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services) that includes traffic and bridge management procedures for emergency situations, the provision of EMS facilities on the TCCA site, and a direct line from TCCA to EMS dispatch for crash alarm notification;**
  - (d) the TPA providing details with respect to the transit strategy required to encourage half of all airport trips to be made by transit (an assumption identified in the additional transportation information submitted by the TPA) to the satisfaction of Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, the Medical Officer of Health and the Chief General Manager of the TTC;**
  - (e) a community advisory committee being established which would meet annually with the TPA to provide feedback on the impact of TCCA operations on the surrounding neighbourhoods and report directly to Council and that Terms of Reference be developed for this Committee;**
  - (f) the TPA agreeing to be held liable for the cost of any damage attributable to the construction of the bridge to the dockwall on the north side of the Western Gap; and**
  - (g) the design of the fixed link being amended to include streetcar tracks;**



- (2) the approval of Recommendation (1) above be conditional on the legal dispute between the City, TEDCO, and the TPA being resolved;**
  - (3) the TPA be requested to fund streetscape improvements along the water's edge and to work with staff of UDS to develop improvements that address pedestrian and parks issues along Bathurst Quay;**
  - (4) staff be instructed to forward this report to the TPA with a request that it confirm with the Commissioner of Urban Development Services acceptance of the above conditions;**
  - (5) following satisfaction of Recommendation (4), the Commissioner of Urban Development Services and the City Solicitor report to Council on the necessary amendments to the Tripartite Agreement and the terms of the proposed resolution of the litigation;**
  - (6) taxi service to the new air terminal be by way of an open taxi stand available to all licensed Toronto Taxis and Limousines;**
  - (7) the Terminal building be constructed in a manner that will provide for direct streetcar access; and**
  - (8) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto; and**
- (2) the confidential report (October 23, 2002) from the City Solicitor be adopted and that in accordance with the Municipal Act, discussions thereto be held in-camera having regard that the subject matter relates to litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals affecting the municipality or local board.**

The joint meeting reports having:

- (1) requested the Chief Administrative Officer to report directly to City Council for its meeting on November 26, 2002 on the process to be followed to ensure that the conditions contained in Recommendation (1)(ii) have been met;
- (2) referred the following motion placed by Councillor McConnell to the Chief Administrative Officer with a request that she report thereon directly to Council for its meeting on November 26, 2002:  
“That the report (October 22, 2002) from the Chief Administrative Officer be further amended by adding the following additional Recommendation (1)(ii)(h):

“(1)(ii)(h) that all aircraft be built in the City of Toronto.”

**The joint Planning and Transportation and Economic Development and Parks Committee submits the following report (October 22, 2002) from the Chief Administrative Officer:**

Purpose:

To respond to directives arising from the meeting of the Waterfront Reference Group (WRG) on October 8, 2002 related to the Toronto City Centre Airport, and to respond to the TPA's recent announcement of a proposed partnership with an airline carrier.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no financial implications resulting from the recommendations contained in this report.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) Council support expansion to the Toronto City Centre Airport (TCCA) to a maximum passenger level of 600,000 per annum and authorize the TPA to construct the fixed link subject to:
  - (i) the Tripartite Agreement being amended to:
    - (a) require that the TPA retain the services of a qualified consultant to monitor all of the traffic-related factors, including environmental factors, identified in this report, that the results of the monitoring exercise be reviewed to determine the need for changes to the timing of the bridge operation or the access control (along with other mitigation measures as may be required), and that the TPA report on these issues to Council on an annual basis;
    - (b) cap passenger volume at 600,000 per year;
    - (c) continue the ban on jet aircraft;
    - (d) formalize curfew hours and limit night flights;
    - (e) establish noise abatement procedures;
    - (f) continue the ban on expansion of existing runways and construction of new runways; and
    - (g) limit parking facilities on the airport lands to a maximum of 200 for employee, taxi and transit use;

- (ii) the following additional conditions being met:
  - (a) the TPA providing all necessary guarantees that any infrastructure improvements at the TCCA, including the construction of a fixed link and terminal, will be completed at no cost to the City. This should be done through a performance bond that specifically outlines such a guarantee to the City, or an alternative instrument that eliminates financial risk to the City;
  - (b) the TPA providing an MOU shielding the City from any shortfall in the projected cash flows available for financing infrastructure investments (the fixed link and terminal). This MOU should include the details of any airline deficiency agreements the TPA has entered into with any potential carriers at TCCA;
  - (c) the development of a comprehensive protocol for Emergency Medical Services (to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services) that includes traffic and bridge management procedures for emergency situations, the provision of EMS facilities on the TCCA site, and a direct line from TCCA to EMS dispatch for crash alarm notification;
  - (d) the TPA providing details with respect to the transit strategy required to encourage half of all airport trips to be made by transit (an assumption identified in the additional transportation information submitted by the TPA) to the satisfaction of Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, the Medical Officer of Health and the Chief General Manager of the TTC;
  - (e) the TPA providing additional modelling of aircraft emissions and ambient air quality impacts based on both on-site and surrounding off-site sources, and the predicated improvement in air quality that would result from specific mitigative measures to address community health concerns to the satisfaction of the Medical Officer of Health;
  - (f) a community advisory committee being established which would meet annually with the TPA to provide feedback on the impact of TCCA operations on the surrounding neighbourhoods and report directly to Council; and
  - (g) the TPA agreeing to be held liable for the cost of any damage attributable to the construction of the bridge to the dockwall on the north side of the Western Gap;
- (2) the approval of recommendation 1 above be conditional on the legal dispute between the City, TEDCO, and the TPA being resolved;

- (3) the TPA be requested to fund streetscape improvements along the water's edge and to work with staff of UDS to develop improvements that address pedestrian and parks issues along Bathurst Quay;
- (4) staff be instructed to forward this report to the TPA with a request that it confirm with the Commissioner of Urban Development Services acceptance of the above conditions;
- (5) following satisfaction of recommendation 4, the Commissioner of Urban Development Services and the City Solicitor report to Council on the necessary amendments to the Tripartite Agreement and the terms of the proposed resolution of the litigation; and
- (6) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

#### Executive Summary:

On October 8, 2002, the WRG considered a report in the form of a discussion paper from the Chief Administrative Officer that assessed four possible operational scenarios for the TCCA.

The Reference Group adopted the CAO's report, with amendments, and requested that the TPA submit additional information on both its business plan and its proposed partnership with a new airline carrier. The Reference Group also asked that staff undertake further review of the implications of enhanced airport operations, including an assessment of all new information submitted by the TPA.

This report summarizes the new information received, addresses the directives arising from the WRG and recommends conditions to be attached to Council's approval of construction of a fixed link, including resolution of the legal dispute that currently exists between the City, TEDCO and the TPA.

Other significant conditions include capping the passenger volume at an enhanced TCCA at 600,000, the level at which a remote terminal and/or significant transit improvements are required to mitigate the impact of traffic volumes on the surrounding community and road network. This passenger level was identified in the Federally-approved environmental assessment undertaken on the proposed fixed link, supported in the TPA's Sypher:Mueller Study and acknowledged by staff of the City's Works and Emergency Services and Urban Development Services Departments.

Additional conditions outlined in the report address measures required to minimize the City's financial exposure as a result of enhancement and operation of the TCCA and ensuring that systems are in place to identify and mitigate environmental and health impacts of airport operations.

The report identifies that Tripartite Agreement as the most effective mechanism through which Council can balance TCCA activities with its city building, recreation and transit objectives of the Central Waterfront. It is recommended that these conditions be embedded in an amended Tripartite Agreement prior to construction of a link.

Background:

On October 8, 2002, the WRG considered a report in the form of a discussion paper from the Chief Administrative Officer that provided a comprehensive assessment of current and possible operational scenarios of the TCCA (incorporating scenarios submitted by Community AIR, REGCO, and the TPA). The report also updated Council on the status of issues related to the fixed link.

Subsequent to the release of the CAO's report, the TPA issued a media release dated October 4, 2002 announcing, among other things, its agreement with a second regional carrier (REGCO).

Based on the above, staff was asked to undertake a more detailed examination of issues related to enhanced TCCA operations. Specific recommendations arising from the meeting of the WRG were that:

- (1) the CAO's report of September 27, 2002 be forwarded from the WRG to the joint meeting of the Economic Development and Parks Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee scheduled for October 24, 2002, and to Council when the analysis of the Toronto Port Authority's Business Plan, as well as the other requested reports, is completed by staff;
- (2) Council recognize both the value of a regional airport to Toronto's economic well-being, regional transportation infrastructure and delivery of emergency services, and the importance of maintaining an effective balance that achieves the proposed objectives of the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan for residential, cultural, and employment revitalization;
- (3) the Toronto Port Authority (TPA) be requested to provide additional information to the Executive Lead for the Waterfront and the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism with respect to its business plan for the TCCA and the fixed link bridge, including:
  - (a) detailed financial calculations and passenger levels beyond 2007;
  - (b) the costs of additional upgrades (e.g. runway lighting, runway resurfacing, development of the Toronto City Centre Airport (TCCA) south-side);
  - (c) the rationale for the differences in the composition of revenues and expenditures between the Sypher:Mueller turboprop scenario and the Baseline forecasts included in the business plan;
  - (d) the rationale for excluding the passenger terminal, and for the non-proportional reduction in revenues from the Passenger User Fee, in the Low growth scenario;
  - (e) a comprehensive set of measures to mitigate the environmental and health effects of any enhancement to TCCA;

- (f) the results of a traffic management study that updates the impacts of TCCA expansion, as well as a fixed link, on the Bathurst Quay and Harbourfront neighbourhoods; and
  - (g) specific assurances that the TPA will provide a copy to the City of the performance bond it will enter into with its contractor(s) ensuring that the construction of the fixed link will be completed according to the City's directives, or, if this is not possible, that the site would be returned to an appropriate condition;
- (4) staff clarify with representatives of Transport Canada their role in funding TCCA activities as set out in the Tripartite Agreement;
  - (5) staff report to Council on the TPA's business plan once the TPA produces all of the above, such report should also comment on how any proposed changes will impact the Tripartite Agreement and the Subsidy Agreement;
  - (6) the outstanding conditions applied to City Council's adoption of a fixed link to the TCCA at its meeting on December 16 and 17, 1998 as outlined in Appendix (A) of the report (September 27, 2002) from the Chief Administrative Officer, be completed prior to City Council making a final decision on expansion plans for the TCCA;
  - (7) a new noise study be undertaken prior to City Council making a final decision on the expansion plans for the TCCA;
  - (8) the TPA be requested to consider incorporating into its business plan an enhanced public transit service, in the form of a Light Rapid Transit Line (LRT) directly to the Toronto City Centre Airport, noting that initial service improvements could be in the form of a shuttle bus service and that any cost to subsidize this service be the responsibility of the Toronto Port Authority;
  - (9) a feasibility study be undertaken to determine the passenger level that would warrant the implementation of an LRT line between Union Station and the TCCA and the results of this study be reported to Council prior to the November 26, 2002 Council meeting;
  - (10) appropriate City staff be requested to recommend the best method to include the condition of and enhanced public transit service in any approval for the bridge design and/or enhanced operations of the TCCA; and
  - (11) City Council include provisions in any approvals for the bridge design and/or enhancements to the operation of the TCCA and that the TPA provide all necessary guarantees that any infrastructure improvements at the TCCA, including the construction of a fixed link and terminal, will be completed at no cost to the City. This should be done through a performance bond that specifically outlines such a guarantee to the City, or an alternative instrument that eliminates financial risk to the City.

In addition, the WRG also requested:

- (1) the Toronto Port Authority to provide to the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, by no later than October 11, 2002, all outstanding information with respect to its business plan as outlined in Recommendation (3) of the report (September 27, 2002) from the Chief Administrative Officer;
- (2) the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, to the fullest extent possible, complete due diligence on this information when received from the TPA and report to the October 24, 2002 joint meeting of the Economic Development and Parks and Planning and Transportation Committees, or, if the completion of the due diligence is not possible, that a report be submitted to the joint meeting outlining the anticipated timing of TPA's response; and
- (3) the City Solicitor report to the joint meeting on October 24, 2002 on the effect of the Navigable Waterways Protection Act on the suggested fixed link to the TCCA.

Recommendations #1 and 2 from the WRG require no additional action at this time; recommendations #8, 9, and 11 are the responsibility of the TPA. Copies of these recommendations were provided to TPA officials on October 11, 2002. With respect to recommendations #8 and 9, the transit strategy requested in this report will facilitate addressing these issues. Recommendation #4 requires the clarification of Transport Canada's funding responsibilities related to the TCCA and is the subject of continuing discussions with representatives of Federal Government.

The Reference Group's recommendation #7 directed that "a new noise study be undertaken prior to City Council making a final decision on the expansion plans for the TCCA." During the preparation of the September 27, 2002 staff report, however, Acres International Limited, in association with RWDI, was retained by staff of UDS to conduct due diligence on the noise implications of the Sypher:Mueller expanded turboprop scenario and the REGCO proposal. It is important to note that Transport Canada's mandated flight paths for take-offs and landings at TCCA require commercial aircraft to turn to or approach from the south. The results of this study satisfy the Reference Group's directive and are summarized in the September 27<sup>th</sup> report from the CAO. In addition, the TPA has agreed to provide to the City an updated NEF 25 contour map on the basis of its recently-submitted business plan and its arrangements with REGCO.

This report responds to the remaining recommendations of the WRG, specifically numbers 3, 5, 6, 10 and requests #1, 2, and 3 (above).

Discussion:

#### I. Additional Information Provided by the TPA

Pursuant to the Reference Group's directives, the TPA submitted a portion of the outstanding requested information with respect to its business plan for the TCCA and the fixed link to City staff on October 8, 2002. Additional items were presented to staff at a meeting on October 11, 2002 and on October 18, 2002.

Information received was grouped into three categories: financial, environmental, and transportation. Officials from Urban Development Services, Works and Emergency Services, Finance, Public Health, and Economic Development were requested to review the data and to report on their findings to the joint Committee on October 24, 2002. The following provides a summary of information submitted by the TPA. Comments and concerns raised by staff are attached as Appendix A.

Based on the above, this report also identifies recommended amendments to the Tripartite Agreement, and other conditions to be satisfied by the TPA, should Council elect to proceed with construction of the fixed link and enhanced non-jet operations at TCCA.

These conditions and amendments are intended to ensure that all of Council's concerns with respect to maintaining a balance between all activities envisioned for a revitalized waterfront are addressed, and that the best interests of the City from a financial, health, and City-building perspective are protected.

#### Additional Financial Information Provided by the TPA

On October 8, 2002, the TPA submitted additional financial information in response to the Reference Group's recommendations #3(a) to (d), which addressed: detailed financial calculations and passenger levels beyond 2007; the costs of additional upgrades, e.g. runway lighting; the rationale for the differences in the composition of revenues and expenditures between the Sypher:Mueller turboprop scenario and the Baseline forecasts included in the business plan; and the rationale for excluding the passenger terminal, and for the non-proportional reduction in revenues from the Passenger User Fee, in the Low growth scenario. Also on that date, the TPA re-iterated the fact that the airport operations would break even financially at a passenger level of 200,000.

The detailed projections beyond 2007 were provided for the Baseline scenario, and the costs of the runway lighting and resurfacing were identified as \$10.1 million, of which all but \$1.6 million would be financed through Transport Canada's Airport Capital Assistance Program. The costs of any south side development at TCCA is expected to be borne by third parties. The details of this development were not identified in the business plan. All of these facts do not impact on the conclusions relating to the financial viability of the TCCA business plan.

In addition, in a letter dated October 16, 2002 to City staff, which is attached as Appendix B, the TPA confirmed that it "is willing to provide a copy of a performance bond to the City that it will enter into with its contractors to the bridge ensuring that the construction of the Fixed Link will be completed according to the City's directives, or, if this is not possible, that the site would be returned to an appropriate condition".

The TPA further confirmed in the same correspondence that it:

- (i) "will provide all necessary guarantees that infrastructure improvements at the TCCA with respect to the construction of a fixed link and the construction of a new terminal will be completed at no cost to the City. The TPA is willing to either post a performance bond, or enter into a guarantee eliminating financial risk to the City for these two projects"; and



- (ii) has had a number of conversations with the TTC “discussing the possibility of a Light Rapid Transit Line directly to the TCCA”. The Traffic Management Plan of the TPA identifies that a shuttle bus service will be utilized and additional discussions will be undertaken with respect to the issues regarding the implementation of an LRT line.

In subsequent discussion with Finance staff, the TPA could not yet confirm whether REGCO would sign an airline deficiency agreement of the type discussed in the business plan. However, it is anticipated that all carriers at the TCCA will eventually enter into this type of agreement, which would make carriers responsible for making up any shortfall in the Airport Improvement Fee revenues collected to pay for the bridge and new terminal. As well, the TPA offered to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that would shield the City from any additional subsidy requirement as a result of a shortfall in the projected cash flows available for financing infrastructure investments.

#### Additional Environmental Information Provided by TPA

In response to the Reference Group’s recommendation #3(e), which requested a comprehensive set of measures to mitigate the environmental and health effects of any enhancements to the TCCA, the TPA submitted a report from Dillon Consulting Limited entitled “Environmental Mitigation Measures Report for TCCA Enhancement and Fixed Link Construction and Operation” on October 11, 2002.

This document identifies broad mitigating measures which the TPA would implement in the event of enhancement in order to minimize any environmental impacts relating to noise, air pollution, and water pollution, as follows:

- Noise: limiting specific flight activities and operating times; implementing new technologies such as GPS landing systems to limit aircraft from diverting from flight paths in bad weather; and preferential or rotational runway use;
- Air Emissions: investigating alternative fuels (e.g. natural gas, propane, electric) for future ground operation vehicles; enforcing a “no vehicle idling” policy while queuing for bridge access/service; and encouraging that only alternative fuel taxi-cabs provide pick-up at the terminal building; and
- Water Pollution: continuing to ensure that the storage, use and disposal of de-icing chemicals is performed in accordance with regulatory requirements; implementing de-icing fluid recovery and recycling options; and using more environmentally friendly anti-icing chemicals that are urea-and tolytriazole-free.

The report continues that “the TPA and TCCA are currently in the process of developing and implementing an Environmental Management System (EMS). Using the principles of the International Standards Organization (ISO) Standard 14001, the system will incorporate environmental considerations and management into all aspects of business and decision-making. In today’s continually changing regulatory environment, a large number of leading private sector industries and governments are adopting an EMS approach to conducting their business and operations.”

The document further lists the environmental mitigation measures, as originally identified in the Environmental Assessment analysis, which will need to be addressed during the construction and operational phases of the fixed link. The EA received federal approval subject to these measures being implemented. In the case of the construction phase, these actions are required to minimize impact on erosion control, the terrestrial environment (e.g. trees), nearby residents, aquatic environment, public safety, boating community. In the case of the operational phase, they are required to minimize impact on public access to the waterfront, boating use of the channel, the surrounding community (especially with respect to noise and air pollution), and the natural environment (e.g. potential for salt and other debris entering into the lake). A copy of the mitigation measures as presented in the EA Report is attached as Appendix C.

The recent report also includes a 1996 study prepared by F.J. Reinders and Associates Canada Ltd. Entitled "Amendment to the Tripartite Agreement Regarding Permissible Aircraft Operations, Toronto City Centre Airport Environmental Screening Report." This report concluded that the cumulative impacts of noise and air pollution resulting from allowing stage 3 turboprop aircraft to use the TCCA were negligibly different from current aircraft restrictions. The TPA claims that this report is still valid, as the Bombardier Q400 planes proposed to be operated by REGCO are fourth-generation turboprop aircraft and are quieter and generate fewer emissions than earlier models due to state of the art technology.

#### Additional Transportation Information Provided by the TPA

In response to the Reference Group's recommendation #3(f), requesting the results of a traffic management study that updates the impacts of TCCA expansion, as well as the fixed link, on the Bathurst Quay and Harbourfront neighbourhoods, the TPA submitted a report from Dillon Consulting Limited entitled "Fixed Link to the TCCA – Traffic Management Study" on October 11, 2002.

The first section of this report summarized the transportation evaluation in the Environmental Assessment study completed in April 1998. This evaluation was conducted on the area bounded by Lake Shore Boulevard to the north, Spadina Avenue to the east, Lake Ontario to the south, and Stadium Road to the west. The assessment was conducted based on the horizon year 2001, when passenger levels at the TCCA were expected to reach 600,000. (While passenger levels up to 900,000 were assessed, for traffic purposes it was expected that passenger volumes beyond 600,000 per year would result in constraints at the TCCA and the need for an off-site terminal). Furthermore, "consideration of future development included the redevelopments planned for the Molson Lands on the northwest corner of the Bathurst Street/Fleet Street/Lake Shore Boulevard intersection. The construction of almost 4,000 residential units, to be developed in a number of phases before the year 2021, were included. Other developments/redevelopments that were planned for sites in the area of TCCA and would add to the study area traffic volumes were also considered. The most recent information on planned development was obtained from the City of Toronto Planning Department."

Traffic growth rates used for the intersections on Lake Shore Boulevard was based on the growth rate used in the "Molson Fleet Street Transportation Study", or 0.36% per year. For the Queen's Quay intersections in the area, a growth rate of 0.5% per annum was assumed.

The report concluded that “the Bathurst Street alignment of the Fixed Link will have minimal impacts on the regional transportation infrastructure. Small impact may be felt on the local road network during busy travel seasons, however, the overall growth in the area will surpass any impacts generated from the fixed link to the Toronto City Centre Airport.”

The subsequent section of the report updates the land use, traffic, and boating conditions in the study area, and analyzed conditions based on an estimate of 900,000 passengers per year. The consultants conclude that “there are no new developments within the area shown that were not accounted for in the EA report...there are a few developments outside the study area that were also considered in our analysis.” These included H&R Developments, Molson Brewery Lands, Wittington Property, and the Tip Top Tailors Building. The concepts put forth in the Fung Task Force report and the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan were also considered, concluding “the transportation infrastructure changes envisioned to support the vision for a revitalized waterfront do not affect the ability to service the Toronto City Centre Airport. The emphasis of these plans to encourage transit and non-auto modes and discourage the use for single occupant vehicles is entirely consistent with the objectives of the traffic management plan to service the TCCA.”

The consultants then projected anticipated traffic volumes in the study area resulting from a passenger level of 900,000, existing traffic volumes, background traffic growth over the next five years, and proposed developments adjacent to the study area. They concluded that “the projected traffic volumes to/from the TCCA...would not impact any of the study area intersections significantly.”

An update of the potential impact on the boating community was also provided. Based on boat counts which were conducted on August 9 and 10, 2002, the study concludes that there is sufficient capacity during bridge opening time to accommodate boating demand.

The report also addresses the need for a queue lane to store vehicles when the bridge is raised during the peak period of airport use, likely some time between the hours of 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. on Thursday or Friday afternoons in the summer months. The need for this lane when inbound traffic volumes to the TCCA exceed approximately 100 vehicles in the afternoon peak hour was identified in the 1998 Environmental Assessment report. In addition to the queue lane, Bathurst Street would need to be re-configured to include a southbound left turn lane to accommodate access to existing and future developments on the east side, a southbound through lane for access onto the bridge to the TCCA, and a landscaped boulevard and sidewalk. The study concludes that “an analysis of the average vehicle arrival rates while the bridge is in the open position (i.e., closed to vehicular traffic) shows there is sufficient storage available to accommodate demand for the ‘road network peak hour’...As passenger volumes increase and airline schedules are operational, the bridge opening schedule will need to be monitored and amendments made as necessary to balance vehicle queuing on Bathurst Street and boating demand in the channel.”

The consultants further addressed the requirement for island-side parking spaces for 900,000 annual passengers, concluding “the traffic management plan for the TCCA includes an emphasis on shuttle service, and taxi service, as the two main methods of accessing the airport. TTC service both direct and scheduled service along Queen’s Quay will also provide non-auto travel to the airport. Walking and cycling are also possible. Based on this, and a 10% overnight stay, the maximum passenger parking demand is approximately 182 spaces. This can be accommodated on the island.”

The description of the traffic management plan envisioned for the TCCA notes that the “TTC was contacted to discuss their specific requirements for service to the island. Initial discussion noted that they will operate a service if there is sufficient demand. The type of service would depend on ridership levels. They also noted that streetcar or Light Rail Transit service would have additional constraint including an exclusive right-of-way in order to maintain a high speed transit link service. Our assessment of public transit is that in the short term, the demand would be best served with a shuttle bus to/from Union Station, in mixed traffic. Rapid transit in the form of an LRT extension could be considered and that would take more detailed investigations with TTC.” In fact, the TPA has indicated to City staff that the new dedicated airline carrier could provide such a shuttle bus service.

Finally, the report re-iterated the statement in the 1998 Environmental Assessment document that “the addition of the new airport-related traffic will also result in an increase in the number of potential conflicts between vehicles and existing pedestrian and bicycle activity associated with the park. This would be offset by the potential to improve conditions for existing pedestrian traffic by constructing sidewalk(s) as part of the area’s redevelopment.” The study also identified a number of other considerations which will address the impact of traffic, such as bridge scheduling to minimize queuing on Bathurst Street and the impact on boat traffic in the channel; the enforcement of the City’s idling by-law; the use of alternative fuels where possible; and an aggressive promotion of non-auto travel to/from the island.

## II. Recommended Actions: A Balanced Approach to Waterfront Revitalization

Balancing TCCA operations with the needs of surrounding communities and plans for a revitalized waterfront is of utmost importance to the City. Proceeding with the construction of a fixed link requires amendments to the existing Tripartite Agreement, providing an opportunity to ensure that factors which would mitigate the impacts of TCCA enhancement on the environment and on the Central Waterfront neighbourhoods are included in the document, while preserving the principles of the existing Agreement. A revised Tripartite Agreement would be a mechanism whereby a strong and effective balance between the various uses for the revitalized waterfront would be maintained.

The specific items which have been suggested for inclusion by various City Departments to achieve this balance, and the rationale supporting these conditions, are as follows:

- (a) Requiring that the TPA retain the services of a qualified consultant to monitor all of the traffic-related factors, including environmental factors, identified in this report, that the results of the monitoring exercise be reviewed to determine the need for changes to the timing of the bridge operation or the access control (along with other mitigation measures as may be required), and that the TPA report on these issues to Council on an annual basis.

Staff of Works and Emergency Services and Urban Development Services note that the Toronto Harbour Commission was previously required to undertake a monitoring study of the fixed link operations. The monitoring study will identify issues and impacts arising from bridge operations and facilitate the implementation of changes necessary to address these issues. There is no reference to implementing this monitoring study in the

current submission. Because of the unique nature of airport operations and the difficulty in accurately forecasting the peak volume of vehicles accessing the airport site, this monitoring study is a key element of the transportation strategy.

- (b) Establishing a passenger cap at 600,000.

This was the level of activity at the TCCA which the Environmental Assessment process and the Sypher:Mueller report confirmed could be managed without adverse impacts on the surrounding communities and on the area road network. Beyond this level, a remote terminal or the implementation of significantly improved transit would be required, as would be additional study on the community and environmental impact of TCCA operations. Staff of both Works and Emergency Services and Urban Development Services concur with this conclusion.

In addition, additional financing would be required to support construction and operation of a remote terminal and/or enhanced transit services. This is not reflected in the business plan submitted by the TPA. The TPA has confirmed that an enhanced airport operation will break-even financially with a passenger level of 200,000.

- (c) Continuation of the ban on jet aircraft.

The TPA has confirmed its intent to maintain the ban on jet aircraft as outlined in the existing Tripartite Agreement. Given strong community opposition to the use of jets, it is appropriate that Council reiterate its support of this condition.

- (d) Formalization of curfew hours and a limitation on night flights.

The TPA has indicated in its recently submitted business plan that limiting hours of operation is a key factor to the success of regional airports. While the TPA currently implements curfew hours and limits night flights, this is not a specific requirement of the current Tripartite Agreement. Calculation of the NEF25 Noise Contour does, however, penalize evening flights. It is recommended that curfew hours be formalized in an amended agreement and that these hours be to the satisfaction of the Medical Officer of Health. The purpose of such limitation is to ensure that the impact of expansion on surrounding communities is mitigated.

- (e) Establishment of noise abatement procedures, while maintaining the NEF25.

The current Tripartite Agreement requires that the TCCA comply with the NEF25 noise restrictions. Under all expansion scenarios third party consultants have confirmed that the NEF25 can be maintained with the implementation of noise management procedures. It is recommended that compliance with NEF25 be continued under an amended Tripartite Agreement.

- (f) Continuation of the ban on runway expansion and on the construction of new runways.

Such a ban exists in the current Tripartite Agreement for the primary purpose of limiting the types of aircraft able to access the TCCA. A third party assessment undertaken by staff of Urban Development Services has confirmed that the Q400 airport proposed to be used at an enhanced TCCA can be accommodated on the existing runways. It is, therefore, recommended that this condition be maintain in an amended agreement.

- (g) Limiting parking facilities on airport lands to a maximum of 200 for employee, taxi and transit purposes.

Encouraging transit use is a priority of the proposed Central Waterfront Secondary Plan and critical to reducing congestion in the downtown area. The TPA has indicated its intent to encourage transit use to access an enhanced TCCA and projects that up to 50% of future airport users will arrive via some form of transit. To encourage transit use and to minimize traffic impacts on surrounding communities, staff recommend limiting parking at the airport to 200 space and restricting the use of these spaces as outlined above.

In addition to recommending that the above conditions be incorporated into an amended Tripartite Agreement, based on information from the TPA and comments from City departments and agencies, the following conditions to approval of construction of a fixed link are also recommended by staff to further strengthen Council's commitment to achieving a balanced approach with respect to the TCCA:

- (a) The TPA provide all necessary guarantees that any infrastructure improvements at the TCCA, including the construction of a fixed link and terminal, be completed at no cost to the City. This should be done through a performance bond that specifically outlines such a guarantee to the City, or an alternative instrument that eliminates financial risk to the City.

As noted earlier in the report, the TPA has confirmed in correspondence that it will provide such a guarantee.

- (b) The TPA provide an MOU shielding the City from any shortfall in the projected cash flows available for financing infrastructure investments (the fixed link and terminal). This MOU should include the details of any airline deficiency agreements the TPA has entered into with any potential carriers at TCCA.

In discussions with Finance staff, the TPA could not confirm whether REGCO would sign an airline deficiency agreement of the type discussed in the TPA business plan. However, it is anticipated that all carriers at the TCCA will eventually enter into this type of agreement, which would make carriers responsible for making up any shortfall in the Airport Improvement Fee revenues collected to pay for the bridge and new terminal. As well, the TPA offered to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that would shield the City from any additional subsidy requirement as a result of a shortfall in the projected cash flows available for financing infrastructure investments.

- (c) The development of a comprehensive protocol for Emergency Medical Services (to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services) that includes traffic and bridge management procedures for emergency situations, the provision of EMS facilities on the TCCA site, and a direct line from TCCA to EMS dispatch for crash alarm notification.

As noted in Appendix A, the General Manager of Emergency Medical Service has identified a number of important safety procedures to be implemented with respect to the both the operation of a fixed link and the design of a new TCCA terminal.

- (d) The TPA provide details with respect to the transit strategy required to encourage half of all airport trips to be made by transit (an assumption identified in the additional transportation information submitted by the TPA) to the satisfaction of Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, the Medical Officer of Health and the Chief General Manager of the TTC.

A previously noted, consultants to the TPA have assumed a transit modal split of 50.0%, compared to a 34.4% modal split used in the 1998 environmental assessment for a fixed link. (The actual modal split at that time was 18.5%). In 1998, the 34.4% split was considered to be optimistic, but achievable, particularly with the extension of the Harbourfront LRT westerly to Exhibition Place and the introduction of a convenient shuttle bus service.

The assumed 50.0% split in the current submission, however, might be overly optimistic and, as a result, can yield a low estimate of the vehicle traffic generated by enhanced TCCA operations. It also represents a significant increase in transit use which does not correspond to the anticipated transit service documented in the TPA's report (i.e. shuttle bus in the short term and a potential rapid transit service subject to further investigations with the TTC).

The strategy required to encourage half of all future airport trips to be made by transit must be identified in order to justify this significant increase over current and previously forecasted assumptions. Additional information from the TPA with respect to this detail is required, especially as passenger levels approach 600,000 per year, the level at which the area road network is materially impacted.

- (e) The TPA provide additional modelling of aircraft emissions and ambient air quality impacts based on both on-site and surrounding off-site sources, and the predicated improvement in air quality that would result from specific mitigative measures to address community health concerns to the satisfaction of the Medical Officer of Health.

As noted in Appendix A, in order to assess the health implications of increased activity at TCCA, the Medical Officer of Health will require modelled estimates of the environmental impacts anticipated to result from the specific proposal that is now being considered by the TPA. While projected emissions from some expanded TCCA scenarios have been discussed, modelled emission and ambient concentration estimates have not been presented for the proposal now under consideration with REGCO, including type of

aircraft, number of aircraft, number of passengers, timing of activities, type and amount of ground operations, etc. The information that has been provided to date, including projected emissions from individual aircraft, and modelled results from other expansion proposals, is an insufficient basis on which to fully assess the health implications of increased activity at TCCA.

- (f) A community advisory committee be established which would meet annually with the TPA to provide feedback on the impact of TCCA operations on the surrounding neighbourhoods and report directly to Council.

Given the considerable concerns raised by representatives of communities adjacent to the TCCA concerning enhanced airport operations, the creation of a community advisory committee presents an effective vehicle for improving communication between the TPA and its neighbours and for keeping Council apprised of issues respecting airport operations.

- (g) The TPA agree to be held liable for the cost of any damage attributable to the construction of the bridge to the dockwall on the north side of the Western Gap.

The section of the north dockwall in the vicinity of the proposed bridge is in the City's ownership.

### III. Other Issues

#### Conditions Applied to Council's Approval of a Fixed Link in 1998

Recommendation #6 arising from the meeting of the WRG on October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2002 directed that "the outstanding conditions applied to City Council's adoption of a fixed link to the TCCA at its meeting on December 16 and 17, 1998 ...be completed prior to City Council making a final decision on expansion plans for the TCCA."

A complete list of Council's directives from 1998, and of the Planning and Transportation Committee's recommendations from 1999, is attached as Appendix C, including a status update on each item.

The main items which remain outstanding include: the final approval of the TPA's business plan for the TCCA and the fixed link (the subject of this report); the issuance of a permit under the Navigable Waters Protection Act by the Canada Coast Guard (the request for this permit will be made by the TPA once the design of the bridge is finalized); the completion of transfer or lease from the Federal Government to the City of the lands currently used for parking and access to the ferry (outstanding until such time as the detailed design of the bridge is finalized); and the completion of a staff report to Council on the airport-end side of the bridge (this report will be subject to the TCCA site plan design, which is still outstanding).

#### Legal Issues

Request #3 arising from the meeting of the WRG on October 8, 2002 directed that "the City Solicitor report to the joint meeting on October 24, 2002 on the effect of the Navigable Waterways Protection Act on the suggested fixed link to the TCCA."



The NWPA provides that no work (which includes a bridge) shall be built over any navigable water unless certain conditions are met. The conditions relate to obtaining appropriate approvals from the Federal Minister of Transport prior to commencing construction. The TPA is aware of these requirements and advises that it intends to comply with the legislation.

The City Solicitor has prepared a companion in camera report that comments on the status of the litigation commenced by the TPA against the City, TEDCO and certain individuals and the connection between the litigation and the issues being discussed for the TCCA. As set out in that report, the litigation directly raises issues concerning the TCCA, the Tripartite Agreement, the Subsidy Agreement and the rights and obligations between the City, the Federal Government and the TPA relating to the funding of the TCCA. The litigation needs to be resolved in order for the City to have any certainty respecting its rights and obligations concerning the TPA and the TCCA. Accordingly, it is recommended that City Council not proceed with the approval of construction of the fixed link and enhanced non-jet operations at the TCCA until such time as the legal dispute between the City, TEDCO, and the TPA is resolved.

#### Conclusion:

Staff across all City departments considered the financial, legal, community health, environmental, and economic impacts of additional details provided by the Toronto Port Authority on October 8 and 11, 2002 regarding its business plan for the TCCA and the fixed link, and its arrangements with a new dedicated carrier, REGCO. This review outlined, among other things, conditions that must be addressed prior to Council's approval of construction of the fixed link and enhanced, non-jet operations at TCCA.

Financial viability of the airport will require substantial capital upgrades to the TCCA facilities, including the construction of a fixed link, in turn requiring amendments to the existing Tripartite Agreement, which expressly prohibits such a structure. It will be necessary to ensure that any amendments will preserve the principles of the current Agreement, and that factors which would mitigate the impacts of TCCA expansion on the environment and on the Central Waterfront neighbourhoods are included therein. Proposed revisions to the Tripartite Agreement could therefore be a mechanism whereby a strong and effective balance between the various uses envisioned for a revitalized waterfront could be maintained.

However, on advice from City Legal, it is recommended that Council not proceed with any approval for construction of the fixed link and enhanced, non-jet operations at the TCCA, until such time as the legal dispute between the City, TEDCO and the TPA is resolved.

#### Contact:

Elaine C. Baxter-Trahair  
Waterfront Project Director  
(416)397-4083 ebaxter@city.toronto.on.ca

---

Appendix A  
Staff Review of Additional TPA Information

Comments from Finance

One of the principal issues identified was the difference in the composition of the revenues and costs between TPA’s Baseline scenario and the Sypher:Mueller Expanded Turboprop scenario. While the total funds projected to be available for financing the proposed infrastructure (from the operating surplus together with airport improvement fees) is similar under both scenarios, the pro-forma income statements appear quite different. Based on the 2005 information provided (this being the first expected “stable” year after the initial period of intense growth, after which passenger levels are assumed to escalate at 2.5%), the Baseline revenues, expenses, net operating revenue, and capital revenues were identified as follows (in \$millions):

	TPA Business Plan	Sypher:Mueller
Operating Revenues	\$5.7	\$5.6
Operating Expenditures	\$3.8	\$5.5
Net Operating Income	\$1.9	\$0.1
Capital Revenues (AIF)	\$2.2	\$4.4
Total Funds Available for Financing New Infrastructure (Op. Surplus + Cap. Revenues)	\$4.1	\$4.5

The TPA has indicated that the main reason for these differences is the application of an updated fee structure for airlines in the business plan. According to the TPA, the fee structure reflected in the business plan is more consistent with current industry practice. This structure levies a Passenger Utilization Fee (PUF, which is included in operating revenues) on both departing and arriving passengers whereas an Airport Improvement Fund Fee (AIF, which is included in capital revenues) is only levied on departing passengers. In the Sypher:Mueller report, the opposite arrangement was assumed, with the PUF only applied to departing passengers and the AIF applied to both departing and arriving passengers. The total amount collected from these fees under the Baseline scenario (\$5.8 million) is slightly lower than under Sypher:Mueller (\$6.4 million).

Another major difference between the two scenarios was in the relationship between the passenger volumes and the expenses for operating materials and utilities (identified in 2005 projections as \$0.6 million in the Baseline option versus \$2.3 million in Sypher:Mueller). In the Sypher:Mueller study, it had been assumed that these expenses would rise directly in proportion to the increase in the number of passengers. The TPA’s explanation that many of these expenses are not, in fact, directly tied to passenger levels appears reasonable. As such, these costs were not escalated to the same degree in the business plan as in Sypher:Mueller despite similar anticipated passenger growth.

The TPA has also clarified the reason for the non-proportionate relationship between revenues and passenger growth in the Low growth scenario. Under all of the business plan scenarios it had been assumed that the PUF would be reduced over time. However, the TPA assumed that these would be dropped more slowly under the Low growth scenario to preserve the airport’s revenue base.

Although staff had assumed that the new terminal would be required in the Low Growth scenario, the TPA has explained its view that the terminal would not be required to attract passengers or new carriers in the same way as the fixed link, and could therefore be deferred. Moreover, the existing terminal has adequate capacity for the passenger levels envisioned in this scenario (estimated at 226,000 in 2005, with an anticipated growth rate of 4% per year thereafter). In light of comments received from TCCA officials during the preparation of the September 27, 2002 report from the CAO to the WRG, further clarification of terminal requirements is needed. At that time, airport staff indicated that no enhancement of operations was possible without a new terminal, given the space constraints imposed by recent additional safety requirements.

With respect to the additional questions subsequently posed by Finance, the TPA confirmed that its MOU with REGCO relates only to REGCO's operations as a carrier at the TCCA. Although REGCO's original proposal involved the financing of the bridge and terminal, it is the TPA's preference that the provision of this infrastructure be handled separately from the carrier agreement. This will allow an open, competitive process to be implemented for both financing and constructing the new facilities.

#### Comments from Medical Officer of Health

A preliminary review of the new information provided to Toronto Public Health by the TPA identified a number of data gaps which preclude the Medical Officer of Health from making a full determination of the health and environmental impacts of the proposed changes in airport operations. There are three areas where additional information is required:

- (1) in order to assess the health implications of increased activity at TCCA, the Medical Officer of Health will require modelled estimates of the environmental impacts anticipated to result from the specific proposal that is now being considered by the TPA. These cumulative estimates would consist of modelled emissions and modelled ambient air quality based on both on-site and surrounding off-site sources, including but not limited to aircraft, passenger vehicles, congestion and ground operations, and other sources in the community that contribute to air quality such as the Gardiner Expressway. While projected emissions from some expanded TCCA scenarios have been discussed, modelled emission and ambient concentration estimates have not been presented for the proposal now under consideration with REGCO, including type of aircraft, number of aircraft, number of passengers, timing of activities, type and amount of ground operations, etc. The information that has been provided to date, including projected emissions from individual aircraft, and modelled results from other expansion proposals, is an insufficient basis on which to fully assess the health implications of increased activity at TCCA;
- (2) additional modelling details required include an analysis of specific measures and options that could be used to minimize the impact of airport activities on the environment and address community health concerns. It is recommended that the TPA provide this information to Public Health, Works and Emergency Services and Urban Development Services as soon as possible;

- (3) on April 8, 2002, the Toronto Board of Health requested that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services review and report on:
- the de-icing practices in use at the Toronto City Centre Airport (TCCA);
  - the extent to which these practices comply with the Toronto Sewer Use By-law and other pertinent Federal guidelines that may apply; and
  - the levels of ethylene glycol and tolytriazole in the waters of Lake Ontario adjacent to the TCCA and how this compares with the Ontario Ministry of the Environment's Provincial Water Quality Objectives (PQWO).

Toronto Public Health cannot comment on the water quality implications of proposed activities at TCCA until the results of this review are available.

Subsequent discussion with staff of WES indicates that the City's labs do not have the capability to analyze for tolytriazole. Staff will therefore be testing for both ethylene glycol and for the substance TKN to assess for the possible presence of urea which is used for tarmac de-icing. The presence of glycol will indicate the presence of tolytriazole to a certain degree.

Furthermore, although preliminary work has been completed for the study to be undertaken (i.e. eight "test" locations have been identified and dry-weather sampling runs of these locations have been conducted to assess background levels), a full analysis can only be completed throughout the winter season when de-icing procedures actually occur. The report is therefore expected to be finalized and forwarded to the Board of Health sometime in the spring of 2003.

Until such time as the above information is provided to and reviewed by Public Health, the Medical Officer of Health is unable to comment on the comprehensive conditions that should be included in a revised Tripartite Agreement in order to protect environmental quality and human health in the event that operations increase at TCCA.

#### Comments from Transportation

##### Recap of Environmental Assessment Report – 1998

By way of background, Transportation staff provided support to the Technical Work Group that was established to provide comments to the Council of the former City of Toronto on the proposals for a fixed link to the City Centre Airport. The Technical Work Group reviewed the consultant's selected options against City objectives in three key policy areas: land use, urban design and transportation.

Dillon Consulting Limited undertook the Environmental Assessment of the proposed construction and operation of a moveable bridge, which was determined to be the preferred option back in June 1997. The Transportation Evaluation is included in Appendix D of the 1998 Environmental Assessment Report. Staff reviewed the consultant's evaluation and undertook independent supplemental analysis. On the basis of this review and additional analysis, staff generally concurred with the consultant's conclusion that the traffic generated by this proposal

could be safely and effectively accommodated on Bathurst Street and the abutting intersections, with the proposed modifications to these facilities. However, when airport-bound traffic reaches a level of more than 100 vehicles/hour, a southbound queuing lane would need to be constructed on Bathurst Street, south of Queens Quay West.

Furthermore, when the annual passenger volume exceeds 600,000 an off-site (remote) terminal building would be required to process passengers, thereby minimizing the volume of vehicles required to use the bridge to access the airport.

In addition, the EA report required that Toronto Harbour Commissioners monitor the effects of the bridge operations on:

- traffic volumes inbound and outbound on the bridge;
- the use of the on-site parking facility;
- the extent of the queues on Bathurst Street;
- traffic operations at the Bathurst Street/Queens Quay intersection;
- access to the abutting properties;
- the effectiveness of any traffic-calming measures implemented; and
- conflicts between airport-related traffic and other vehicular and pedestrian activity on Bathurst.

Finally, as a result of the monitoring exercise, the Toronto Harbour Commissioners would be required to make appropriate changes to the bridge operations or access control to mitigate the impact of this facility on traffic operations.

#### Review of October 11, 2002 Information Provided by the TPA

The recent submission from the TPA includes an assessment of the impacts of 900,000 annual passengers. The consultant concludes that the peak hour inbound passenger traffic is less for an annual passenger volume of 900,000 than that which was predicted in 1998 for 600,000 annual passengers. This reduction is attributed to:

- the introduction of the new Q400 turboprop aircraft which have a higher seating capacity than the aircraft currently using the airport;
- an increase in the expected average number of passengers per plane; and
- more passengers flying in off-peak hours.

The consultant has also assumed a transit modal split of 50.0%, compared to a 34.4% modal split used in the 1998 assessment (the actual modal split at that time was only 18.5%). In 1998, the 34.4% modal split was considered to be optimistic, but achievable, particularly with the extension of the Harbourfront LRT westerly to Exhibition Place and the introduction of a convenient shuttle bus service.

The assumed 50.0% modal split in the current submission might be overly optimistic and, as a result, can yield a low estimate of the vehicle traffic generated by this scenario. It is also a significant increase which does not correspond to the anticipated transit service documented in the TPA's report (i.e. shuttle bus in the short term and a potential rapid transit service subject to further investigations with the TTC). The transit service required to encourage half of all future airport trips to be made by transit must be identified in order to justify this significant increase over current and previously forecasted assumptions. Additional information from the TPA with respect to this detail is required, especially as passenger levels approach 600,000 per year, the level at which the area road network is materially impacted.

The decrease in the peak hour volumes is based on the assumption that flights and passenger demands are distributed somewhat evenly throughout the day. The reliance on scheduling to minimize the peak hour impacts is problematic. The scheduling of flights is demand driven and outside the control of the City. If peak passenger demands are generated during the traditional peak roadway hours (e.g. 7:30 to 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 to 5:30 p.m.), then the scheduling of flights evenly throughout the day, as proposed, could become economically unviable. As a consequence, more flights may be scheduled during peak hours to accommodate passenger demands and, as a result, the estimated peak hour volumes contained in the consultant's recent submission would be unrealistically low.

The consultant has estimated that a storage length of 214 metres is required to accommodate vehicles waiting in queue to use the bridge (using the 50.0% modal split and assumed peaking factors). The consultant has estimated that a queue length of 320 metres is available (in two lanes). However, as noted previously, the former City of Toronto Council did not support the option of providing a second queue lane. Without this element, only 160 metres of queue storage length would be available, which is less than the required 214 metres and vehicles could back up beyond the Queens Quay/Bathurst intersection creating operational and safety hazards.

#### Comments from Urban Development Services

As was noted above, previous work undertaken by the City identified the need for a comprehensive monitoring program. Given the importance of bridge operation, it is recommended that, in the event that Council elects to proceed with the fixed link, the Tripartite Agreement be amended to include the requirement that the TPA retain the services of a qualified consultant to monitor all of the factors identified above, that the results of the monitoring exercise be reviewed to determine the need for changes to the timing of the bridge operation or the access control (along with other mitigation measures as may be required), and that the TPA report on these issues to Council on an annual basis.

In addition, it is premature to conclude that "the traffic impact associated with an airport operations scenario of 900,000 passengers per year can be accommodated with no significant traffic impacts." Staff therefore recommends that, in order to further strengthen traffic management in the area surrounding the fixed link, the number of passenger be limited to 600,000 per year.

The additional information provided by the TPA notes that, based on updated flight scheduling information, the maximum forecast of 900,000 passengers per year is expected to generate less traffic for all trips in the afternoon peak hour as compared to the 1998 Environmental Assessment forecast of 600,000 passengers per year. This may be unrealistic given passenger demands related to the timing of flights. (The 1998 EA considered passenger levels of up to 900,000, but for traffic purposes it was expected that passenger volumes beyond 600,000 per year would result in constraints at the TCCA and the need for an off-site terminal).

#### Comments from Emergency Medical Services

In a memorandum to the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services dated November 16, 1998, the General Manager of Emergency Medical Services and the Fire Chief indicated that their support of a fixed link would be contingent on twelve criteria being addressed. These related to both operational issues and design. Staff of both divisions was included in the Technical Working Group, which was one of the two groups convened to assist in the finalization of the bridge design. As a result, the June 17, 1999 report to the Planning and Transportation Committee outlining the preferred design stated that the recommended option “meets the requirements of emergency services.” As previously indicated, the Committee deferred consideration of this report until such time as certain criteria were met. These are identified in Appendix D.

Nevertheless, in reviewing the additional information from the TPA, staff of EMS have identified the following conditions which must be satisfied in order to further advance Council’s commitment to safety issues surrounding the fixed link. The importance of these conditions is further strengthened as a result of the substantial growth in the Bathurst Quay and Harbourfront neighbourhoods over the past several years.

- (i) The design of the access and egress routes onto the bridge, and traffic management procedures, must allow for rapid response in the event of an island evacuation, as well as for vehicle evacuation. The preferred design option for the fixed link addresses this requirement; however, it is important to re-iterate that emergency vehicles must not compete for access with vehicles being evacuated from the TCCA, and there must be an avoidance of “bottlenecking” near and surrounding the bridge;
- (ii) in order to ensure public safety, protocols must be developed surrounding the timing of the bridge (i.e. time to close if the bridge is open), and the control of the bridge in the event of an emergency;
- (iii) protocols must be developed to ensure that, in the event of an emergency situation, the Toronto EMS dispatch centre would notify bridge control of a call to ensure that the bridge would be down, all traffic would be stopped, and access would be cleared in advance of emergency vehicles reaching the bridge;

- (iv) given the enhanced activity levels, there will be a need to include facilities for EMS at the airport site. EMS should be involved in the design of the terminal to ensure additional space is incorporated if required; and
- (v) a direct line from the TCCA to EMS dispatch must be established for crash alarm notification, similar to the existing link between EMS and the Greater Toronto Airports Authority.

---

Appendix (B)

(Communication dated October 16, 2002) from Lisa Raitt,  
Chief Executive Officer and Harbour Master, Toronto Port Authority  
addressed to Ms. Elaine Baxter-Trahair, Urban Development Services)

Thank you for meeting with us on Friday, October 11, 2002. At that meeting we provided you with a study reviewing a comprehensive set of the measures to mitigate the environmental and health effects at the Toronto City Centre Airport ("TCCA") prepared by Dillon Consulting Limited in fulfilment of the Waterfront Reference Group recommendation 1(e). We also provided you the result of a Traffic Management study updating the impacts of an enhanced TCCA operation on Bathurst Quay and Harbourfront neighbourhoods as prepared by Dillon Consulting Ltd., and in fulfilment of the Waterfront Reference Group recommendation 1(f).

We also indicated at the time that the Toronto Port Authority ("TPA") is willing to provide a copy of a performance bond to the City that it will enter into with its contractors to the bridge ensuring that the construction of the Fixed Link will be completed according to City's directives, or, if this is not possible, that the site would be returned to an appropriate condition. This was in fulfilment of the Waterfront Reference Group recommendation 1(g).

I further confirm that on October 7, 2002, we sent to you a copy of a letter sent to Eric Arm by Alan Paul, our C.F.O., dealing with the Waterfront Reference Group recommendations (a) through (d).

You requested at the October 11<sup>th</sup> meeting that if a new noise study be undertaken prior to City Council and we agreed that we would have that prepared for you. We will be receiving that new study in our offices on Friday, and I will transfer to you as soon as available.

I confirm as well that Dillon Consulting Ltd., on behalf of the TPA have had a number of conversations and meetings with the Toronto Transit Commission discussing the possibility of a Light Rapid Transit Line (LRT) directly to the TCCA. In response to this the Traffic Management Plan of the TPA indicates that a shuttle bus service will be utilized and we will continue to speak with TTC with respect to the issues regarding the implementation of a LRT line.



The TPA also confirms that it will provide all necessary guarantees that infrastructure improvements at the TCCA with respect to the construction of a Fixed Link and the construction of a new terminal will be completed at no cost to the City. The TPA is willing to either post a Performance Bond, or enter into a guarantee eliminating financial risk to the City for these two projects.

Yesterday, we received a copy of a memo to yourself from Joe Farag, Director of Development, Policy and Research. Mr. Farag indicates that there were a number of financial issues for which the TPA was requested to have answers in writing. As we just received them late yesterday we will be reviewing them today and will have responses to these 9 questions by the end of this week.

I would appreciate it if you would please confirm that you have received the material noted above, and that the recommendations from the Waterfront Reference Group with respect to provision of information is satisfied.

Should you have any further questions, please contact me at (416) 863-2016.

---

Appendix (C) - Mitigation Measures Identified in Dhillon Consulting's  
Environmental Assessment Report

Insert Table/Map No. 1  
Table 6.1 - Proposed Mitigation Measures for  
Construction Activities

Insert Table/Map No. 2  
Table 6.1 - Proposed Mitigation Measures for  
Construction Activities (Continued)

Insert Table/Map No. 3  
Table 6.1 - Proposed Mitigation Measures  
For Construction Activities (Continued)

Insert Table/Map No. 4  
Table 6.1 - Proposed Mitigation Measures  
For Construction Activities (Continued)

Insert Table/Map No. 5  
Table 6.2 - Proposed Mitigation for Operations  
And Maintenance Activities

Insert Table/Map No. 6  
Table 6.3 - Monitoring Program

## Appendix (D)

### (I) Conditions Applied To Council's Approval Of A Fixed Link

On December 16 and 17, 1998, City Council recommended the adoption of a fixed link to the City Centre Airport being built in the form of a bridge, subject to:

- (a) the approval of the design of the bridge by the Fire Chief, the General Manager, Ambulance Services, and City Council.

Status: the recommended design of the bridge as presented to the Planning and Transportation Committee in June of 1999 addressed all safety concerns identified by the Fire Chief and the General Manager, Ambulance Services.

- (b) the final design of the bridge being submitted to the Urban Environment and Development Committee for review and approval for consistency with established urban design objectives along the waterfront.

Status: the recommended design of the bridge as presented to the Planning and Transportation Committee in June of 1999 was consistent with all established urban design objectives.

- (c) the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer being requested to submit a report to the Urban Environment and Development Committee recommending that City Council give approval to the bridge's business plan.

Status: the business plan for the proposed TCCA operations, including the construction of a bridge, was submitted by the TPA on September 19, 2002.

- (d) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services being requested to submit a report to the Urban Environment and Development Committee, prior to the authorization of the alteration of Bathurst Street, on the cost of such alteration and the source of funding.

Status: this information was included in the report on the bridge design to the Planning and Transportation Committee in June of 1999.

- (e) the Toronto Harbour Commission and the Port Authority being required to monitor and report annually to the Urban Environment and Development Committee on the effects of the bridge operation, as requested by the City.

Status: outstanding until such time as the bridge is implemented.

- (f) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services being requested to submit a report to the Urban Environment and Development Committee on the impact of the Fixed Link on traffic patterns along the waterfront and what concrete traffic calming options exist, such a report to seek the input of local residents and be the subject of a public meeting.



Status: this information was included in the report on the bridge design to the Planning and Transportation Committee in June of 1999. Four community consultation meetings were held as part of the bridge design process.

- (g) approval being conditional upon a legally binding commitment that not one penny of City tax dollars will be spent on the bridge or on Airport losses which result from the bridge financing.

Status: the business plan which was submitted by TPA on September 19, 2002 included in this information.

- (h) the Canadian Coast Guard and/or the Federal Fisheries Ministry be requested to submit to the Urban Environment and Development Committee, their report on the impact of the fixed link (bridge ) to the City Centre Airport.

Status: the environmental assessment process incorporated the consideration of the Coast Guard's concerns.

- (i) the Greater Toronto Airports Authority (GTAA), as a courtesy, be requested to make available to the City of Toronto, through the Office of the Mayor and the Chairs of the Economic Development Committee and the Urban Environment and Development Committee, its analysis and conclusions as to the City Centre Airport forecasted passenger volumes and financial implications, and further, that Mayor Lastman be requested to expeditiously forward this request to the GTAA verbatim and in writing.

Status: outstanding,

- (j) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services be requested to submit a report to the Urban Environment and Development Committee on the facts of the flight paths of commuter aircraft which use the City Centre Airport, at present and as projected for the future.

Status: this issue of flight paths was addressed in a report from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services which was considered by Council on November 6, 2001 (Planning and Transportation Committee Report 12, Clause 2). The report concludes that "the responsibility for aviation safety rests primarily with the Federal Minister of Transport. The long-term compatibility of continued and/or expanded airport operations in the City's developing waterfront area depends on a number of factors including aircraft safety. This is best assessed by the Federal Minister of Transport in keeping with his responsibilities as defined in the Aeronautics Act." Council received this report, and deferred further consideration concerning future levels of activity at the Toronto Island Airport until such time at the Chief Administrative Officer has reported back on the negotiations with the Toronto Port Authority.

Council also directed:

- (1) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, in consultation with appropriate staff, to continue discussion and consultation on the appropriate role of the

City Centre Airport and its relationship to other uses and activities in the waterfront, and the impacts that these matters might have on the terms of both the Tripartite and Subsidy Agreements to which the City is a party;

- (2) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services and the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services to report on an assessment of the emergency response capability of the bridge, tunnel and ferry, including suggested improvements to the operation of each option; and
- (3) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, in consultation with appropriate staff, continue to compile technical information on the bridge and tunnel options but the decision on the type of fixed link required be deferred until the matters raised in recommendations (i) to (k) be resolved.

Status: the above requested information was included in the report on the bridge design to the Planning and Transportation Committee in June of 1999.

- (ii) Directives resulting from the Planning and Transportation Committee's consideration of the report dated June 17<sup>th</sup>, 1999 from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services with respect to the design of the bridge to the Toronto City Centre Airport

The Committee deferred consideration of the report until the following conditions are met:

- (a) the Business Plan for the Airport is approved.

Status: a business plan for TCCA was submitted in 1998, and an analysis thereof by the Finance Department was included in the report considered by Council on December 17 and 18, 1998. At that time, Finance concluded that:

“the single most significant factor underlying the feasibility of the Business Plan is the achievement of forecast passenger levels. The level of risk and uncertainty inherent in the estimates are sufficient to transform accumulated surpluses into accumulated deficits over the five year period (being considered, i.e. 1998 – 2002). However, an acceptable level of risk for investment of this nature can be adequately assessed only after identifying and quantifying the economic benefits of expansion of airport operations including a fixed link to the airport. As a result, the plan includes strategies and options to minimize the financial impact of the risks and uncertainty identified in this review.

The ability of airport operations to be financially self-sustaining in the future is largely dependent on such critical factors as market share, routes, and passenger levels. Because of the uniqueness of airport operations and the industry practices used to determine market potential, a definitive answer as to the feasibility of the Business Plan may require the services of independent experts.”

Finance also identified a number of key areas where additional information is required, specifically market research and analysis, passenger levels and surplus/deficit forecasts, expenditure estimates, and details of the Toronto Harbour Commissioners reserve balances.

An updated business plan for the proposed TCCA operations, including the construction of a bridge, was submitted by the TPA on September 19, 2002.

- (b) the Federal Government has given its final approval for the Environmental Assessment.

Status: the environmental assessment for the fixed link received approval on September 10, 1999, subject to the “mitigation measures” identified in the Dillon report being implemented. These include measures related to the construction, operation, and maintenance phases of the project.

- (c) a permit under the Navigable Waters Protection Act has been issued by the Canada Coast Guard.

Status: outstanding.

- (d) the transfer or lease from the Federal Government to the City of the lands currently used for parking and access to the ferry.

Status: outstanding. This transfer will occur only after a design for the bridge has been approved.

The Committee also requested staff to report on the approaches to the bridge at both ends.

Status: the information with respect to the land – side end of the bridge was included in the June 17<sup>th</sup>, 1999 report. The approach at the airport end will be subject to the TCCA site plan design.

**The joint Planning and Transportation and Economic Development and Parks Committee also submits the following communication (October 10, 2002) from the City Clerk, Waterfront Reference Group:**

Recommendations:

The Waterfront Reference Group recommends to the joint meeting of Economic Development and Parks and the Planning and Transportation Committees that the report (September 27, 2002) from the Chief Administrative Officer be amended subject to:

- (1) amending Recommendation (1) by deleting the words “at its meeting in November 2002” and replacing with the words “when the analysis of the Toronto Port Authority’s Business Plan, as well as the other requested reports, are completed by staff”;
- (2) deleting Recommendation No. 6;
- (3) adding additional recommendations (6), (7), (8), (9), (10) and (11):

so that the recommendations of this report now read:

- “(1) This report be forwarded from the Waterfront Reference Group to the joint meeting of the Economic Development and Parks Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee scheduled for October 24, 2002, and to Council when the analysis of the Toronto Port Authority’s Business Plan, as well as the other requested reports, are completed by staff;
- (2) Council recognize both the value of a regional airport to Toronto’s economic well-being, regional transportation infrastructure and delivery of emergency services, and the importance of maintaining an effective balance that achieves the proposed objectives of the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan for residential, cultural, and employment revitalization;
- (3) the Toronto Port Authority (TPA) be requested to provide additional information to the Executive Lead for the Waterfront and the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism with respect to its business plan for the TCCA and the fixed link bridge, which was submitted on Thursday, September 19, 2002, including:
  - (a) detailed financial calculations and passenger levels beyond 2007;
  - (b) the costs of additional upgrades (e.g. runway lighting, runway resurfacing, development of the Toronto City Centre Airport (TCCA) south-side);
  - (c) the rationale for the differences in the composition of revenues and expenditures between the Sypher:Mueller turboprop scenario and the baseline forecasts included in the business plan;
  - (d) the rationale for excluding the passenger terminal, and for the non-proportional reduction in revenues from the Passenger User Fee, in the low growth scenario;
  - (e) a comprehensive set of measures to mitigate the environmental and health effects of any enhancement to TCCA;
  - (f) the results of a traffic management study that updates the impacts of TCCA expansion, as well as a fixed link, on the Bathurst Quay and Harbourfront neighbourhoods; and
  - (g) specific assurances that the TPA will provide a copy to the City of the performance bond it will enter into with its contractor(s) ensuring that the construction of the fixed link will be completed according to the City’s directives, or, if this is not possible, that the site would be returned to an appropriate condition;

- (4) staff clarify with representatives of Transport Canada their role in funding TCCA activities as set out in the Tripartite Agreement;
- (5) staff report to Council on the TPA's business plan once the TPA produces all of the above, such report should also comment on how any proposed changes will impact the Tripartite Agreement and the Subsidy Agreement;
- (6) the outstanding conditions applied to City Council's adoption of a fixed link to the TCCA at its meeting on December 16 and 17, 1998 as outlined in Appendix (A) of the report (September 27, 2002) from the Chief Administrative Officer, be completed prior to City Council making a final decision on expansion plans for the TCCA;
- (7) a new noise study be undertaken prior to City Council making a final decision on the expansion plans for the TCCA;
- (8) the TPA be requested to consider incorporating into its business plan an enhanced public transit service, in the form of a Light Rapid Transit Line (LRT) directly to the Toronto City Centre Airport, noting that initial service improvements could be in the form of a shuttle bus service and that any cost to subsidize this service be the responsibility of the Toronto Port Authority;
- (9) a feasibility study be undertaken to determine the passenger level that would warrant the implementation of an LRT line between Union Station and the TCCA and the results of this study be reported to Council prior to the November 26, 2002 Council meeting;
- (10) appropriate City staff be requested to recommend the best method to include the condition of an enhanced public transit service in any approval for the bridge design and/or enhanced operations of the TCCA;
- (11) City Council include provisions in any approvals for the bridge design and/or enhancements to the operation of the TCCA and that the TPA provide all necessary guarantees that any infrastructure improvements at the TCCA, including the construction of a fixed link and terminal, will be completed at no cost to the City. This should be done through a performance bond that specifically outlines such a guarantee to the City, or an alternative instrument that eliminates financial risk to the City."

The Waterfront Reference Group reports for the information of the joint meeting having requested:

- (1) the Toronto Port Authority to provide to the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, by no later than October 11, 2002, all outstanding information with respect to its business plan as outlined in Recommendation (3) of the report (September 27, 2002) from the Chief Administrative Officer;

- (2) the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, to the fullest extent possible, complete due diligence on this information when received from the TPA and report to the October 24, 2002 joint meeting of the Economic Development and Parks and Planning and Transportation Committees, or, if the completion of the due diligence is not possible, that a report be submitted to the joint meeting outlining the anticipated timing of TPA's response; and
- (3) the City Solicitor report to the joint meeting on October 24, 2002 on the effect of the Navigable Waterways Protection Act on the suggested fixed link to the TCCA.

Background:

At its meeting on October 8, 2002, the Waterfront Reference Group gave consideration to the report (September 27, 2002) from the Chief Administrative Officer reporting on the financial, legal, community, health, environmental and economic impacts of various operational scenarios for the Toronto City Centre Airport (TCCA) and on the status of outstanding directives related to Council's approval of a fixed link to the TCCA and recommending that:

- (1) this report be forwarded from the Waterfront Reference Group to the joint meeting of the Economic Development and Parks Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee scheduled for October 24, 2002, and to Council at its meeting in November, 2002;
- (2) Council recognize both the value of a regional airport to Toronto's economic well-being, regional transportation infrastructure and delivery of emergency services, and the importance of maintaining an effective balance that achieves the proposed objectives of the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan for residential, cultural, and employment revitalization;
- (3) the Toronto Port Authority be requested to provide additional information to the Executive Lead for the Waterfront and the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism with respect to its business plan for the TCCA and the fixed link bridge, which was submitted on Thursday, September 19, 2002, including:
  - (a) detailed financial calculations and passenger levels beyond 2007;
  - (b) the costs of additional upgrades (e.g. runway lighting, runway resurfacing, development of TCCA south-side);
  - (c) the rationale for the differences in the composition of revenues and expenditures between the Sypher:Mueller turboprop scenario and the baseline forecasts included in the business plan;
  - (d) the rationale for excluding the passenger terminal, and for the non-proportional reduction in revenues from the Passenger User Fee, in the low growth scenario;
  - (e) a comprehensive set of measures to mitigate the environmental and health effects of any enhancement to TCCA;

- (f) the results of a traffic management study that updates the impacts of TCCA expansion, as well as a fixed link, on the Bathurst Quay and Harbourfront neighbourhoods; and
  - (g) specific assurances that the TPA will provide a copy to the City of the performance bond it will enter into with its contractor(s) ensuring that the construction of the fixed link will be completed according to the City's directives, or, if this is not possible, that the site would be returned to an appropriate condition;
- (4) staff clarify with representatives of Transport Canada their role in funding TCCA activities as set out in the Tripartite Agreement;
  - (5) staff report to Council on the TPA's business plan once the TPA produces all of the above, such report should also comment on how any proposed changes will impact the Tripartite Agreement and the Subsidy Agreement; and
  - (6) upon satisfaction by the TPA of the conditions noted above, Council confirm its approval of enhanced, non-jet operations at the TCCA, including terminal improvements and the construction of a fixed link bridge at no cost to the City.

The Waterfront Reference Group also had before it the following submissions:

- (September 13, 2002) from Joe Altieri submitting a document examining the campaign of Community AIR to close the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (August 29, 2002) from Irene Fedun, Green Dragon Landscaping objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 17, 2002) from Laszlo (Les) Jarmai objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 19, 2002) from George and Niki Sekely objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 17, 2002) from Gerald H. Parker, President, Beyond Ability International supporting the continuance of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 4, 2002) from Bonnie & Jerry Good objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (August 26, 2002) from Roger Wilson, Fasken Martineau DuMoulin, Barristers & Solicitors submitting letter (August 7, 2002) from Roger D. Wilson addressed to Lydia Danylciw, Waterfront Secretariat, (April 4, 2002) from Roger D. Wilson and letter (April 15, 2002) from Paul Henderson objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;

- (September 23, 2002) from Denys Jones objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 22, 2002) from Cam Miller objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 22, 2002) from Eliza Wong objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 22, 2002) from Michael Page objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 23, 2002) from Allan Sparrow, Community Air forwarding submissions objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 22, 2002) from Rosanne Renzetti objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 18, 2002) from Doreen Hamilton objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 18, 2002) from Karin Michael objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 23, 2002) from Nicky Perry objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 23, 2002) from Sharon Oatway objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 23, 2002) from Yvonne Parti objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 24, 2002) from Lori Nancy Kalamanski objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 24, 2002) from Joan Cohl objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 23, 2002) from Rod Seiling, President, Greater Toronto Hotel Association, supporting the continuance of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 20, 2002) from the City Clerk forwarding for the information of the Waterfront Reference Group, a list of written submissions relating to the Toronto City Centre Airport which were included on the February 20, 2002 agenda of the Waterfront Reference Group;



- (September 28, 2002) from Chris Kelk objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 27, 2002) from Penelope Tyndale objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 28, 2002) from Luis Alfredo Carrasco supporting the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 26, 2002) from Kevin Psutka, President & C.E.O, Canadian Owners and Pilots Association supporting the continuance of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 26, 2002) from Warner Cowan supporting the continuance, but not expansion, of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 2002) from Brenda Roman objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 30, 2002) from Rosanna Crabbe objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 1, 2002) from Ian Russell objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 1, 2002) from Lynne Besner objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 2, 2002) from Richard Reinert objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 1, 2002) from Jane O'Callaghan objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 30, 2002) from John Firth objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 2, 2002) from Greg Bonser objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 2, 2002) from Cheryl Reid objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 3, 2002) from Zella Wolofsky objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 2, 2002) from Kim Mandzy objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;

- (October 3, 2002) from Carol Bigwood objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 3, 2002) from Paul Copeland objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 3, 2002) from Paul Kirby objecting to a bridge connecting the Island;
- (October 3, 2002) from Lee Rickwood objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 3, 2002) from Ron Monteith, President, St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association, objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 4, 2002) from The Bristons objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 1, 2002) from Jerry Englar objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 1, 2002) from Leida Englar objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 1, 2002) from Tom Patterson objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (September 23, 2002) from Patricia MacKay objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 2, 2002) from John T. Morin, The Royal Canadian Yacht Club, objecting to the proposed bridge connecting the Island;
- (undated) from Karen Langlois objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 4, 2002) from Eric Holzwarth objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 4, 2002) from Lois James objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 4, 2002) from Chris Damiano objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 4, 2002) from Corinne Moore objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;

- (October 6, 2002) from Judy Malkin objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Geoff Evason objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Bob Gibson submitting comments on the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 1, 2002) from Dwight Peters objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 6, 2002) from Phyllis Platt objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (undated) from Michael Colgrass objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 4, 2002) from Margaret Whitfield objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 6, 2002) from Joseph Ho objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 4, 2002) from Steve Bellantoni objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Terri Tenberg objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Dan Y. Zabelishensky objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 5, 2002) from Dorothy Holmes objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 4, 2002) from Deborah Speyer objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 6, 2002) from Elaine Gold objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 6, 2002) from Hugh MacKay objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 3, 2002) from Ron Monteith, President, St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association, objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;

- (October 2, 2002) from Nancy White objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 2, 2002) from Jeff Vile objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 3, 2002) from Joanna Sworn and David Sworn objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 3, 2002) from Sandra Bain objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 4, 2002) from Malcolm King objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 5, 2002) from Laszlo J. Jarmai objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Trevor Shaw supporting the continuance of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 4, 2002) from B.R. Holmes supporting the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Christy Manis objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Geoff Evason objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Cathy Waiten objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Alanna McDonagh objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from O. John Hawkins objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 2, 2002) from Henry Ding supporting the continuance of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (undated) from Stig Harvor opposing the continuance of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Ann Bosley, President, Toronto Real Estate Board, supporting the continuance of the Toronto City Centre Airport;

- (April 23, 2002) from Chris Ridabock, Chair and M. Elyse Allan, President and C.E.O., The Toronto Board of Trade supporting the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Peter Lukas, President, Showline Limited forwarding concerns respecting the noise levels from over-flight helicopters;
- (October 4, 2002) from Carol L. Holmes, Administration and Property Management, City Centre Aviation Ltd., supporting the continuance of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Ann Lovering objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Irene Fedun objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Dr. Moira McQueen objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Rebecca Schechter objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Sophie Perrault objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Tim Flawn & Peggy Slegers objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 8, 2002) from Alice E. Courtney objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Tibor Major objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Irene E. Grubb objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Suzanne Fitzpatrick objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 8, 2002) from Joan York objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 8, 2002) from Jason D. Craig objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 7, 2002) from Ronny Yaron objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;

- (September 26, 2002) from Karen Tzventarny objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 8, 2002) from Keri Wong, Tanya Battersby, Marta Polack, Robert Osborne and David Hsia objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 8, 2002) from Karin Tari objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 8, 2002) from Linda Sheppard objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 8, 2002) from Wilfrid Walker, Board Member for Transport 2000 Ontario. forwarding concerns respecting the airport;
- (undated) from Allan Sparrow, Outreach Coordinator, Community AIR, submitting concerns regarding the expansion of the airport;
- (undated) from Michael Rosenberg, Economics of Technology Working Group forwarding concerns regarding planning relating to the Portlands;
- (October 8, 2002) from Elyse Allan, President and C.E.O., The Toronto Board of Trade, supporting the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 8, 2002) from Andy Manahan, Development Promotion Representative, Universal Workers Union, Local 183, supporting the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 8, 2002) from Mitchell Gold, International Association of Educators for World Peace, objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 8, 2002) from Victor Pappalardo, President, Trans Capital Air Ltd., supporting the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 8, 2002) from Hamish Wilson objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 8, 2002) from Ben Smith Lea, President and Elizabeth Quance, Secretary, Niagara Neighbourhood Association, objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- (October 8, 2002) from Rosario Marchese, MPP, Trinity-Spadina, objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport; and
- (October 7, 2002) from Boris Broz objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport.

The following persons appeared before the Waterfront Reference Group in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Henry J. Pankratz, Chair, Toronto Port Authority;
- Robert Deluce; Regional Airlines Holdings Inc.;
- Lisa Raitt, Chief Executive Officer and Harbour Master, Toronto Port Authority;
- Al Will, Executive Director, Ontario Sailing Association;
- Jerry Shiner, President, Keepsafe Storage;
- John Bessai;
- Pam Mazza, President, Toronto Island Trust;
- Marc Brien, Partner, Domicity Limited;
- Allan Sparrow, Outreach Coordinator, Community AIR;
- Max Moore, President, Harbourfront Community Association;
- Julie Beddoes, Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association;
- Alexander M. Giannelia, President, The Airborne Sensing Corporation;
- Elyse Allan, President and C.E.O., Toronto Board of Trade;
- Anthony Pappalardo, Co-Chair, Toronto City Centre Airport Association;
- Joe Altieri;
- Phillip Van Manen, Airport Manager, Toronto City Centre Airport;
- Manfred Humphries;
- Drew Bowles;
- Gerald H. Parker, Beyond Ability International;
- John Spragge;
- Roger D. Wilson, Barrister and Solicitor;
- Andy Manahan, Development Promotion Representative, Universal Workers Union, Local 183;
- Bill Freeman;
- Mark Millen;
- Paul Ferreira, President, Toronto Centre-Rosedale NDP;
- Warner Cowan;
- Brenda Roman;
- Debbie Alexander;
- Sylvia Pellman;
- Bob Fear, Q400 Product Planning Manager, Bombardier Aerospace;
- Mitchell Gold, International Association of Educators for World Peace;
- John Stephenson;
- Michael Colgrass;
- Alison Rose;
- Paul Farrelly;
- Keith Stewart, Smog and Climate Change Campaigner;
- Kayle Gordon;
- Janice Zemdegs;
- Malcolm King;
- Hamish Wilson;
- Tomislav Svoboda, Community Medicine Specialist, St. Michaels's Hospital;
- Joseph Koole;
- Trevor Shaw;

- Sharon Poitras;
- Allan Fenton;
- Terri Tenberg, New Media Producer, Corporate Communications-Internet, Bell Canada;
- Dan Zabelishensky, Board Member, Toronto Bird Observatory;
- Nola Crewe;
- Robert Anglin;
- Terry Wong;
- Elizabeth Quance;
- Boris Broz;
- Donald Hart;
- Pat Fagnano, Duty Manager, Toronto City Centre Airport;
- Christopher Wallace; and
- Jacob Allderdice.

—————  
(Report dated September 27, 2002, from the  
Chief Administrative Officer, addressed to the  
Waterfront Reference Group)

Purpose:

To report on the financial, legal, community, health, environmental and economic impacts of various operational scenarios for the Toronto City Centre Airport (TCCA) and on the status of outstanding directives related to Council's approval of a fixed link to the TCCA.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

As set out in this report, changes to the operation of TCCA could result in a reduction in the annual subsidy paid by the City to the Toronto Port Authority (TPA) under the existing Subsidy Agreement.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) this report be forwarded from the Waterfront Reference Group to the joint meeting of the Economic Development and Parks Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee scheduled for October 24, 2002, and to Council at its meeting in November, 2002;
- (2) Council recognize both the value of a regional airport to Toronto's economic well-being, regional transportation infrastructure and delivery of emergency services, and the importance of maintaining an effective balance that achieves the proposed objectives of the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan for residential, cultural, and employment revitalization;



- (3) the Toronto Port Authority be requested to provide additional information to the Executive Lead for the Waterfront and the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism with respect to its business plan for the TCCA and the fixed link bridge, which was submitted on Thursday, September 19, 2002, including:
  - (a) detailed financial calculations and passenger levels beyond 2007;
  - (b) the costs of additional upgrades (e.g. runway lighting, runway resurfacing, development of TCCA south-side);
  - (c) the rationale for the differences in the composition of revenues and expenditures between the Sypher:Mueller turboprop scenario and the baseline forecasts included in the business plan;
  - (d) the rationale for excluding the passenger terminal, and for the non-proportional reduction in revenues from the Passenger User Fee, in the low growth scenario;
  - (e) a comprehensive set of measures to mitigate the environmental and health effects of any enhancement to TCCA;
  - (f) the results of a traffic management study that updates the impacts of TCCA expansion, as well as a fixed link, on the Bathurst Quay and Harbourfront neighbourhoods; and
  - (g) specific assurances that the TPA will provide a copy to the City of the performance bond it will enter into with its contractor(s) ensuring that the construction of the fixed link will be completed according to the City's directives, or, if this is not possible, that the site would be returned to an appropriate condition;
- (4) staff clarify with representatives of Transport Canada their role in funding TCCA activities as set out in the Tripartite Agreement;
- (5) staff report to Council on the TPA's business plan once the TPA produces all of the above, such report should also comment on how any proposed changes will impact the Tripartite Agreement and the Subsidy Agreement; and
- (6) upon satisfaction by the TPA of the conditions noted above, Council confirm its approval of enhanced, non-jet operations at the TCCA, including terminal improvements and the construction of a fixed link bridge at no cost to the City.

Executive Summary:

Staff across all relevant City departments have considered the financial, legal, community health, environmental, and economic impacts of four operational scenarios for the future of TCCA. Specifically, the four options were: status quo, closure and subsequent conversion to green space or alternative public use, enhancement within the parameters of the Tripartite Agreement, and enhancement with amendments to the Tripartite Agreement.

The Medical Officer of Health has remained neutral on the question of whether TCCA operations should decrease, remain the same, or expand. However, the MOH has drawn attention to the scientific literature describing the health effects of airports and their associated ground operations, and has noted that both air pollution and noise impacts can be expected to increase with increased activities of the TCCA.

In order to ensure that an effective balance is accomplished that achieves the proposed objectives outlined in the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan for residential, cultural, and employment revitalization in the Central Waterfront, each of the four options was evaluated against a number of criteria. These were: the principles of the Secondary Plan, the Official Plan, the potential impact on investment in and development of the Central Waterfront and beyond, the fiscal impact of the TCCA operations on the City, consistency with the City's vision of sustainable transportation for the Waterfront, and the impact on the economy and long-term competitive position of the City.

Of the four options, both the status quo, and enhancement within the parameters of the Tripartite Agreement, were deemed to be unviable. The decision before Council is therefore a choice between doing nothing (which will likely result in eventual closure), or enhancement beyond the parameters of the Tripartite Agreement (specifically the "expanded turboprop" option).

The closure of TCCA will ultimately lead to the loss of the economic benefits it currently provides to the City, including approximately \$130 million in direct, indirect and induced benefits, and improved competitiveness for businesses through fast, convenient connections between key urban business centres and markets in downtown Toronto.

Moreover, enhancement beyond the parameters of the Tripartite Agreement is the sole course of action which will ensure the profitability of airport operations. Details of this scenario were identified in the report prepared by the consultants retained by the TPA to study alternatives for the future of TCCA (Sypher:Mueller). This option involves: the construction of a new terminal, a fixed link, and improved approach aids; an enhanced fee structure similar to that in place at Pearson International Airport; and the introduction of an "Airport Improvement Fee". With this infrastructure in place, new carriers would be attracted to the airport, resulting in a projected increase in passenger traffic levels to 650,000 by the year 2020. The TCCA would be financially viable as soon as enhanced services are commenced, and would generate enough funding to eliminate the City's annual subsidy and to cover the required capital improvements on a cumulative basis over the period to the end of year 2020.

On September 19, 2002, the TPA submitted a business plan for the TCCA, together with information on the design and the environmental assessment of the proposed bridge. The plan is heavily based on the Sypher:Mueller "expanded turboprop" scenario, with "no plan for jets".

In fact, in 1998, Council recommended the adoption of a fixed link to TCCA being built in the form of a bridge, subject to certain conditions being met. Furthermore, in 1999, the Planning and Transportation Committee deferred consideration of a report with respect to a proposed design of the bridge pending several conditions being met. The directives from both meetings are outlined in Appendix A. The most significant outstanding issues requiring resolution at the time were the need for the business plan for the bridge, and a detailed business plan for TCCA itself.

The construction of the bridge will require amendments to the existing Tripartite Agreement, which expressly prohibits such a structure. It will be necessary to ensure that any amendments will preserve the principles of the current Agreement, and that factors which would mitigate the impacts of TCCA enhancement on the environment and on the Central Waterfront neighbourhoods are included.

Background:

In 2000, City Council considered the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Task Force Report (“Our Toronto Waterfront: Gateway to the New Canada”), and in October 2001, the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan was released for public consultation. While neither document addressed issues with respect to the TCCA, the Task Force recommended that “a comprehensive study...be undertaken immediately...in order to devise a plan for the airport that meshes with the vision for the waterfront. Specific attention should be paid to the noise cone of airport operations with respect to housing”. The Central Waterfront Secondary Plan assumed status quo TCCA operations.

In January of 2002, the Toronto Port Authority (TPA) released a report prepared by Sypher:Mueller International Inc. entitled “Toronto City Centre Airport: General Aviation & Airport Feasibility Study”. This study outlined three options for future operations at the TCCA: baseline (essentially status quo with variable fee structures and passenger levels), enhancement of turboprop services, and introduction of jet services. Of these, only the enhanced turboprop and jet scenarios were considered to be financially viable choices; the report concluded that “the status quo is not sustainable, and will likely lead to continued financial losses and a loss of scheduled services”.

At its meeting of January 29, 2002, the Toronto East York Community Council forwarded to the Waterfront Reference Group a request for a formal response to a communication from Councillors Chow and McConnell respecting the proposed expansion alternatives. Specifically, the Council requested:

“the Chief Planner to report to the Planning and Transportation Committee, at its meeting on March 25, 2002, regarding the compatibility of the current airport operation and the proposed expanded island airport with the Waterfront Revitalization Plan, and having directed him, in the preparation of the report, to consult with the Medical Officer of Health regarding the health and environmental issues that are relevant to this matter, in particular, the Toronto Cancer Prevention Coalition’s concerns”.

At the meeting of the Waterfront Reference Group on February 20, 2002, the Commissioner of Urban Development Services presented a report outlining the process through which staff would respond to the Community Council’s request. In summary, the Commissioner proposed to co-ordinate a full assessment of the current and proposed Island Airport operations with staff of Planning, Economic Development, Parks, Emergency Medical Services, Public Health, Environmental Services, Legal, and Finance.

At that time, the Reference Group:

- (i) considered approximately 100 oral and written deputations from the public supporting and opposing TCCA operations;

- (ii) endorsed the proposed process outlined by the Commissioner of Urban Development Services; and
- (iii) recommended that the resultant report be presented to a special joint meeting of the Economic Development and Parks Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee.

A joint meeting of these Committees has been scheduled for October 24, 2002.

Early in 2002, the TPA received an unsolicited proposal from Regional Airlines Holdings Inc. (REGCO) to “rejuvenate the Toronto City Centre Airport”. Copies of the REGCO proposal were also sent to City officials. Essentially the proposal called for REGCO to invest \$551 million in upgrades to the TCCA in exchange for the right to operate a TCCA-based airline servicing up to seventeen Canadian and U.S. destinations within 500 nautical miles of Toronto using fifteen Q400 Bombardier turboprop aircraft. REGCO projects that it will attract approximately 900,000 passengers per year within its first four years of operation.

On May 1, 2002, Community Airport Impact Review (Community AIR) held a public meeting to reiterate its position opposing any expansion at the TCCA, and advocating immediate closure and conversion of the facility to greenspace and other public uses. At its meeting on May 30, 2002, the Waterfront Reference Group requested that the Waterfront Project Secretariat review the Community AIR plan and address it in its report to the October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2002 meeting of the Waterfront Reference Group.

In June 2002, the Chairman of the TPA wrote to the Commissioners of Urban Development Services and Economic Development, Culture and Tourism informing them of the Authority’s intent to move forward with plans for construction of a fixed link connecting the airport with the mainland at Bathurst Street and requesting that outstanding issues related to final approval of the link be addressed at the October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2002 meeting of the Waterfront Reference Group.

This report responds to the above directives, provides a comprehensive assessment of current and proposed operations of the TCCA, including scenarios submitted by REGCO, Community AIR and the TPA, and updates Council on the status of issues related to the proposed fixed link.

#### History:

The TCCA was completed in 1939 with two paved runways, a terminal building, and a seaplane base. Used as a military training base during World War II, it reverted to civilian use in 1945, and achieved popularity as interest in aviation increased. During the early 1960’s, a new 4,000-foot runway was commissioned, runway lighting was installed, and the current ferry “The Maple City” was put into service.

In order to develop the TCCA for general aviation and limited short take-off and landing service, the three owners of the airport lands, namely the former City of Toronto, the Toronto Harbour Commission (now the Toronto Port Authority), and Transport Canada entered into a 50-year Tripartite Agreement in June of 1983. This Agreement remains in effect today, and specifically prohibits additional runways or extensions to runways, a bridge or vehicular tunnel to the Island,

turboprop or piston aircraft generating excessive noise, and jet operations (with the exception of medical evacuations, other emergency medical uses as required, and the Canadian National Exhibition air show). While the document does not place a specific maximum on the number of flights or passengers at TCCA, it does set noise exposure parameters which are not to be exceeded (NEF25). The Agreement provides that should the TPA elect to no longer operate the airport, Transport Canada could assume this responsibility. It also stipulates that, in the event that the TCCA is closed, the Minister of Transport can decide whether the TPA lands and the Federal lands should remain for public harbour purposes. Should these lands not be required for either an airport or for harbour purposes, the Federal lands shall be conveyed to the City for a nominal sum, and the City would have an option to purchase the TPA lands at their fair market value.

Also in 1983, an independent operator (City Express) began providing services from the TCCA, resulting in an increase in passenger traffic over a four-year span from 75,000 in that year to 400,000 by 1987. At this point, Air Canada (through Air Ontario) entered into the market, and City Express failed in 1991 as a result of the increase in competition and an economic downturn. Traffic has since declined steadily, with 2001 levels approximating 90,000, and 2002 levels projected at 80,000. Currently, the TCCA flight mix consists of general aviation services, encompassing private planes, corporate aircraft, training, recreational activity, limited scheduled air-passenger services primarily to Ottawa, Montreal and London, Ontario, and medevac fixed wing and helicopter flights providing emergency air ambulance services to Central Ontario.

In 1989, just after the peak of the TCCA's operations, a Royal Commission on the Future of the Toronto Waterfront was convened. A report summarizing the Commission's findings indicated that "most people, including residents and commercial and local business people, agree that the airport should continue to exist, although there were a few suggestions at the hearings that it be closed".

The former City of Toronto Council, at its meeting held on October 16 and 17, 1995, endorsed building a fixed link to TCCA, subject to the completion of an Environmental Assessment. At its meeting on August 21, 1997, Council requested the Minister of Transport to undertake a full Environmental Assessment for this initiative.

In 1998, Dillon Consulting on behalf of the Toronto Port Authority undertook an Environmental Assessment process. The resultant report, entitled "Fixed Link to the Toronto City Centre Airport", was released in April 1998, and identified the need for a link in the form of a bridge to address the requirements of projected expanded services at the TCCA.

At its meeting of December 16 and 17, 1998, Toronto City Council debated a report from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development regarding a proposal to build either a bridge or a tunnel to the TCCA. Council recommended "the adoption of a fixed link to the City Centre airport being built in the form of a bridge" (subject to certain design, safety and reporting requirements, including "consistency with established urban design objectives along the waterfront", being addressed). Furthermore, this approval was to be "conditional upon a legally binding commitment that not one penny of City tax dollars will be spent on the bridge or on airport losses which result from the bridge financing".

In the spring of 1999, a Technical Working Committee and a Bridge Design Community Working Group were convened by the Toronto Harbour Commissioners to address the City's and other issues related to the bridge. The Technical Working Committee was comprised of staff from Planning, Works, Parks, Fire, Ambulance, Legal, Transport Canada, and the former Toronto Harbour Commissioners and their consultant team. The Bridge Design Community Working Group consisted of staff and community representatives.

In July of the same year, a report from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development accepting the design for a bascule bridge subject to a number of conditions was forwarded to the Planning and Transportation Committee. The proposed design took into consideration all of the safety concerns raised by the Fire Chief and the General Manager of Emergency Medical Services. In addition, the report concluded that the bridge could accommodate forecasted traffic associated with 600,000 airport passengers per year with a southbound storage lane on Lower Bathurst Street. The resultant recommendation stipulated that operations should be monitored, and that a remote terminal should be considered in the event that the storage lane became inadequate.

The Committee deferred consideration of this matter until certain outstanding issues were resolved, including the preparation and submission of a business plan for the airport, the finalization and approval of the Environmental Assessment for the fixed link, and the completion of the transfer or lease to the City by the Federal Government of lands currently used for ferry parking and access to the ferry. A complete list of Council's directives from 1998 and of the Committee's recommendations from 1999 is attached as Appendix "A", including a status update on each item.

Subsequently, in July of 1999, the City Planning Division commissioned an independent consultant to study the condition of the ferry slip, and of the dockwall of the land-side ferry dock (which is currently under Federal jurisdiction). The resultant report concluded that both areas are in very poor shape, and recommended that specific repairs totalling \$740 thousand (for the ferry slip) and \$600 thousand (for the dockwall) be undertaken in order to "prevent further accelerated deterioration of these structures, to address the existing safety hazard, and to prepare this area for greater use by the public". These repairs, which are the responsibility of the TPA, have not yet been carried out.

Furthermore, the Environmental Assessment for the fixed link received approval on September 10, 1999, from the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, subject to the "mitigation measures" identified in the Dillon report being implemented. These include minor technical measures related to the construction, operation, and maintenance phases of the project.

Since 1999, a number of developments have taken place which must be considered when evaluating the business plan for the future operations at TCCA and for the fixed link. Specifically, these are: the continuing decline in passenger volumes; substantial residential growth in the Harbourfront and Bathurst Quay communities; the establishment of the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation; the Federal Minister of Transport's announcement with respect to the rail link from Union Station to Pearson Airport; the Sypher:Mueller and REGCO proposals; and the concepts put forth by Community AIR.

Finally, on Thursday, September 19, 2002, the TPA forwarded to the City a business plan for the proposed future operations of the TCCA, together with information on the design and the Environmental Assessment of the proposed fixed link bridge.

Discussion:

City staff assessed financial, legal, economic, community, planning, transportation, health and environmental impacts of four scenarios for the TCCA and its land. These scenarios are:

- (a) Status quo – current traffic and passenger levels;
- (b) Closure and subsequent conversion to green space or alternative public use;
- (c) Enhancement within the parameters of the existing Tripartite Agreement; and
- (d) Enhancement, with amendments to the Tripartite Agreement.

Scenario (B) includes a discussion of Community AIR's vision for TCCA lands. Scenario (D) incorporates the proposal identified in the TPA's Sypher:Mueller study on which its recently submitted business plan has been based (expansion of turboprop operations), and a second put forward by REGCO.

Principles:

Toronto's waterfront is one of the City's chief amenities and an invaluable resource. Its strength, which is recognized internationally, is its diversity of use – "working" uses such as shipping, the TCCA and offices in the Yonge and Bay corridors are balanced by parks, tourism and the Harbourfront, Bathurst Quay and Island neighbourhoods. Maintaining this balance of uses in the Central Waterfront is critical to the effective revitalization of this area and essential if it is to become an integral part of the City's dynamic urban fabric.

Consequently, in order to achieve a balance of all points of view, all operating scenarios were evaluated against the criteria outlined below:

- (i) the four basic principles of the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan, specifically removing barriers/making connections, creating a network of spectacular waterfront parks and public spaces, promoting a clean and green environment, and creating dynamic and diverse new communities;
- (ii) the City's current Official Plan and the proposed new Official Plan, both of which contain policies to permit the airport to be used for aviation purposes, including the protection of flight paths. The Official Plan also states that, should the airport be closed, the lands shall be used for parks or for parks and residential uses. The new Official Plan proposes to continue these policies;
- (iii) the potential impact on investment in and development of the Central Waterfront and beyond;

- (iv) the fiscal impact of the TCCA operations on the City;
- (v) consistency with the City's vision of sustainable transportation for the waterfront, including: a balance between transportation needs and other City-building objectives; the impact on the proposed rail link from Union Station to Pearson Airport; accommodation of new waterfront travel demand primarily by transit; improved and maximized pedestrian access to the waterfront; modification to existing and new arterial roads to maintain traffic capacity and improve traffic operations and safety; and limits on any new road capacity for travel in/out of the waterfront/Gardiner corridor area; and
- (vi) the impact on the economy and long-term competitive position of the City, including: enhancing competitive industry clusters; and acknowledging the unique quality of the downtown core to the City's economic vitality. The Toronto Economic Development Strategy, approved by Council in August, 2000, identifies the need to strengthen Toronto's role as an international gateway by expanding services to markets that improve the competitive position of export clusters, enhancing the quality of air transportation services, and increasing utilization of TCCA including the construction of a fixed link.

#### Assessment of Options:

##### (A) Status Quo – Continuation of Current Passenger and Traffic Levels

While the TPA has indicated its commitment to operating a financially viable airport, it has concluded that the TCCA is not sustainable as it currently exists.

Nevertheless, maintaining the status quo allows for the continuation of emergency medical services provided from this location and generates a variety of direct, indirect, and induced economic benefits for Toronto. Conversely, however, it raises community concerns related to health, the environment, and the potential impact on Waterfront Revitalization. The magnitude of these impacts is assessed in the following sections.

##### A1. Financial Impacts of Existing TCCA Operations

As a result of declining passenger traffic since 1987, the TCCA has been operating in a deficit position for several years, with losses ranging from \$0.6 million in 1996 to \$0.948 million in 2001. Approximately \$0.5 million of this deficit is directly attributable to ferry operations.

The Tripartite Agreement stipulates that the Minister of Transport shall grant financial assistance to the airport by way of an annual operating subsidy equal to the operating deficit, subject to certain provisos regarding the types of costs that are acceptable to the Minister. This subsidy has not occurred in several years. While Transport Canada provides a limited amount of project-specific capital support to the TCCA through its national \$38.0 million Capital Assistance Program, Transport Canada staff have confirmed that the TCCA's annual operating subsidy was phased out over five years, beginning in 1996. This resulted from the passage of the new National Airports Policy, which required that airports be commercially viable. At the time, the Port Authority was presented with two options: maintaining an operating subsidy which would require submitting an annual operating plan, or having its subsidy phased out. The TPA opted for the latter. The City was not consulted or advised of these developments at the time by either the TPA or Transport Canada.



The City, on the other hand, continues to pay the TPA an operating subsidy of \$2.8 million annually. Of this total, \$2.4 million is funded by TEDCO through its operating budget, which does not rely on property taxes, and the remaining \$0.4 million comes from the City's tax-supported operating budget. Consequently, the City is offsetting TCCA losses. The TPA also receives a capital subsidy from the City. The level of this subsidy was \$1.5 million in 2000.

From a financial perspective, these facts support the conclusion of the Sypher:Mueller report that "the status quo is not sustainable, and will likely lead to continued financial losses and a loss of scheduled services". The consultants' extrapolation of existing trends indicated that with the current decline in passenger demand, even the application of fees similar to those in place at Pearson International Airport would not offset the operating deficit. (The Pearson fee structure has a minimum fee of \$120 per landing for aircraft up to 19 tonnes and \$13.70 per tonne for aircraft over 19 tonnes, and a passenger utilization fee of \$4.40 per seat for domestic arrivals and \$5.50 per seat for international/transborder arrivals. By contrast, TCCA currently has no landing fee for scheduled service carriers, no airport improvement fee, and a relatively high per-passenger charge of approximately \$11.76). Only when Pearson-like fees are applied in combination with a passenger growth rate of 2.5% per year could the shortfall be eliminated in three years' time. (This would translate to 184,000 passengers by 2020).

Achieving this rate of growth with a "status quo" style of operation is highly improbable. Air Canada experiences efficiencies from using Pearson as its hub of operations and is unlikely to more aggressively promote its services at TCCA. Other airlines appear to be unwilling to commence operations at TCCA until infrastructure improvements are constructed. They may also have concerns about facing an aggressive competitive response from Air Canada similar to that experienced by City Express in the late 1980s. In addition, TCCA staff have confirmed that the airport, even at its current level of operation, has no surplus space as a result of, among other things, new security requirements resulting from the events of September 11. Its ability to accommodate growth without infrastructure enhancements is severely limited.

#### A2. Impacts of Existing TCCA Operations on Emergency Medical Services

Regardless of its financial viability, the TCCA does provide valuable services and benefits to the Toronto community. It is an active air ambulance base for the Ministry of Health's Long Term Care Emergency Health Services Branch and is one of three receiving transportation terminals for air evacuation/medevac flights entering and leaving the Toronto Region.

Canadian Helicopters has been contracted by the Province of Ontario to provide air ambulance services to Ontario's Central Region inclusive of the City of Toronto, to operate two primary and one back up helicopters from the TCCA, and to retain flight paramedics as required. Two helicopters are staffed around the clock from the facility. The hangar located at the TCCA is owned by the Ontario Realty Corporation and was specifically designed for the operation and maintenance of helicopter air ambulances. In addition to hangar facilities, the base maintains offices and crew quarters for the flight paramedics and supervisors and has been designed to provide temporary shelter for medevac patients awaiting flights out of Toronto and for patients awaiting transportation to the mainland.

The TCCA is “instrument flight rules” (IFR) equipped, allowing for 24-hour use by air ambulance. The air ambulance program responds to over 1000 calls annually within the Central Region. In 2001, there were 2,152 air ambulance helicopter movements (1,072 take-offs and 1,080 landings) at TCCA. Prior to moving to the island approximately 5 years ago, flight operations were maintained at the Buttonville airport.

Patients treated by the Bandage One air ambulance helicopter operating out of the TCCA are not usually returned to the airport for movement to a health facility. They are transported to Sunnybrook and Women’s Health Sciences Centre campus, the Hospital for Sick Children and, once complete, the heliport at St. Michael’s Hospital. Other destinations may include hospitals within the Central Region. These hospitals are designated Active Treatment Care centres providing neonatal, paediatric, specialized care and adult trauma care.

In addition to the above, private fixed wing aircraft utilize the TCCA to pick up and deliver patients to hospitals within the Toronto Region. Pearson International Airport and Buttonville Airport also receive fixed wing patients.

Approximately 610 patients arrive at the City Centre Airport and 644 leave the airport on fixed wing aircraft over the course of a year. The type of aircraft may vary from Ministry of Health and Long Term Care fixed wing aircraft to private carriers contracted either by the sending hospital, the Ministry or, in some cases, the patient. Almost all medevac patients are transported to downtown hospitals.

All patient movements by air are co-ordinated through Med Com, the dispatch centre operated by the Ministry. Med Com advises regional Central Ambulance Communications Centres such as Toronto when a patient is arriving or is scheduled on a flight out of the TCCA. Ground Ambulance Operations co-ordinate the ambulance vehicle to either meet the arriving flight or to take the patient to the awaiting aircraft. Ground ambulances utilize the Maple City Ferry to traverse the channel between the mainland and the airport.

It can be concluded that Air Ambulance, medevac, and evacuation services and the patients they serve benefit from the proximity of TCCA to the high level of medical services available in the downtown core.

### A3. Impacts of Existing TCCA Operations on the Waterfront Revitalization Initiative

The proposed Central Waterfront Secondary Plan assumes status quo TCCA operations. While the status quo is not expected to impact the City’s ability to address the four principles of the proposed Waterfront Plan, staff note the importance of achieving a balance between land uses and airport operations. Current and previous airport operations, which peaked at 400,000 passengers per annum, have not hampered development of thriving communities in the Bathurst Quay and Harbourfront areas.

### A4. Economic Impacts of Existing TCCA Operations

The projected economic impact of the TCCA in Toronto has been documented by the TPA and others over the years. At present, about 330 people are employed in 24 businesses operating at the TCCA. In 2000, these businesses had estimated total salary expenditures of

\$12 million annually, generated gross sales of goods and services of about \$70 million, and based on standard industry multipliers provided by Statistics Canada, accounted for an additional \$45 million in indirect and induced economic impacts to the City.

The real economic importance of the airport, however, is not measured by the sale of travel-related goods and services, but by the contribution of the overall airport operation to the competitiveness of the City of Toronto and, in particular, to businesses in the downtown core.

The TCCA provides easy City-to-City access -- an important factor for business success as noted by the Board of Trade:

“the presence of a regional airport adjacent to the downtown Toronto core is a critical factor in the City’s favour when many domestic and international corporations are deciding where to make capital investments and head office location decisions. The TCCA also encourages existing businesses to stay in Toronto and expand.” (Toronto Board of Trade, *Foundations for a Strong City: Improving Toronto’s Physical Infrastructure*, February 1999).

The TCCA also provides a strategic competitive advantage to the City by providing fast, convenient connections between key urban business centres and markets and downtown Toronto.

#### A5. Impacts of Existing TCCA Operations on Public and Environmental Health

Scientific literature provides reasonable evidence that air emissions and noise released from airports can adversely affect human health and quality of life.

##### Air Quality

On March 21, 2002, Toronto Public Health released a report “Ten Key Carcinogens in Toronto Workplaces and Environment” which examined the potential for exposure to carcinogens, including formaldehyde, benzene and 1,3-butadiene. These are among the carcinogens that are known to be emitted from aircraft. In addition, aircraft emit smog-producing compounds and gases that contribute to climate change. Studies show that airport ground activities and associated passenger vehicles emit a similar range of chemicals as do aircraft.

Studies that have looked at the link between cancer and the proximity of residences to airports have not been consistent in their results. Several studies have suggested a potential risk, although these, for the most part, have focussed on much larger airports than TCCA, such as Chicago’s O’Hare International.

The degree to which individual airports contribute to air quality problems is directly related to their levels of activity.

##### Water Quality

The TCCA location on Lake Ontario, which functions as a complex of ecosystems, a drinking water source and a centre for recreation, underscores the importance of evaluating the potential impact on the aquatic environment. There are various potential sources of water pollution from

airports, primarily de-icing and anti-icing products. The Greater Toronto Airports Authority has recently improved its management of spent de-icing and anti-icing fluids, and has greatly reduced the discharge into the natural environment, thereby demonstrating that this impact can be successfully managed. Since the 1990's, the TCCA has implemented a mitigation program which greatly reduces the run-off of ethylene glycol into the lake. Some concerns have been raised about the potential impact of the toxic additive tolytriazole which is found in these fluids. At the request of the Board of Health, the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services is reviewing the practices at the TCCA and the levels of ethylene glycol and tolytriazole in Lake Ontario adjacent to the TCCA. As well, the TPA itself is responsible for water quality in the harbour and is vigilant in minimizing any negative environmental impacts.

### Noise

In a March, 2000 report to the Board of Health, Toronto Public Health concluded that noise at levels below those that impair hearing could result in health effects. Noise can produce a reaction in people, particularly if the sounds are unpredictable and intermittent, and if the hearer has no control over the sources of the sound. The reported impacts of noise include effects on sleep, reading and memory acquisition, performance and behaviour, mental health, and an increased risk of cardiovascular disease.

Researchers have also investigated the effects of airport-related noise on the health of local residents. Scientists have documented annoyance, stress or reduced quality of life among residents living very near airports. In addition to these general impacts, some studies have identified specific adverse health impacts in residents, while other studies have not.

It is important to note, however, that the degree to which noise becomes a significant health concern varies dramatically with the level of activity and the nature of airline traffic undertaken at individual airports. In the case of the TCCA, staff of Environmental Services have indicated that during the early to mid 1990's a number of additional studies/initiatives were undertaken specific to this site: the Toronto Island Airport Study (KPMG, 1991); the Conference on the City Centre Airport – What is its Future Role (Canadian Urban Institute, 1995); and the Environmental Screening Report (documentation of the Environmental Assessment process to amend the Tripartite Agreement to permit other types of aircraft [Toronto Harbour Commissioners, 1996]). The findings of these reports with respect to noise levels confirm the measurements which have been conducted by City staff, namely that the noise levels within the immediate vicinity of the airport are less intrusive than those from the nearby road and rail noise sources, which are operational 24 hours a day. In addition, a study undertaken by the TPA in 1998 confirmed that, at present, no one resides within the NEF 25-noise contour for the TCCA, while over 150,000 residents live within the NEF 25-noise contour for Pearson International Airport. (Aire Ashkenazy, Management Consultant, Toronto City Centre Airport: A Discussion Paper, April 1998).

#### A6. Conclusion: Option (A) - Status Quo

Even at the current low passenger levels, TCCA provides a variety of economic benefits to Toronto businesses and plays an important role in the delivery of emergency medical services in the region. While, like all airports, it poses air, water, and noise pollution concerns, these impacts

are small relative to other major facilities. Regardless, current airport operations are neither financially viable nor sustainable, making continuation of the status quo scenario highly unlikely in the long-term.

## (B) Closure

Closing the TCCA has legal, financial and economic impacts, as well as implications for Emergency Medical Services. However, it could be beneficial for Waterfront Revitalization.

### B1. Legal Implications of Closure

The lands making up the TCCA are comprised of different parcels separately owned by the Federal Government, the TPA, and the City. According to the Tripartite Agreement, should the TPA no longer wish to operate the TCCA, a number of steps must be undertaken, prior to any land reverting to the City for public use. First, Transport Canada has the option of continuing TCCA operations under its own auspices. Staff of Transport Canada's regional office in Toronto have confirmed with City staff that, should the TPA withdraw from operating the TCCA, the Federal Government would assume this responsibility. Transport Canada considers the TCCA to be an underused asset that could better serve Toronto's downtown and beyond. If Transport Canada instead chose to close the airport, it can still require that the Federal and the TPA lands be used for public harbour purposes. Should these lands not be required for either an airport or harbour purposes, the Federal lands shall be conveyed to the City for a nominal sum, and the City would have an option to purchase the TPA lands at their fair market value. The new Canada Marine Act defines port uses broadly, and requires that port authorities undertake whatever activities are necessary to ensure financial viability. These could include activities in the areas of recreation, tourism, and economic development.

With the TPA's current complaints that it does not own sufficient lands to carry out its port operations, it appears unlikely that the Federal Government and the TPA would both decide that the airport lands were not needed for either an airport or for harbour purposes. Finally, it is emphasized that the City is one of three entities that own land on which the TCCA is located, and one of three parties to the Tripartite Agreement. The City does not have the right or power to unilaterally force a closing of the TCCA.

### B2. Financial and Economic Implications of Closure

Accessibility is a key factor affecting economic development. It is the position of the City's Economic Development staff that closing the TCCA and diverting air traffic to suburban regions would decrease accessibility to the downtown core and increase accessibility to outlying areas, thereby encouraging both residential and employment sprawl. Businesses that want the convenience and accessibility of locating close to an airport will be encouraged to seek suburban locations. Diverting passengers destined to downtown to outlying airports would also create additional, lengthy commutes to the downtown core. In addition, with closure of the TCCA, the City would no longer benefit from the indirect and direct economic activities that result from current operations.

### B3. Impacts of Closure on Emergency Medical Services

Closing the TCCA would require the relocation of both the air ambulance and the contract service provider's bases of operations currently located on TCCA lands. As in the past, in all probability, the contractor would secure space at Buttonville or Oshawa airports. This would be a decision of the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care and the contracted provider. There would be no direct impact on emergency response time of helicopter services as a result of relocation, other than possible take-off delays if located at a busy airport. In all probability Pearson would refuse relocation of helicopter services because of the potential disruption to scheduled flight plans.

Return helicopter calls, with patients, would be to established heliports at the Hospital for Sick Children, Sunnybrook and Women's Health Sciences Centre and St. Michael's Hospital. This may result in an increased number of landings at downtown heliports. Currently fixed wing aircraft landing at the TCCA are used to transfer sub-acute patients, with ground vehicles moving these patients from the island to the appropriate medical facility. An increase in some response times may result if helicopters or other ambulance vehicles are to be used to move sub-acute patient from a fixed wing location outside of the city to the core downtown hospitals.

Inner city hospitals are part of the organ transplantation network. Access to the TCCA has significant advantages. The transplantation network is nation-wide; having fixed wing aircraft use regional locations could delay the arrival of organs based on time and distance travelled, particularly given the fact that most transplant organs are destined to downtown hospitals.

For stable patients arriving and leaving Toronto by fixed wing aircraft, the regional services would assume total responsibility for transporting patients into Toronto should the TCCA close. Toronto EMS would be responsible for out going patients and there would be an increase in travel time from the inner core to regional airport facilities.

### B4. Impacts of Closure on the Waterfront Revitalization Initiative

If the TCCA were to be closed, various opportunities may be opened up to integrate this 81 hectare parcel of land into the Central Waterfront in a way that could achieve the four principles of the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan. These could include:

- the creation of a waterfront park with a range of active and passive recreational/cultural uses;
- the expansion of the Toronto Island community with a range and mix of housing types;
- the development of an "urban resort" on the Island with hotels, restaurants, cafes, etc.; and
- the expansion of Hanlan's beach.

A number of scenarios are possible with respect to the use of this land with an opportunity for diverse social, cultural, tourism, recreational, and economic activities that may not exist if the airport were to be maintained or enhanced. However, these scenarios are dependent on the TCCA lands not being wanted by the Federal Government or the TPA for either an airport or for harbour purposes.

#### B5. Community AIR Vision

On May 1, 2002, Community AIR held a public meeting to present its wishes to “close the Island Airport and return the land to environmentally friendly uses, as part of a clean green Toronto waterfront”.

Community AIR supports the construction of a fast rail link to Pearson International Airport, improvements to Via Rail services (connecting Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal and beyond with new high-speed trains), and the creation of a new park for Toronto. It envisions 200 acres of regional parkland, with space dedicated to year-round attractions, including facilities for culture, heritage, education, restaurants, and accommodation. It is the position of Community AIR that more detailed analysis of this vision, including its financial viability, is the responsibility of the City.

In subsequent correspondence to City officials, Community AIR also indicates that its proposal “will attract in the order of 1,000,000 new visitors a year to the expanded Island park”, and that “the current Island park is already at capacity”.

#### B6. Conclusion: Option (B) -- Closure

According to Economic Development staff, the loss of TCCA services will negatively impact the City’s ability to attract, retain and serve priority businesses and business clusters. While impacts on emergency medical services can be mitigated by surrounding hospitals and facilities, these services benefit from close proximity to a regional airport when transporting critical patients or participating in the national transplant program. In addition, Transport Canada’s stated interest in continuing operation of the TCCA, should the TPA wish to withdraw from provision of this service, would seem to render this option as unviable. Finally, as one of three parties to the Tripartite Agreement, the City does not have the right or power to unilaterally force a closing of the TCCA.

#### (C) Enhancement within the Current Tripartite Agreement

As indicated, the Tripartite Agreement specifically prohibits additional runways or extensions to runways, prohibits a bridge or vehicular tunnel to the Island, limits jet operations, and identifies an overall noise boundary which cannot be exceeded (the NEF 25 contour).

Within these restrictions, the Island Airport reached its peak passenger level of 400,000 per year in 1987 with an independent, TCCA-based operator (City Express) providing services with DHC8 turboprop commuter aircraft.

The TPA, Sypher:Mueller consultants, REGCO and the Board of Trade all agree that construction of a fixed link is vital to the TCCA's long-term viability. The link, together with upgrades to the existing terminal, is critical to attracting a new carrier to be based at the airport and to generate the passenger volumes necessary for financial viability. In addition, both the General Manager of Ambulance Services and the City's Fire Chief have confirmed that a fixed link is necessary if there is to be any increase in airport activity for reasons of public safety. These improvements are explicitly prohibited under the Tripartite Agreement, and would therefore require an amendment to the Agreement.

C1. Conclusion: Option (C) – Enhancement within the Tripartite Agreement

The infrastructure does not exist to permit any significant enhancement of activities at the TCCA within the parameters of the current Tripartite Agreement. As a result, this option is not viable or implementable.

(D) Enhancement, with Amendments to the Tripartite Agreement

Two scenarios have been presented as options which would require revisions to the Tripartite Agreement. The first was put forward in the Sypher:Mueller report undertaken for the TPA, and the second by REGCO in its efforts to introduce a new regional airline based out of the TCCA. Both proposals foresee construction of a fixed link and improved terminal facilities. Neither includes the expansion of runways, the introduction of jets, or changes in the present noise parameters governing the TCCA.

D1. The Sypher:Mueller Enhanced Turboprop Proposal

Sypher:Mueller projected an increase in TCCA turboprop operations to a passenger traffic level of 650,000 by the year 2020. This would result in incremental growth to 520 commercial aircraft movements per day, of which 130 would relate to turboprops (112 large, 18 small) and the remaining 390 to piston aircraft. The report concludes that the TCCA would: be financially viable under this scenario as soon as enhanced services are commenced; immediately experience passenger volumes greater than the peak levels in the late 1980s; operate with an ever-increasing surplus; and generate enough funding to eliminate the City's annual subsidy and to cover the required capital improvements on a cumulative basis over a period to the year 2020. The net present value of the cash flow expected to be generated over the period 2003 - 2020 is \$45.2 million, assuming a 5% discount rate.

The Sypher:Mueller proposal encompasses:

- (1) an enhanced fee structure similar to that in place at Pearson International Airport;
- (2) a capital program of \$37.5 million, consisting of a new terminal (\$20 million), a fixed link (\$16 million), and improved approach aids (\$1.5 million); and
- (3) the introduction of an "Airport Improvement Fee" of \$10 to cover the capital expenditures (similar to that in place at Pearson International Airport).



The consultants state that “with a clear commitment to the airport’s future, it is believed that there are several carriers that would be interested in operating domestic and transborder services from the airport.” While the report does not specifically identify a dedicated airline, it does recommend that TCCA “request proposals for a new/expanded carrier operation at the airport to serve domestic and transborder operations with quiet turboprop aircraft “ (DHC8 or similar equipment).

The report further concludes that this scenario “generally meets the noise criteria set out in the Tripartite Agreement...there is a minor extension of the 28 NEF beyond the official 25 NEF on the east side....Through the implementation of a noise management plan, these deviations could be eliminated.”

From an economic perspective, this option is estimated to generate a cumulative \$3.4 billion (constant year 2000 dollars) of direct, indirect, and induced benefits over the 17-year period between 2003 and 2020, translating to an average impact of \$190 million per year. In addition, approximately 51% of the direct output would be from scheduled passenger traffic. “Direct employment levels are expected to increase by approximately 200 assuming that additional carrier(s) use the airport as their home base...During the years 2003 – 2010, direct employment levels are estimated to be 531 FTEs, and indirect plus induced at 1,045 for a total of 1,576 FTEs. During the years 2011 – 2020, direct employment is expected to be 461 FTEs, and indirect plus induced at 907 for a total employment level of 1,368.”

Under this scenario, TCCA’s deficit can quickly be eliminated and replaced with significant surpluses. According to an analysis completed by Finance staff on the Sypher:Mueller models, an acceptable rate of return can likely be achieved on the infrastructure investment even if passenger levels grow significantly more slowly than anticipated (i.e. passenger levels approximately 26% lower overall than in the Sypher:Mueller projections, with an initial passenger level ramp-up spread over three years from the time of infrastructure completion).

It would, therefore, appear that this proposal would be financially viable if an airline would commit to operations at TCCA. It is important to note, however, that potential carriers may continue to be concerned about the competitive response from Air Canada. It is impossible to estimate the value that Air Canada currently places on deterring other carriers from developing commuter flight operations at TCCA, and, therefore, to predict the depth of this response. To ensure fair competition, the Federal Government amended the Competition Act and Regulations to specifically address the potential “abuse of dominance in the airline industry”. The amendments give the Competition Bureau additional authority to investigate, enforce, and intervene to prevent injury to competition, and to prevent the elimination of a competitor or loss by a competitor of significant market share or revenue. Anti-competitive behaviour by a dominant carrier includes operating at a capacity or increasing capacity on a route or routes at fares that do not cover the avoidable cost of providing the service, or using a low-cost second brand carrier to do the same. The new authority given to the Competition Bureau includes the power to take immediate action and issue a temporary “cease and desist” order, even before a case is brought before the Competition Tribunal, to stop predatory or other anti-competitive actions before permanent damage is caused. Although the “Abuse of Dominance” provisions of the Act refer to the anti-competitive acts of a domestic airline service, in keeping with other provisions of the Act, the Bureau addresses concerns about foreign carriers on a similar basis. Ensuring fair competition may require ownership of the remaining flight slots at the airport.

## D2. The REGCO Proposal

Early in 2002, the TPA received an unofficial and unsolicited proposal from Regional Airlines Holdings Inc. (REGCO) to “rejuvenate the Toronto City Centre Airport.” Essentially the proposal calls for the private sector to invest \$551 million in upgrades to the TCCA in exchange for: (i) the operation of a TCCA-based airline servicing up to 17 Canadian and U.S. destinations within 500 nautical miles of Toronto with 15 Q400 Bombardier turboprop aircraft; and (ii) ownership of the remaining flight slots at the airport. The company projects that it will attract approximately 900,000 passengers per year within a four-year time frame, translating to a maximum of 130 turboprop flights a day (18 small, 112 large). The proposed destinations include Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Detroit, and Chicago, as well as Montreal, Ottawa, Quebec City, and Sudbury. Toronto’s key economic clusters have links to industries in each of these cities. Flights would operate on a schedule that serves primarily the business traveller, and would remain within the mandated TCCA hours of operation. In addition, the plan includes providing approximately 200 short-term parking spaces on airport lands, as well as a bus shuttle service from the downtown area.

The infrastructure, which REGCO proposes to construct, includes:

- a lift bridge to improve access to the TCCA and accommodate water traffic (\$20 million);
- a new passenger terminal capable of handling in excess of 800,000 passengers (\$21 million);
- check-in facilities at Union Station (\$5 million); and
- 15 fourth-generation Bombardier Q400 turboprop aircraft built locally at the deHavilland production facility in Downsview (\$505 million).

REGCO maintains that TCCA runway lengths and fuel storage facilities are sufficient for the implementation of its proposal and would require no upgrades. It also claims that environmental issues resulting from the proposal are “non-existent”, due to the advanced technology of the Q400 aircraft:

“studies conducted for aircraft certification conclude that the Q400-type aircraft satisfies the highest noise and emission standards with ease. The Q400 is about 40% quieter than average street traffic and quieter than the Dash 8 –100 on take-off. Emissions of a Q400 aircraft are 41% below the required Federal Aviation Regulation requirements, and the Q400 uses 30% less fuel than a regional jet. Rapid climb profiles and over-water flight paths will minimize noise for waterfront and Island residents. Greenspace at the TCCA grounds will be preserved and landscaped by REGCO”.

If implemented, REGCO claims that its proposal will yield \$800 million in direct and indirect benefits, more that \$210 million in annual tax revenues, increases in property values (citing the Toronto Real Estate Board’s opinion), the elimination of the City’s annual operation subsidy to the Toronto Port Authority, and the creation of 500 direct and indirect jobs at the TCCA, with an additional 3,000 jobs in Greater Toronto.

In terms of financial viability, the REGCO proposal is a private sector initiative, under which private sector investors assume all of the financial risk. Details of the business plan were not provided. REGCO would likely require assurance of the availability of sufficient flight slots at TCCA to allow it to increase service over time in accordance with its business plan.

Both the TPA and REGCO emphasize that Emergency Medical Services flights will be accommodated as a priority at TCCA at all passenger volume levels.

#### D3. Third Party Assessment of Proposals

Acres International Limited, in association with RWDI, was retained by staff of UDS to conduct due diligence with respect to both the REGCO and the Sypher:Mueller proposals, with particular focus on the current TCCA infrastructure.

The resultant conclusions for REGCO are as follows:

- (1) the Dash 8-Q400 can operate on the existing 4,000 foot runway (Runway 08/26); however, it should be noted that in some conditions payload restrictions may be applied depending on the air temperature, wind speeds, etc. at TCCA;
- (2) both a fixed link and a new terminal would be required to properly support the projected passenger level;
- (3) in order for the proposed peak-hour flight traffic to be accommodated, some modifications to the existing fuel facilities would be required. If Shell AeroCentre was awarded the commercial fuel supply contract, an additional fuel truck, an upgrade to the current truck-filling rate, and an additional storage tank would be required; and
- (4) in order to strictly comply with the Tripartite Agreement without the implementation of noise control measures, the number of turboprop aircraft movements at TCCA would be capped at either 114 or 116 per day (18 small, 96 – 98 large), depending on the mix of Dash 8-100 and Dash 8-Q400 aircraft. Based on this number, TCCA will not have a problem assigning slots to aircraft carriers. If REGCO did start up scheduled operations at TCCA, they would have to negotiate slot times with the respective authorities at the destination airports.

Acres also concluded that the expanded turboprop scenario in the Sypher:Mueller report allows for 130 turboprop movements per day (18 small, 112 large), which will comply with the noise constraints of the Agreement, provided specific noise management measures are implemented. Based on this number of daily movements, TCCA will also not have a problem assigning slots to the aircraft carriers.

#### D4. Legal Implications of Amending the Tripartite Agreement

This report already identifies several parts of the Tripartite Agreement that would have to be amended in order to facilitate enhancement of the current TCCA operations. These include removal of the prohibition on a fixed link between the airport and the mainland, and expansion

of the buildings on the site. Further amendments would have to be considered based on a determination of whether the particular proposal is in contravention of one of the terms of the Agreement.

Section 59 of the Agreement states that if at any time during the continuance of the Agreement the parties deem it necessary or expedient to make alterations or additions to the Agreement, they may do so by means of a written agreement between them. There is no provision for one of the parties to make a unilateral alteration or addition to the existing Agreement; amendments can only be made with the agreement of all parties. There are no provisions in the Agreement itself that specifically prohibit alteration of any of its terms.

If agreement on any issue with respect to any matter relating to application or interpretation of the Agreement cannot be reached between the City and the TPA that is not related to a default under the Agreement, then the matter may be referred to the Court for resolution. However, this provision only applies to terms in the existing agreement.

In earlier communications, Community AIR raised the issue of civil liability for nuisance claims if the TCCA is expanded. In terms of the City's civil liability for expansion of the airport operations, there is a risk that the City could be named as a party to an action in nuisance. However, in general plaintiffs have had very limited success in suing for damages for effects on their property due to construction of public works. One example dealt with the creation of Highway 407, which case was ultimately decided by the Supreme Court of Canada. Adjacent landowners brought an action in nuisance for a variety of effects, including loss of view, loss of prospect and loss of amenities. The plaintiffs were unsuccessful in proving their claim and the court found that there was nothing unreasonable in the Minister's decision to build the highway. The Minister was statutorily authorized to do so and furthermore, the necessity and utility of a highway for the public good far outweighed the disruption and injury visited upon the adjoining lands.

A more recent example from British Columbia dealt directly with the effects of a new airport runway on nearby residential properties. The homeowners complained of severe disruption to their daily lives and to the enjoyment of their homes. The noise was so great that many homeowners found it difficult to carry on telephone conversations within their homes and all stated that use of their backyards was no longer possible with jets flying overhead. The homeowners in that case were faced with upwards of 40,000 aircraft per year descending directly over their homes at low altitude and a high noise level. At the trial level, the court upheld the homeowner's claim in nuisance and awarded damages amounting to the diminution in value to their homes.

The case was appealed to the British Columbia Court of Appeal where it was overturned in a decision dated July 3, 2002. The higher court upheld the judge's decision that the claim in nuisance had been made out but found that the Minister of Transportation and the Airport Authority were entitled to rely on the defence of statutory authority. Our law recognizes that where Parliament has authorized that something be constructed or operated in a certain place, there can be no action in nuisance caused by the construction or operation if the nuisance is the inevitable result thereof. The court found that the combination of orders-in-council authorizing the Minister to enter into a lease with the Airport Authority for the operation of the airport, and the lease itself were ample statutory authority for the operation of the runway. Furthermore, the

increase in noise levels and vibrations felt by the neighbouring properties were an inevitable result of the operation. Therefore, the Minister and the Airport Authority were entitled to rely upon this defence as a complete answer to the claim.

In terms of expansion of operations at the TCCA, any potential claims from adjacent homeowners or other interested parties would first have to satisfy the test for establishing a nuisance. It is difficult to comment on the outcome of such a claim given that there are a variety of factors that need to be considered, including the actual increase in the noise level and the level of vibration, as well as the effect such increases would have on the individual homeowners and the enjoyment of their land. Based upon the few cases which have considered such claims, it appears that a substantial loss of enjoyment of property beyond mere inconvenience or annoyance would have to be established.

A party claiming for any nuisance caused by expansion of the TCCA operations would likely seek damages from the Minister and the Toronto Port Authority, as those would be the entities responsible for the creation, operation and management of the airport. Although a party to the Tripartite Agreement, it is unlikely that liability would attach to the City simply by virtue of being a lessor of the lands. If such a nuisance were established, the Minister and the TPA would likely rely on the defence of statutory authority. Again, the City would rely on the Tripartite Agreement, and the argument that the City is only a lessor of the lands and is not involved in the actual operation of the airport. Therefore, based on the recent British Columbia Court of Appeal case, the risk of a successful claim against the City in nuisance for an expansion of the TCCA appears minimal.

#### D5. Impacts of Enhancement with Amendments to the Tripartite Agreement on Emergency Medical Services

Heliport and air ambulance operations at the TCCA functioned well within the 400,000-passenger environment that existed in the 1980s. While the impact of additional airport activity beyond the 400,000 passenger level has not been studied, it can be assumed that heliports and other facilities available through Toronto's hospitals could be accessed for additional services if needed. In addition, with the use of larger turbo-prop aircraft, increased passenger volume may not equate to a material increase in the number of actual flights.

#### D6. Impacts of Enhancement with Amendments to the Tripartite Agreement on Economic Development

An Economic Impact Study prepared by Acres International Limited in August, 1988, at the peak of TCCA operations with annual passenger traffic of 400,000, identified that activity at the airport (including public and private sector expenditures and investment), combined with the spending of air travellers using TCCA, was associated with the following direct, indirect and induced impacts, calculated on a province-wide basis:

- \$183 million in business sales revenue;
- \$141 million contribution to Gross Provincial Products;
- over \$74 million in wages and salaries, and in excess of 4,000 person years of employment; and
- tax earnings by all levels of government over \$32 million.

The results indicated that Toronto receives slightly more than half of the impacts.

It can be assumed that similar benefits would be generated today if expansion to upwards of 400,000 passengers per annum were achieved.

### The Regional Airport System

Effective enhancement of TCCA activities would strengthen the region's flight traffic efficiency. In the same way an efficient road network requires a number of different elements (highways, arterial, collector, and local roads) to work as a system, developing an efficient air transport network for a region the size and scale of the GTA also requires a number of complementary elements. Each element has a specific role and serves a particular function within the system.

Lester B. Pearson International Airport is a major gateway to eastern North America for international and long haul domestic flights and cargo shipments.

The TCCA by contrast is the gateway and front door to Toronto, and is well-suited for regularly scheduled short-haul domestic and transborder flights for business travellers (and corporate aircraft), medevac flights serving Central Ontario, high value leisure tourism market destined for the downtown core, and general aviation. Consistent with federal government policy direction to encourage competition in the airline industry, the TCCA is a viable location for smaller airlines to access the Toronto market.

Buttonville Airport serves business travellers and corporate aircraft primarily destined for York Region business centres as well as general aviation and recreational flights.

The regional airport system should be managed to ensure that smaller aircraft are routed to smaller airports and do not use the scarce and expensive capacity at Pearson. Differences in the size and flight (takeoff and landing) dynamics of smaller vs. large aircraft create airside delays and increase costs to the airlines, airports and travelling public. Routing corporate and smaller airplanes with passengers destined to downtown Toronto to the TCCA provides for a more efficient regional airport system. Diverting smaller planes to Buttonville, Hamilton, or Oshawa would take those passengers destined from downtown Toronto farther away from their true destination.

### The Proposed Rail Link to Pearson International Airport

The impact on the TCCA of a new rail link between the downtown and Pearson International Airport depends on a number of factors. Obviously, each airport serves somewhat different and distinct markets. For most passengers flying to Toronto on shorthaul flights, destined for the downtown, the City Centre Airport offers an attractive alternative even with a new rail link to the downtown in place. The closeness of the TCCA to the downtown, its focus on regional carriers and smaller, more convenient size will continue to offer strong advantages over Pearson for air passengers destined to and from the downtown area.

### Economic Clusters

Expansion of TCCA services would also offer many benefits and opportunities to Toronto's diverse economic clusters.

The Financial Services sector and Business and Professional Services sector, for example, account for about 340,000 jobs within the City (more than half located within the Central Area) and represent about 25% of total employment within the City, as well as a significant proportion of the high-value added office activity that is critical to the economic vitality of the downtown core. These, and other major industry clusters such as Biotechnology, Film and Television, Fashion and Apparel, are highly export oriented, selling goods, services, products and advice around the world. They rely heavily on face-to-face contact, and, therefore, on proximity and ease of access to and for clients. The TCCA is ideally located to provide service to U.S. and Canadian destinations important to the development of these key economic clusters. More than 80% of passengers currently using the TCCA are business travellers who choose the airport because of its close location to the central core. The long delays at Pearson (and most large international airports) at both the departure and arrival end of trips is a major point of dissatisfaction with many business travellers, particularly for short duration (often same day) trips and a reality that can clearly work to the advantage of the TCCA.

In addition, economic success and accessibility go hand-in-hand. The accessibility provided by the TCCA could be important to the success of the proposed “Convergence Centre” in the Central Waterfront. The Mississauga Corporate Centre (Eglinton Avenue/Renforth Drive), immediately south of Pearson International Airport, is an example of the importance of accessibility in attracting investment and jobs.

#### Attracting and Supporting Convention and Leisure Tourism

Tourism is one of the largest and most important industries in Toronto’s economy. As Canada’s largest city, Toronto acts as a gateway for commerce, culture and tourism. The downtown has the highest concentration of arts and culture in the region and the country. Toronto competes for both leisure and convention tourism business in a very competitive North American marketplace.

The TCCA is ideally suited to provide convenient service to major markets in the U.S. Border States including cities such as Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, as well as major Canadian cities such as Ottawa, Montreal and urban centres in northern Ontario. It provides a unique opportunity to develop and market a diverse mix of packaged tour products for weekend hotel stays, theatre, sporting events, cultural events, dining, etc.

It could also be a key asset in attracting major international events. There is a significant opportunity cost for the current underutilization of the National Trade Centre and Exhibition Place. The accessibility to the high value added convention markets provided by the TCCA would boost the marketing and development potential of these important assets.

#### D7. Impacts of Enhancement with Amendments to the Tripartite Agreement on the Waterfront Revitalization Initiative

In 1987 when the TCCA was operating at its “peak” with 400,000 passengers per year, the population of the Bathurst Quay and Harbourfront neighbourhoods was approximately 400 people in 203 dwellings. Since then there has been a tremendous amount of development in these neighbourhoods with the influx of new residential uses, community facilities, a school and cultural facilities. According to Statistics Canada information, by 2001, there were

approximately 4,687 people in 3,022 dwelling units for the same area. So far, these neighbourhoods have been able to coexist with the TCCA at present low passenger levels of approximately 100,000.

Enhancement to 650,000 passengers per year (Sypher:Mueller) could have a much broader effect on the Central Waterfront as a whole. It is likely to impact the type of land uses attracted to the area and may result in more industrial or warehouse-type development and less residential development in the Port Lands.

Further enhancement to 900,000 passengers per year (REGCO) could affect the larger objectives of the Central Waterfront Plan. The expansion could impact the quality of people's enjoyment in the proposed network of new waterfront parks and public spaces. The higher level of environmental standards envisioned for the Central Waterfront could be undermined, as could the balance of compatible waterfront uses.

Enhancement of the TCCA at any level would necessitate a fixed link to meet fire safety requirements and passenger demands. A bridge at the foot of Bathurst Street which runs directly through the Bathurst Quay neighbourhood just east of the existing ferry slip has been approved by Council, subject to a number of conditions.

A design study concluded that a bridge with a moveable centre span that can be raised and lowered would be the best way of providing a link across the Western Gap. The design of the bridge would require reconfiguration of Bathurst Street south of Queen's Quay to provide for pedestrians, vehicles, enhanced emergency response capabilities, and access to adjacent properties. During the boating season, the bridge would be raised and lowered a maximum of twice an hour, effectively closing it to traffic for a total of 20 minutes per hourly operating cycle.

A bridge to serve the airport has raised a number of concerns:

- according to members of the boating community, it will disrupt boating traffic, result in congestion and may create unsafe boating conditions for vessels using the Western Gap during the summer boating season;
- traffic would increase along Bathurst Street in the Bathurst Quay neighbourhood increasing pollution from vehicles queuing to cross the bridge; and
- a re-configured four lane Bathurst Street south of Queen's Quay with greater vehicular volume increases the potential conflict between vehicles and pedestrians, including school children who, as a "short cut", would cross the street mid-block between the Harbourfront Community Centre/Waterfront Public School and Little Norway Park.

While these concerns were dealt with in the Environmental Assessment process, the TPA should be requested to prepare an updated traffic study to identify and address the impacts of TCCA growth, as well as a fixed link, on the Bathurst Quay and Harbourfront neighbourhoods. This study is discussed further in section D11 in the context of the TPA business plan which was submitted on September 19, 2002.



With the introduction of the bridge, parking would be transferred to airport lands. The City should encourage the use of public transit to access the airport through such means as a shuttle bus service operating between Union Station, the major hotels in the downtown area and the airport in order to limit the amount and location of passenger parking that is provided in conjunction with any airport enhancement. In addition, if passenger volumes at the airport were eventually to rise beyond the annual level of 600,000, the question of access and parking would need to be re-thought. The construction of a remote terminal in conjunction with the use of shuttle bus services would be required to handle passenger growth at these levels.

D8. Impacts of Enhancement with Amendments to the Tripartite Agreement on Public and Environmental Health

While the discussion under the status quo scenario with respect to the impact of TCCA operations on air quality, water quality, and noise will continue to hold true and be enhanced under a growth scenario, available data does not to quantify the potential health burden.

Members of the public have raised concern as to the heightened levels of pollution that would result from enhanced operations at TCCA. Each of the two enhancement scenarios would generate increased ground activity, including traffic to and from the airport. Possible responses to this include stepped-up enforcement of the City's anti-idling by-law and more extensive landscaping to produce a buffering effect.

Enhancement of TCCA operations would also increase potential sources of water pollution related to de-icing and anti-icing activities. It would be essential to ensure that the TCCA uses state-of-the-art methods for containing, recycling or eliminating contaminated runoff from the airport.

Finally, if TCCA service were to be enhanced and buffering provisions are not made, the level of noise, and/or the frequency with which noise events are experienced, will increase. Also, if the amount of aircraft traffic in any single flight path increases, specific communities may experience increased or new airport-related noise.

Acres International Limited, in association with RWDI, was retained by staff of UDS to conduct due diligence regarding the noise implications of the Sypher:Mueller expanded turboprop scenario and the REGCO proposal. It is important to note that Transport Canada's mandated flight paths for take-offs and landings at TCCA require commercial aircraft to turn to or approach from the south.

With respect to the Sypher:Mueller scenario, it was concluded that "all scenarios are capable of falling within the noise parameters required by the Tripartite Agreement." However, as the NEF 28 noise contours slightly exceed to the east of the NEF 25 contour limits, it will be necessary to implement specific noise management measures. The indicated excursions above the Tripartite Agreement contour limits occur over water, and the resulting expanded turboprop scenario NEF 25 contour does not encroach on any noise-sensitive land mass. Furthermore, "it should be noted that the noise issues examined address only noise captured by the NEF model (i.e. aircraft in flight and takeoff or landing rolls). Noise studies conducted as part of the Fixed Link environmental assessment to address aircraft noise at the TCCA identified that at some

localized areas north of the airport, taxi and gate noise generated by aircraft were in fact the dominant noise source. This issue of ground-based noise is not addressed under the Tripartite Agreement but nonetheless may be of concern to the closest residences”.

With respect to the REGCO proposal, if only REGCO is operating scheduled Dash 8 commercial flights at TCCA, the noise levels should fall within the parameters required by the Tripartite Agreement, as this option proposes a smaller number of quieter aircraft to those used in the Sypher:Mueller expanded turboprop scenario.

However, if the existing air carriers continue to operate their existing commercial flights, there would be a cap on the number of REGCO flights that could be added. In order to draw these conclusions, the number of large turboprop movements were maintained at a daily maximum level equal to the Sypher:Mueller expanded turboprop scenario of 112, and the small turboprop flights were maintained at existing levels of 18, for a total of 130. The analysis which was conducted varied the split of the 112 movements between REGCO and Air Canada (which uses older, louder Dash 8 – 100 aircraft). Maintaining existing Air Canada service levels at 34 flights per day would result in REGCO’s number of daily flights being capped at 78. Rather than carrying 900,000 passengers as proposed, REGCO could serve only 792,000 within this maximum. However TCCA would serve approximately 1,025,000 passengers per year in total. The same noise management measures as identified in the Sypher:Mueller expanded turboprop would need to be implemented in this case as well.

It was further concluded that the noise parameters of the Tripartite Agreement could accommodate anywhere from 114 to 116 turboprop movements a day (18 small, 96 to 98 large, depending on the aircraft mix), without any noise management measures being required. This would translate to an annual passenger level between 847,000 and 1,020,000.

#### D9. Impacts of Enhancement with Amendments to the Tripartite Agreement on Parks and Recreation Operations

Recreational and tour boat operations are important activities in the Central Waterfront. The Parks and Recreation Division leases City parkland sites to fourteen yacht and sailing clubs containing over 9,000 mooring spaces, owns two major commercial marinas, and operates hundreds of transient boat mooring slips both on the mainland and on the Toronto Islands. Parks and Recreation also operate the Toronto Island Ferry System, which consists of five ferryboats that transport a yearly average of 1.3 million passengers to the Toronto Islands from the Ferry Terminal at the foot of Bay Street. The service operates year round and is governed by a variety of federal and provincial statutes.

The recent expansion of the keepout buoys by the TPA in the western part of the harbour has restricted marine traffic in the western section of the harbour. The new perimeter designation and keepout buoy placement to the east of the TCCA has constrained the channel at the entrance to the Hanlan’s Point Ferry Terminal. As a result the ferry servicing this location has had to adjust its routing and the narrow channel poses a constraint to marine traffic in this area.

With respect to the natural environment, TCCA operations are governed by Transport Canada safety regulations, which, among other things, impose limitations on the height of obstructions in the operating area of the airport. As a result, over the past 20 years, trees in the operating area of the airport on Hanlan's Point have been pruned and "topped" (i.e. where the top of the tree is removed), a poor arboricultural practice.

In the context of the Waterfront Revitalization, these impacts may be offset by the new parks and open space proposed for the Central Waterfront. Significant expansion of the TCCA, however, could impact the recreational and environmental effectiveness of these new spaces.

#### D10. The Jet Scenario

The Sypher:Mueller report also identified the option of modifying TCCA operations to introduce jet service to central domestic and U.S. markets while continuing turboprop service to destinations in the North (northern routes cannot support jet service). While this scenario would see fewer flights at TCCA on a daily basis, there is considerable public resistance to the introduction of jets, and, as a result, this alternative is likely not feasible.

#### D11. The TPA Business Plan for TCCA and the Fixed Link

On September 19 2002, the TPA submitted a new business plan for the TCCA, together with information on the design and the environmental assessment of the proposed bridge.

The plan seeks to position TCCA as the smart alternative for the regional domestic and transborder traveller. TCCA will use its proximity to downtown Toronto to attract and serve a niche market for high frequency, short haul flights to destinations within a 400 nautical mile radius.

To achieve this objective, the TPA is proposing to implement operations based on the expanded turboprop scenario in the Sypher:Mueller report, with "no plan for jets", a course of action which they feel will ensure a profitable airport with sustainable growth.

The business plan proposes the construction of a bridge over 2003 and 2004 identical in design to that which was presented to the Planning and Transportation Committee in June of 1999, together with a new terminal to be built over 2004 and 2005, at a cost of \$20 million each. Construction of a bridge eliminates the need for the existing ferry operation and immediately improves customer service. The ferry operation is a costly and unreliable service in winter, and the primary reason for the TCCA's annual deficit. The plan also contemplates the longer term, and, with a view to ensuring that future automobile traffic to the airport can be managed, indicates that part or all of the new terminal facility may be built off-site. Other infrastructure improvements, which have not been costed nor included in the financial projections, include "runway lighting, runway resurfacing, and the development of the TCCA south-side".

With this infrastructure in place, the TPA feels it will be able to attract new airlines and charter services by offering incentives to "new entrant" carriers, primarily through a slot allocation mechanism. The goal of the slot allocation policy is to generate a competitive environment by providing start-up carriers with protection from predatory business activities and assurance of

future slot availability to grow their businesses. The addition of other carriers is expected to expand current markets and develop markets currently untapped. The policy also acts as an incentive to attract and retain TCCA-based carriers by giving preference in the allocation of slots to airlines with base operations at TCCA.

As well, an aggressive marketing strategy will be undertaken, specifically aimed at targeting airlines, travel agents, regional travellers, and businesses.

Furthermore, the fee structure will be amended as follows:

- new landing fees of \$2.40 per tonne will be introduced. In 2004, this will be increased to \$4.80 per tonne;
- passenger user fees will be increased by \$3.00 per passenger to \$15.00, plus the existing \$2.00 security charge. As new carriers enter the market and traffic increases, this fee may be reduced;
- a passenger facility fee will be introduced at \$10.00 per enplanement in November, 1, 2002, and as new carriers enter the market and traffic increases, will become an airport improvement fee dedicated to the capital program; and
- an access surcharge will be introduced when the bridge is opened.

The fee structure has been developed to be compensatory, while remaining competitive with Pearson Airport.

The business plan includes financial projections of three scenarios, as described below. The plan indicates that passenger traffic is expected to take a one-time jump as new services are initiated, and will grow at 2.5% per year thereafter (or 4% for the low growth scenario). The projections are based on conservative estimates of market share (mainline domestic 6%, north domestic 12.6%, transborder 8.4%) relative to past experience. However, a detailed breakdown of revenues, expenses, and passenger levels has not been provided beyond 2007, although the summary net present value calculations which have been included, and which form the basis of the conclusions with respect to viability, are based on a twenty-year time frame. In summary, the scenarios are:

- “Baseline”, in which traffic grows in accordance with the Sypher:Mueller expanded turboprop option, and which includes the construction of a bridge and terminal. A new carrier would enter into the market and traffic would increase to 468,000 by 2007, the airport’s operations would breakeven in 2004. The net present value of the revenues from the airport improvement fee and the positive cash flow from operations over a twenty year period (together totalling \$48.7 million, including provisions for debt interest and amortization) would more than cover the \$40 million of capital requirements, assuming a discount rate of just under 5%;

- “High growth”, which “reflects discussions with interested carriers. Traffic grows to over 800,000 by 2007 through rapid route expansion...This option also includes building a bridge link and terminal building.” The net present value of the revenues from the airport improvement fee and the positive cash flow from operations over a twenty year period (together totalling \$86.9 million, including provisions for debt interest and amortization) would more than cover the \$40 million of capital requirements, assuming a discount rate of just under 5%; and
- “Low growth”, in which “passenger traffic numbers increase when the bridge is opened, but at a lower rate. A new terminal facility is not built, and existing facilities remain in use. The airport is breakeven at approximately 200,000 passengers” in 2004. The net present value of the revenues from the airport improvement fee and the positive cash flow from operations over a twenty year period (together totalling \$25.5 million, including provisions for debt interest and amortization) would more than cover the \$20 million of capital requirements, assuming a discount rate of just under 5%. This scenario represents a fall back position if a new carrier has not been signed at the point in time when a decision is to be made on building a new terminal.

In order to cover the capital expenditures, the TPA specifies that project financing would be structured so that the “revenue streams specific to the project are pledged for debt service. For TCCA, this means that the PFF/AIF collected would be used to service debt”.

In addition, TPA would consider airline deficiency agreements in which carriers pledge to make up any deficiency in annual debt service payments, and in which a further fee may be allocated to the individual carriers on an equitable basis (weight landed or passengers). Other potential sources of financing cited are various forms of private/public partnerships.

Finally, the TPA will review the several written offers it has received to finance the infrastructure and will assess these to determine the most advantageous proposal. “The TPA will explore financing options and may issue an RFP in this regard. This project may also be funded through funding arrangements in the Tripartite Agreement, or may qualify for a subsidy in the form of Airport Capital Assistance Program (ACAP) funding from the Federal government (Transport Canada). However, the bridge link and terminal at TCCA will not depend on government assistance”.

While the plan is both thorough and strategic, there are several specific areas requiring clarification and/or additional information. These are as follows:

- the TPA states that “the turboprop scenario works within the terms of the Tripartite Agreement between the Toronto Port Authority, Transport Canada, and the City of Toronto. In fact, given that the Agreement specifically prohibits the construction of a fixed link and the construction of a new terminal, this is not the case;
- the business plan cites that “the bridge link and the new terminal at TCCA will not depend on government assistance, while, at the same time, indicating that “funding could come through funding arrangements in the Tripartite Agreement, or TCCA may qualify for a subsidy in the form of Airport Capital Assistance Program (ACAP) funding from

the Federal government.” However, funding through the Tripartite Agreement would require government contributions, and, moreover, such a mechanism currently does not exist;

- detailed financial calculations and passenger levels beyond 2007 have not been provided;
- the costs of the additional infrastructure upgrades (e.g. runway lighting, runway resurfacing, development of the TCCA south-side) have not been provided or included in the financial projections, although these could likely be covered by the excess of cash flows which will be generated under the three scenarios;
- the baseline scenario generates annual cash flows available for financing capital expenditures which are similar (approximately 10% lower) to the Sypher:Mueller expanded turboprop projections, but the composition of revenues and expenditures are substantially different;
- the low growth scenario identifies that a 5% real rate of return can be achieved even if passenger levels are only 50% of those projected in the baseline forecast. However, this option excludes the construction of a terminal. It would appear unlikely that any additional carriers would be based at TCCA without this infrastructure being in place to support their operations, and it is not apparent how a low passenger growth scenario would render a new terminal unnecessary. Furthermore, although the business plan states that Passenger User Fee revenues vary with traffic levels, the amounts included in the low growth scenario are only 4.9% lower than in the baseline forecasts, even though passenger traffic levels are 50% lower. In fact, if the PUF revenues are reduced proportionately to passenger traffic, this would translate to a reduction of 60% in the net cash flow available for financing the capital expenditures;
- the proposed plan does not identify a comprehensive set of measures to mitigate the environmental and health effects of any enhancement to TCCA; and
- the proposed plan does not identify any plans for a traffic management study which should be conducted to update the impacts of TCCA expansion, as well as a fixed link, on the Bathurst Quay and Harbourfront neighbourhoods.

The TPA should be requested to address these concerns, and to provide a copy to the City of the performance bond it will enter into with its contractor(s) ensuring that the construction of the fixed link will be completed according to the City’s directives, or, if this is not possible, that the TCCA site would be returned to an appropriate condition.

#### D12. Conclusion: Option (D) – Enhancement, with Amendments to the Tripartite Agreement

Enhancement of operations at the TCCA is required if the airport is to become financially viable and sustainable in the long term. This would require amendments to the Tripartite Agreement to permit improvements to terminal operations, the construction of a fixed link and the implementation of processes required to minimize the environmental impact of increased activity.

Investment in this option is not without financial risks. Effective strategies would be required to mitigate possible actions by existing TCCA carriers to limit competition and to ensure that the resources, business plan and marketing supports are in place to achieve growth and revenue projections. Consideration must also be given to minimizing the potential impacts of an enhanced airport on the objectives of the Central Waterfront Secondary Plan.

Conclusions:

Staff across all relevant City departments have considered the financial, legal, community health, environmental, and economic impacts of four operational scenarios for the future of TCCA. The Medical Officer of Health has remained neutral on the question of whether TCCA operations should decrease, remain the same, or expand. However, the MOH has drawn attention to the scientific literature describing the health effects of airports and their associated ground operations, and has noted that both air pollution and noise impacts can be expected to increase with increased activities of the TCCA.

Of the four options, both the status quo, and enhancement within the parameters of the Tripartite Agreement, were deemed to be inviable. The decision before Council is therefore a choice between doing nothing (which will likely result in eventual closure), or enhancement beyond the parameters of the Tripartite Agreement (specifically the “expanded turboprop” option). The latter is the sole course of action which will ensure the profitability of airport operations. It will, however, require substantial capital upgrades to TCCA facilities (the most significant of which will be the construction of a fixed link).

In fact, in 1998, Council recommended the adoption of a fixed link to TCCA being built in the form of a bridge, subject to certain conditions being met. Furthermore, in 1999, the Planning and Transportation Committee deferred consideration of a report with respect to a proposed design of the bridge pending several conditions being met. The directives from both meetings are outlined in Appendix A.

The construction of the bridge will require amendments to the existing Tripartite Agreement, which expressly prohibits such a structure. It will be necessary to ensure that any amendments will preserve the principles of the current Agreement, and that factors which would mitigate the impacts of TCCA enhancement on the environment and on the Central Waterfront neighbourhoods are included.

Finally, as one of three parties to the Tripartite Agreement, the City does not have the right or power to unilaterally force a closing of the TCCA.

Contact:

Elaine C. Baxter-Trahair  
Waterfront Project Director  
(416) 397-4083 ebaxter@city.toronto.on.ca

---

## Appendix (A)

### (i) Conditions Applied to Council's Approval of a Fixed Link

On December 16 and 17, 1998, City Council recommended the adoption of a fixed link to the City Centre Airport being built in the form of a bridge, subject to:

- (a) the approval of the design of the bridge by the Fire Chief, the General Manager, Ambulance Services, and City Council.

Status: the recommended design of the bridge as presented to the Planning and Transportation Committee in June of 1999 addressed all safety concerns identified by the Fire Chief and the General Manager, Ambulance Services.

- (b) the final design of the bridge being submitted to the Urban Environment and Development Committee for review and approval for consistency with established urban design objectives along the waterfront.

Status: the recommended design of the bridge as presented to the Planning and Transportation Committee in June of 1999 was consistent with all established urban design objectives.

- (c) the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer being requested to submit a report to the Urban Environment and Development Committee recommending that City Council give approval to the bridge's business plan.

Status: the business plan for the proposed TCCA operations, including the construction of a bridge, was submitted by the TPA on September 19, 2002.

- (d) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services being requested to submit a report to the Urban Environment and Development Committee, prior to the authorization of the alteration of Bathurst Street, on the cost of such alteration and the source of funding.

Status: this information was included in the report on the bridge design to the Planning and Transportation Committee in June of 1999.

- (e) the Toronto Harbour Commission and the Port Authority being required to monitor and report annually to the Urban Environment and Development Committee on the effects of the bridge operation, as requested by the City.

Status: outstanding until such time as the bridge is implemented.

- (f) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services being requested to submit a report to the Urban Environment and Development Committee on the impact of the Fixed Link on traffic patterns along the waterfront and what concrete traffic calming options exist, such a report to seek the input of local residents and be the subject of a public meeting.



Status: this information was included in the report on the bridge design to the Planning and Transportation Committee in June of 1999. Four community consultation meetings were held as part of the bridge design process.

- (g) approval being conditional upon a legally binding commitment that not one penny of City tax dollars will be spent on the bridge or on Airport losses which result from the bridge financing.

Status: the business plan which was submitted by TPA on September 19, 2002 included in this information.

- (h) the Canadian Coast Guard and/or the Federal Fisheries Ministry be requested to submit to the Urban Environment and Development Committee, their report on the impact of the fixed link (bridge ) to the City Centre Airport.

Status: the environmental assessment process incorporated the consideration of the Coast Guard's concerns.

- (i) the Greater Toronto Airports Authority (GTAA), as a courtesy, be requested to make available to the City of Toronto, through the Office of the Mayor and the Chairs of the Economic Development Committee and the Urban Environment and Development Committee, its analysis and conclusions as to the City Centre Airport forecasted passenger volumes and financial implications, and further, that Mayor Lastman be requested to expeditiously forward this request to the GTAA verbatim and in writing.

Status: outstanding,

- (j) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services be requested to submit a report to the Urban Environment and Development Committee on the facts of the flight paths of commuter aircraft which use the City Centre Airport, at present and as projected for the future.

Status: this issue of flight paths was addressed in a report from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services which was considered by Council on November 6, 2001 (Planning and Transportation Committee Report 12, Clause 2). The report concludes that "the responsibility for aviation safety rests primarily with the Federal Minister of Transport. The long-term compatibility of continued and/or expanded airport operations in the City's developing waterfront area depends on a number of factors including aircraft safety. This is best assessed by the Federal Minister of Transport in keeping with his responsibilities as defined in the Aeronautics Act." Council received this report, and deferred further consideration concerning future levels of activity at the Toronto Island Airport until such time at the Chief Administrative Officer has reported back on the negotiations with the Toronto Port Authority.

Council also directed:

- (1) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, in consultation with appropriate staff, to continue discussion and consultation on the appropriate role of the

City Centre Airport and its relationship to other uses and activities in the waterfront, and the impacts that these matters might have on the terms of both the Tripartite and Subsidy Agreements to which the City is a party;

- (2) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services and the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services to report on an assessment of the emergency response capability of the bridge, tunnel and ferry, including suggested improvements to the operation of each option; and
- (3) the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, in consultation with appropriate staff, continue to compile technical information on the bridge and tunnel options but the decision on the type of fixed link required be deferred until the matters raised in recommendations (i) to (k) be resolved.

Status: the above requested information was included in the report on the bridge design to the Planning and Transportation Committee in June of 1999.

- (ii) Directives resulting from the Planning and Transportation Committee's consideration of the report dated June 17<sup>th</sup>, 1999 from the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services with respect to the design of the bridge to the Toronto City Centre Airport

The Committee deferred consideration of the report until the following conditions are met:

- (a) the Business Plan for the Airport is approved.

Status: a business plan for TCCA was submitted in 1998, and an analysis thereof by the Finance Department was included in the report considered by Council on December 17 and 18, 1998. At that time, Finance concluded that:

“the single most significant factor underlying the feasibility of the Business Plan is the achievement of forecast passenger levels. The level of risk and uncertainty inherent in the estimates are sufficient to transform accumulated surpluses into accumulated deficits over the five year period (being considered, i.e. 1998 – 2002). However, an acceptable level of risk for investment of this nature can be adequately assessed only after identifying and quantifying the economic benefits of expansion of airport operations including a fixed link to the airport. As a result, the plan includes strategies and options to minimize the financial impact of the risks and uncertainty identified in this review.

The ability of airport operations to be financially self-sustaining in the future is largely dependent on such critical factors as market share, routes, and passenger levels. Because of the uniqueness of airport operations and the industry practices used to determine market potential, a definitive answer as to the feasibility of the Business Plan may require the services of independent experts.”

Finance also identified a number of key areas where additional information is required, specifically market research and analysis, passenger levels and surplus/deficit forecasts, expenditure estimates, and details of the Toronto Harbour Commissioners reserve balances.

An updated business plan for the proposed TCCA operations, including the construction of a bridge, was submitted by the TPA on September 19, 2002.

(b) the Federal Government has given its final approval for the Environmental Assessment.

Status: the environmental assessment for the fixed link received approval on September 10, 1999, subject to the “mitigation measures” identified in the Dillon report being implemented. These include measures related to the construction, operation, and maintenance phases of the project.

(c) a permit under the Navigable Waters Protection Act has been issued by the Canada Coast Guard.

Status: outstanding.

(d) the transfer or lease from the Federal Government to the City of the lands currently used for parking and access to the ferry.

Status: outstanding. This transfer will occur only after a design for the bridge has been approved.

The Committee also requested staff to report on the approaches to the bridge at both ends.

Status: the information with respect to the land – side end of the bridge was included in the June 17<sup>th</sup>, 1999 report. The approach at the airport end will be subject to the TCCA site plan design.

Councillor Disero declared an interest with respect to Toronto City Centre Airport, and advised that the nature of her interest is that she is one of the parties named in a litigation matter related to the Toronto Port Authority.

---

The joint Planning and Transportation and Economic Development and Parks Committee had before it a confidential report (October 23, 2002) from the City Solicitor respecting the status of litigation with the Toronto Port Authority, having regard that the subject matter relates to litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board.

The joint Planning and Transportation and Economic Development and Parks Committee also had before it the following material and copies thereof are on file in the office of the City Clerk, City Hall:

- appended to the communication (October 10, 2002) from the City Clerk, Waterfront Reference Group:
  - communication (September 13, 2002) from Joe Altieri submitting a document examining the campaign of Community AIR to close the Toronto City Centre Airport;

- communication (August 29, 2002) from Irene Fedun, Green Dragon Landscaping objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 17, 2002) from Laszlo (Les) Jarmai objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 19, 2002) from George and Niki Sekely objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 17, 2002) from Gerald H. Parker, President, Beyond Ability International supporting the continuance of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 4, 2002) from Bonnie & Jerry Good objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (August 26, 2002) from Roger Wilson, Fasken Martineau DuMoulin, Barristers & Solicitors submitting letter (August 7, 2002) from Roger D. Wilson addressed to Lydia Danylcw, Waterfront Secretariat, (April 4, 2002) from Roger D. Wilson and letter (April 15, 2002) from Paul Henderson objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 23, 2002) from Denys Jones objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 22, 2002) from Cam Miller objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 22, 2002) from Eliza Wong objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 22, 2002) from Michael Page objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 23, 2002) from Allan Sparrow, Community Air forwarding submissions objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 22, 2002) from Rosanne Renzetti objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 18, 2002) from Doreen Hamilton objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 18, 2002) from Karin Michael objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;

- communication (September 23, 2002) from Nicky Perry objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 23, 2002) from Sharon Oatway objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 23, 2002) from Yvonne Parti objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 24, 2002) from Lori Nancy Kalamanski objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 24, 2002) from Joan Cohl objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 23, 2002) from Rod Seiling, President, Greater Toronto Hotel Association, supporting the continuance of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 20, 2002) from the City Clerk forwarding for the information of the Waterfront Reference Group, a list of written submissions relating to the Toronto City Centre Airport which were included on the February 20, 2002 agenda of the Waterfront Reference Group;
- communication (September 28, 2002) from Chris Kelk objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 27, 2002) from Penelope Tyndale objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 28, 2002) from Luis Alfredo Carrasco supporting the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 26, 2002) from Kevin Psutka, President & C.E.O, Canadian Owners and Pilots Association supporting the continuance of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 26, 2002) from Warner Cowan supporting the continuance, but not expansion, of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 2002) from Brenda Roman objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 30, 2002) from Rosanna Crabbe objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 1, 2002) from Ian Russell objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;

- communication (October 1, 2002) from Lynne Besner objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 2, 2002) from Richard Reinert objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 1, 2002) from Jane O'Callaghan objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 30, 2002) from John Firth objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 2, 2002) from Greg Bonser objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 2, 2002) from Cheryl Reid objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 3, 2002) from Zella Wolofsky objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 2, 2002) from Kim Mandzy objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 3, 2002) from Carol Bigwood objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 3, 2002) from Paul Copeland objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 3, 2002) from Paul Kirby objecting to a bridge connecting the Island;
- communication (October 3, 2002) from Lee Rickwood objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 3, 2002) from Ron Monteith, President, St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association, objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 4, 2002) from The Bristons objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 1, 2002) from Jerry Englar objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 1, 2002) from Leida Englar objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;

- communication (October 1, 2002) from Tom Patterson objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 23, 2002) from Patricia MacKay objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 2, 2002) from John T. Morin, The Royal Canadian Yacht Club, objecting to the proposed bridge connecting the Island;
- communication (undated) from Karen Langlois objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 4, 2002) from Eric Holzwarth objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 4, 2002) from Lois James objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 4, 2002) from Chris Damiano objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 4, 2002) from Corinne Moore objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 6, 2002) from Judy Malkin objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Geoff Evason objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Bob Gibson submitting comments on the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 1, 2002) from Dwight Peters objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 6, 2002) from Phyllis Platt objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (undated) from Michael Colgrass objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 4, 2002) from Margaret Whitfield objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 6, 2002) from Joseph Ho objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;

- communication (October 4, 2002) from Steve Bellantoni objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Terri Tenberg objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Dan Y. Zabelishensky objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 5, 2002) from Dorothy Holmes objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 4, 2002) from Deborah Speyer objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 6, 2002) from Elaine Gold objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 6, 2002) from Hugh MacKay objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 3, 2002) from Ron Monteith, President, St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association, objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 2, 2002) from Nancy White objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 2, 2002) from Jeff Vile objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 3, 2002) from Joanna Sworn and David Sworn objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 3, 2002) from Sandra Bain objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 4, 2002) from Malcolm King objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 5, 2002) from Laszlo J. Jarmai objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Trevor Shaw supporting the continuance of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 4, 2002) from B.R. Holmes supporting the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;



- communication (October 7, 2002) from Christy Manis objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Cathy Waiten objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Alanna McDonagh objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from O. John Hawkins objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 2, 2002) from Henry Ding supporting the continuance of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (undated) from Stig Harvor opposing the continuance of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Ann Bosley, President, Toronto Real Estate Board, supporting the continuance of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (April 23, 2002) from Chris Ridabock, Chair and M. Elyse Allan, President and C.E.O., The Toronto Board of Trade supporting the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Peter Lukas, President, Showline Limited forwarding concerns respecting the noise levels from over-flight helicopters;
- communication (October 4, 2002) from Carol L. Holmes, Administration and Property Management, City Centre Aviation Ltd., supporting the continuance of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Ann Lovering objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Irene Fedun objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Dr. Moira McQueen objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Rebecca Schechter objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Sophie Perrault objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Tim Flawn & Peggy Slegers objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;

- communication (October 8, 2002) from Alice E. Courtney objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Tibor Major objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Irene E. Grubb objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Suzanne Fitzpatrick objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 8, 2002) from Joan York objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 8, 2002) from Jason D. Craig objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Ronny Yaron objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (September 26, 2002) from Karen Tzventarny objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 8, 2002) from Keri Wong, Tanya Battersby, Marta Polack, Robert Osborne and David Hsia objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 8, 2002) from Karin Tari objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 8, 2002) from Linda Sheppard objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 8, 2002) from Wilfrid Walker, Board Member for Transport 2000 Ontario. forwarding concerns respecting the airport;
- communication (undated) from Allan Sparrow, Outreach Coordinator, Community AIR, submitting concerns regarding the expansion of the airport;
- communication (undated) from Michael Rosenberg, Economics of Technology Working Group forwarding concerns regarding planning relating to the Portlands;
- communication (October 8, 2002) from Elyse Allan, President and C.E.O., The Toronto Board of Trade, supporting the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;

- communication (October 8, 2002) from Andy Manahan, Development Promotion Representative, Universal Workers Union, Local 183, supporting the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 8, 2002) from Mitchell Gold, International Association of Educators for World Peace, objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 8, 2002) from Victor Pappalardo, President, Trans Capital Air Ltd., supporting the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 8, 2002) from Hamish Wilson objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 8, 2002) from Ben Smith Lea, President and Elizabeth Quance, Secretary, Niagara Neighbourhood Association, objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport;
- communication (October 8, 2002) from Rosario Marchese, MPP, Trinity-Spadina, objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport; and
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Ane Christensen and John McCluskey filed by Boris Broz objecting to the expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport.
- communication (May 2, 2002) from Jason Self, Web Consultant, Adeo Communications;
- communication (May 2, 2002) from Robert Bernecky, C.E.O., Snake Island Research Inc.;
- communication (May 2, 2002) from Margaret Needham;
- communication (May 3, 2002) from Vince Corn;
- communication (May 3, 2002) from Jennifer Amey;
- communication (May 7, 2002) from Nick Elson;
- communication (May 7, 2002) from Karen Langlois;
- communication (May 9, 2002) from Moya Ashby;
- communication (May 11, 2002) from Dave Lomasd;
- communication (May 12, 2002) from Joan Cohl;
- communication (May 15, 2002) from Peter Taylor;

- communication (May 20, 2002) from Andrew Flynn;
- communication (May 20, 2002) from Jennifer Waithe;
- communication (May 21, 2002) from Richard Swaffer, President & C.E.O., Systems Approach Corporation;
- communication (May 22, 2002) from Rev. Robin Gordon Guinness;
- communication (May 26, 2002) from Michael Carson;
- communication (May 8, 2002) from Max Moore, President, Harbourfront Community Association;
- communication (June 6, 2002) from Karen Chorney;
- communication (June 13, 2002) from Sandra Bowen;
- communication (October 11, 2002) from Barbara Santamaria;
- communication (May 1, 2002) from Ann Lovering;
- communication (April 30, 2002) from Bruna Nota;
- communication (April 30, 2002) from Brian R. Smith;
- communication (May 1, 2002) from Ian Russell;
- communication (May 1, 2002) from Roger Northwood;
- communication (May 1, 2002) from James Duncan MacLean;
- communication (May 1, 2002) from Mark Northwood;
- communication (May 1, 2002) from Jeannie Parker;
- communication (May 1, 2002) from Tabby Johnson;
- communication (May 1, 2002) from Robert Wolf;
- communication (May 1, 2002) from Joan Allison;
- communication (May 1, 2002) from Don Darroch, Canadian Commercial Capital (1973) Ltd.;
- communication (May 1, 2002) from Kathleen Doody;

- communication (May 1, 2002) from Alastair Dickson;
- communication (May 1, 2002) from Peter Holt;
- communication (May 1, 2002) from Annie Szamosi;
- communication (May 2, 2002) from Barbara Klunder;
- communication (May 1, 2002) from Kathleen McDonnell;
- communication (May 1, 2002) from Anna Prodanou;
- communication (October 8, 2002) from Laura Carson;
- communication (October 8, 2002) from Victoria and Nick Kapos, McKinnon Design Associates;
- communication (August 29, 2002) from Irene Fedun, Green Dragon Landscaping;
- communication (September 17, 2002) from Jackie Thomas;
- communication (September 18, 2002) from Brent Rogers;
- communication (October 9, 2002) from Philip V. Moller;
- communication (October 9, 2002) from Dominic Menegon;
- communication (October 11, 2002) from Hubert Budding;
- communication (October 10, 2002) from Zella Wolofsky;
- communication (September 27, 2002) from Martin Roebuck;
- communication (September 30, 2002) from Roger Wilson, obo Paul Henderson, President, International Sailing Federation;
- communication (September 29, 2002) from Martine Anne Johnson;
- communication (October 8, 2002) from Steve Mirkopoulos, Vice President, Cinespace Studios Management;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Rod Seiling, President, Greater Toronto Hotel Association;
- communication (September 19, 2002) from Keith Beard, Vice President, Canadian Seaplane Pilots Association;

- communication (September 23, 2002) from Howard Sutton, P.Eng., MBA, CFA, Tera Capital Corporation;
- communication (October 15, 2002) from Murray E. Blankstein;
- communication (undated) from John E. Langdon;
- communication (October 7, 2002) from Harry Truderung;
- communication (February 21, 2002) from Marilyn Roy, Chair, Harbourfront Community Centre;
- communication (February 21, 2002) from Robert Keppy, Que;
- communication (February 22, 2002) from Michel Labbe, President, Options for Homes;
- communication (February 23, 2002) from Jasmine N. Do & Mesfun Y. Haile;
- communication (February 24, 2002) from Helga Weterings;
- communication (March 22, 2002) from Barry Cason;
- communication (March 25, 2002) from Stephen Planck;
- communication (March 25, 2002) from Bob Keeping;
- communication (April 2, 2002) from Brenda J. Ferris;
- communication (April 2, 2002) from Victor Brunka;
- communication (April 2, 2002) from Kathleen Chung;
- communication (April 2, 2002) from Marc Bisnaire, President, Mimico Cruising Club;
- communication (April 2, 2002) from James D. Lewis, President, Lewis and Associates;
- communication (April 3, 2002) from Irene Fedun;
- communication (April 3, 2002) from Jackie Thomas;
- communication (April 4, 2002) from Roger D. Wilson, Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP, Barristers and Solicitors;
- communication (April 5, 2002) from Marilyn Macdonald;
- communication (April 10, 2002) from Magan Ambasna, President, Raag-Mala Music Society;

- communication (April 25, 2002) from Wilfred Laman, Commodore, Royal Hamilton Yacht Club;
- communication (April 2, 2002) from Marc Bisnaire, President, Mimico Cruising Club;
- communication (April 23, 2002) from Commodore Patrick Flynn, Toronto Hydroplane and Sailing Club;
- communication (April 13, 2002) from J.F. MacLellan;
- communication (April 25, 2002) from Al Will, Executive Director, Ontario Sailing Association;
- communication (April 22, 2002) from Julie Beddoes;
- communication (April 22, 2002) from P. Develioglu;
- communication (April 24, 2002) from D. David Zane;
- communication (April 24, 2002) from Heather Chetwynd;
- communication (April 29, 2002) from Marcel Pereira;
- communication (April 29, 2002) from Judy and Ivan Flaschner;
- communication (April 29, 2002) from Martine Johnson;
- communication (April 29, 2002) from J.T. Healy, Anna Binswanger-Healy and Braidia Duer;
- communication (April 29, 2002) from Dr. C. Bigwood;
- communication (April 29, 2002) from Dave Lomasd;
- communication (April 24, 2002) from Bill & Audrey Lake;
- communication (April 25, 2002) from Panou;
- communication (April 16, 2002) from Dr. Jay R. Malcolm;
- communication (April 16, 2002) from Jameson Elliott;
- communication (April 17, 2002) from Mike Hoolboom;
- communication (April 17, 2002) from Alex Pauk, Music Director/Conductor, Esprit Orchestra;
- communication (April 17, 2002) from Anthony Zwig, President, Horizon Legacy Group;

- communication (April 17, 2002) from Edward Nixon, Past-President, SLNA;
- communication (April 17, 2002) from Elaine Leve, Commodore, Island Yacht Club;
- communication (April 16, 2002) from Norm and Judy Mann;
- communication (April 17, 2002) from Carl R. Szamosvari;
- communication (April 17, 2002) from Howard Sutton, P.Eng, MBA, CFA, Tera Capital Corporation;
- communication (April 17, 2002) from Jeffrey Engel, Wm. Engel Co. Limited/Wm. Engel Realty Limited;
- communication (April 18, 2002) from The Cheungs;
- communication (April 18, 2002) from Norman Pancic;
- communication (April 18, 2002) from Diane Burt;
- communication (April 19, 2002) from Jon Haick;
- communication (April 19, 2002) from Dan Angiu, IT Specialist, CANDU Owners Group Inc.;
- communication (undated) from Paul Henderson, IOC Member in Canada/President, International Sailing Federation;
- communication (April 16, 2002) from Nicole and Ben Ratelband;
- communication (April 19, 2002) from Serap Ozden Develioglu;
- communication (April 19, 2002) from Malcolm King;
- communication (April 19, 2002) from Danielle Carrs;
- communication (April 19, 2002) from Maureen MacMillan;
- communication (April 19, 2002) from Irene Mellon;
- communication (April 18, 2002) from Warner Cowan;
- communication (April 15, 2002) from Vaune Davis;
- communication (April 19, 2002) from Peter Hubbard, Hubbard, Favaro, Barristers & Solicitors;



- communication (April 23, 2002) from S. Lintott, Commodore, Fifty Point Yacht Club (FPYC);
- communication (April 23, 2002) from Colin Kilgour, President, Efficient Capital Corporation;
- communication (April 29, 2002) from Patricia Mackay;
- communication (April 26, 2002) from Eileen Grace Dalusong and Lia Moran;
- communication (April 26, 2002) from Irene and Ron Fuchs;
- communication (April 30, 2002) from Dawne Jubb;
- communication (April 30, 2002) from Pauline Carey;
- communication (April 30, 2002) from Sam and Trudy Coles, Hazel Self and Karen Woodley;
- communication (April 30, 2002) from C.S. Bennett;
- communication (April 30, 2002) from L.N. Kalamanski;
- communication (undated) from Jack Brannigan;
- communication (October 9, 2002) from Eric M. Carroll;
- communication (October 9, 2002) Suzanne Morrison;
- communication (October 10, 2002) from Mike Hoolboom;
- communication (October 13, 2002) from Hubert Budding;
- communication (October 16, 2002) from Mitchell Gold;
- communication (October 16, 2002) from Mel deSouza, Commodore, Mooredale Sailing Club;
- communication (October 17, 2002) from Manfred Humphries;
- communication (October 17, 2002) from Lo Chow Y. Chun;
- communication (October 17, 2002) from Kim Cassiram;
- communication (October 17, 2002) from David H. Lewis;
- communication (October 17, 2002) from David Trebilcock;

- communication (October 21, 2002) from Matt Kunz;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Boris Mather, for Citizens for a Lakeshore Greenway;
- communication (October 19, 2002) from Nadia Szilvassy;
- communication (October 19, 2002) from Cheryl and Manuel Buchwald;
- communication (October 19, 2002) from Michael Raby;
- communication (October 19, 2002) from Robin Eccles;
- communication (October 20, 2002) from Diane Marshall;
- communication (October 20, 2002) from Eliza Wong and Patrick Li;
- communication (October 20, 2002) from Sally Gibson;
- communication (October 20, 2002) from Bert and Joy Van Kleef;
- communication (October 20, 2002) from Chi Piu Li;
- communication (October 20, 2002) from Dorothy Holmes;
- communication (October 20, 2002) from Tibor Major;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from David Armstrong;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Bob Tundermann;
- petition signed by 1,195 persons objecting to closing the Toronto City Centre Airport, a copy of which is on file in the office of the City Clerk, City Hall;
- communication (October 16, 2002) from Patrick Flynn, Commodore, Toronto Hydroplane and Sailing Club;
- communication (October 16, 2002) from Mark Barclay, Co-Captain of UNICORN;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Elaine Farragher;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Greg Gatenby;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Rick Barlow;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Nan F. Cooper (Marianne);
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Dipl. Ing. Laszlo J. Jarmai;

- communication (October 21, 2002) from David J. Hall, Commodore, Queen City Yacht Club;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Sandra Pavan, North Toronto Tenants Association;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Andrew J. Bertram, Glenholme Advisors;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Alanna McDonagh;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Harold Murray;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Vince Kreizinger;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Lynda Perry;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Bill Dickson;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Michael Guy;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Laura Beard and David Hustler;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Tim Broughton;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Rene Auger;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Andrew McCammon;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from David J. Hall, Commodore, Queen City Yacht Club;
- communication (undated) from Roger Wilson;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Jocelyn Lecluse;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Susan Swan;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Emily Hurson;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Tim Hurson;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Isabella Bassett;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Carol L. Holmes, Administration and Property Management, City Centre Aviation Ltd.;
- communication (October 8, 2002) from Stig Harvor;

- communication (October 22, 2002) from Penelope Tyndale;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Dawn E. Gardham, Commodore, Lakeshore Yacht Club;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Simon Lawrence;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Angie Borowiec;
- communication (undated) from Michael Colgrass;
- communication (undated) from Allan A. Rubin, President and Founder of The Canadian Air Land Sea Museum and Wings of Flight Aerospace Learning Centre;
- communication (undated) from Sheila C. MacKinnon, Barrister & Solicitor;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Amanda Robinson;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Geoff Pickering;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from David Couch;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Douglas and Jean Paton;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Sandy Douglas;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Michael L. Vollmer;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Bonnie J. Caldwell;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Roger W. Proctor, President and Chairman of the Board of MTCC 979 (Residences of the World Trade Centre - 10 Yonge Street);
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Patricia Wilde;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from John Porter;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from James R. McCreary;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Jonathan Crinion;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Isobel Collins;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Karen and Richard Bryer;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Emily Hurson;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Noel Ryan;

- communication (October 23, 2002) from Danielle Cole;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Katya Gardner;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Anne E. Chun;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Warren St. Romain;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Ray Gates;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Millie Greenfield;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Brian Thompson;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Joseph Lem;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Mary Neumann;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Peter Morgan;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Arlene Levin;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Tamara Weterings;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Ken Lem;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Dr. Steven Gedeon;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Ron Hemstreet;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Dr. L.A. Marson;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Chris Davies;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Andrew Obrien;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Nick Lenskyj;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Ane Christensen;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from John Stephenson;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Patricia Wilde;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Lorensa McDonald;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Greg Bonser;

- communication (October 22, 2002) from Linda Sepp;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Cristina Kerekes;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Jacqueline Sharp;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Joel Ornoy;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Carla Torchia;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from David Smaller;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Yaneev Forman;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from James Kudelka, Artistic Director and Kevin Garland, Executive Director, The National Ballet of Canada;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Tamara Weterings;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Vanessa McMillan;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Kelly Hyatt;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Joel Clark;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Robert Anglin;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Margot Dawson;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Daniel and Emily Tang;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Alex Ross;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Katya Gardner;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from David Shaw;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Sandy Forsyth;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Lynne Hunt;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Russ Germain;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Ozan Isinak;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Chris Kim;

- communication (October 23, 2002) from D/C Annie Cook;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Sandra Lowe;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Barbara Bryden;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Harold Murray;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Marianne Cooper;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Alanna McDonagh;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Emily Hurson;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Richard Young;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from George Sekely;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from David Agnew;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Ingrid Sapona;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Rodolfo Aldana;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Martin Stevens;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Simone Abel;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Tibor Major;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Dennis Bryant;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from John Berke;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Brenda Ferris;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Brenda Marshall;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Ulla Colgrass;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from John Davies;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Irene Dunthorne;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Susan Davies;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Boris Broz;

- communication (October 23, 2002) from Steve Tanguay;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Barbara McIvor;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Diana Menzies;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from John Burch;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Ryan James;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from David Lewis;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Mr. & Mrs. Bill MacLean;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Geoff MacBride;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Marc Brien;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Dr. A. Toi;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Susan Banks;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Irwin Doxsee;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from John W. Porter;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Jennifer Harold;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Linda O'Loughlin;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Jennifer Chan;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Michael Comrie;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Elayne Lockhart;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Bonnie Fuller;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Dave Fuller;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Jacqueline Courval, Co-Chair, Friends of the Spit;
- communication (undated) from Trevor Shaw;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from James Kreppner;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Julie Beddoes;



- communication (October 23, 2002) from Fred Gaysek;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Marion Briston;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Stephen McMillan;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Sherif Eskandar;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Susan Banks;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Chi Fu;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Alan Briston;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Pat Gleeson;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from David Farenick;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Ulli Diemer;
- communication (October 23, 2020) from Christopher Wallace;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Roger J. Shaw;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Craig Manchulenko;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Nansi Thomas;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Bogdan Pyka;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Debbie Keffer;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Lilian Poon;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Johnny Sin;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Benjamin de Groot;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Jacqueline Cook;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from B.R. Holmes, President, City Centre Aviation Ltd.;
- communication (October 21, 2002) from Rich Gage, President and C.E.O., Canadian Business Aviation Association;
- communication (October 16, 2002) from Chris Idestrup;

- communication (October 20, 2002) from Jack Brannigan;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Chris Ridabock, Chair and M. Elyse Allan, President and C.E.O., The Toronto Board of Trade;
- communication (October 22, 2002) from Harve Sokoloff;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Warren R. Cresswell;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Meirav Even-har;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Stephanie Mills;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Trina Boivin;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Ken Rodmell;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Eric Ling;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Dr. Andrew Malcolm;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Daryl Kee;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Mr. Panou;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Catherine McClelland;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Emelene Palileo-Lennox;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Wendy Owen;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Shira Miller;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Milena Cmokrak;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Anita Laite;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Kathleen McDonnell;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Christine de Groot;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Malcolm King;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Ivan Kosir;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Rosanne Renzetti;

- communication (October 23, 2002) from Steve Behal;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from April Hickox;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Nancy Grieveson;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Olga Zamora;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Susan Wright;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from K. Fearn;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Martin Perl;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Ulli Diemer;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Terri Tenberg;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Dennis Bryant;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Ed Starczewski;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Liz McClelland;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Anne Cameron;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Bruce Cameron;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Ruth Milikin;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Anne Nicoll;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Howard Sutton;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Anthony Chong;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Ken Goodings;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Irwin Doxsee;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Bob Kotyk;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Keith Nunn;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Delwyn Higgens;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Franc St-Pierre;

- communication (October 23, 2002) from Theresa aka Tessa Correll;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Roberta Miggiani;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Lloyd Speyer;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Lee Rickwood;
- communication (undated) from Alan Fenton;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Karel Fearn;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Freya Godard;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Aubrey Millard;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Fabrizio Filippo;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Kelly McInenly;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Margaret Anglin;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Bob Gates;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Murray Hodgins;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Frank Centofanti;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Irwin Doxsee;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from John Gray;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Lisa Hyatt;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Susan Ginsberg;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Paul Hindle;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Patrick Conner;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Greg Hilton;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Tamara Weterings;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Norman Sherman;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Daphne Lavers;

- communication (October 23, 2002) from Larry Ginsberg;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Bruce Voogd;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Gerald Slater;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Norman Pancic and Diane Burt;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Anne M. Lewis;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Joey Schwartz;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Elyse Allan, President and C.E.O., The Toronto Board of Trade, forwarding a submission, entitled “Public Consultations on the Toronto City Centre Airport”;
- communication (October 17, 2002) from Ivan Lavine, Past Commodore, Island Yacht Club;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Y. Dan Zabelishensky, Board Member, Toronto Bird Observatory;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Donna Metcalfe, Executive Director, The North York Chamber of Commerce;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Linda McKnight;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Niki Walker and Josh Wiwcharyk;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Martin Lister, Daniel Lister, E.K. Canfield and Nathan Lister;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Ron Lackner, P.Eng., Director of Operations, Crompton Co./Cie;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Alastair Dickson;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Dawn Brennan;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Gabrielle David and Luc Chalifour;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Julie Liu;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Frank Moore;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Anna and George Prodanou;

- communication (October 24, 2002) from Julie Glenn;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Sidney Sproule;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Pat & Kamerni Pillay;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Stephen Cooper;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Matthew McKenzie;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Tony Makepeace;
- communication (October 23, 2002) from Wilfrid Walker, Transport 2000 Ontario;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Marcia Douglas, President, St. Lawrence Condominium Ratepayers Association (SLRCA);
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Maria Borowiec;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Elyas Burney;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Chris Crozier;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Lisa Botticella;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Teri Ann Dorey;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Chander Chaddah;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Marilyn Powell;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Andy Banaszak;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Jana Cervinka and Roger Smith;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Jean-Philippe Cool;
- communication (October 15, 2002) from R. Storey Fenton, M.D., Otolaryngologist-in-Chief, St. Michael's Hospital;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Peter Grant, P.Eng.;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Men-Chong Luk;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Margaret Needham;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Cheryl Purves;

- communication (undated) from Shirley Bush;
- communication (undated) from Diana Midwinter;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Alanna McDonagh;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Marc Coulavin;
- communication (undated) from Cameron Miller and Ronny Yaron, SEDERI/SLNA;
- communication (undated) from John G. Spragge;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Fran Pileggi;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Katherine McKinnon;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Mitchell Gold, C.A., International Association of Educators for World Peace (IAEWP);
- communication (undated) from Stig Harvor;
- pamphlet submitted by Janice Zemdegs respecting Runway 26 & Adjacent Residences;
- communication (undated) from Keith Stewart, Ph.D., Smog and Climate Change Campaigner, Toronto Environmental Alliance, forwarding a submission, entitled "Environmental Impacts of Expanding the Toronto Island Airport;
- communication (undated) from Michael Colgrass;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Conghua Li;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Klaus See;
- communication (September 26, 2002) from Karen Tzventarny, RN;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Tomislav Svoboda, MSc, MD, CCFP, FRCPC, Community Medicine Specialist, Post Doctoral Fellow, Inner City Health Research Unit, St. Michael's Hospital;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Graham Mudge, Chairman, Toronto Port Authority, forwarding comments respecting the financial statements of the Toronto Port Authority;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from George Vona and Lark Popov;
- communication (October 24, 2002) from Pieter Bergen;

- communication (undated) from Joe Lobko, Chair, Toronto Society of Architects, forwarding concerns respecting the expansion of the Toronto Island Airport; and
- communication (undated) from Robert Moss supporting the fixed link to the Toronto City Centre Airport.

The following persons appeared before the joint Planning and Transportation and Economic Development and Parks Committees in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Harry Pankratz, Chair, Toronto Port Authority;
- Robert Deluce, Regional Airline Holdings;
- Lisa Raitt, Harbour Master, Toronto Port Authority;
- Gordon Hamilton, Sypher-Mueller International Inc.;
- Claudio Cavelli (answered questions);
- Elyse Allan, The Toronto Board of Trade;
- John Kennedy, President, C.A.W., Local 112;
- Bob Hamilton, Plant Chair, Bombardier-deHavilland and C.A.W., Local 112 Member;
- Ron Abraham, Toronto Real Estate Board;
- Philip Van Manen, Airport Manager, Toronto Port Authority;
- Barry MacKinnon, Vice-President, Marketing and Airline Analysis, Regional Aircraft, Bombardier Aerospace;
- Norman Acuna, Director of Sales, Special Aircraft Applications, Regional Aircraft, Bombardier Aerospace;
- Imtiaz Ahmad, Pratt & Whitney Canada (answered questions);
- Andy Manahan, Development Promotion Representative, Universal Workers Union, Local 183;
- Bud Purves, President and General Manager, CN Tower;
- Arlene Mete, obo Dean Mortimer, President, Cloud Air Service Ltd.;
- Dennis Mills, M.P.P., Toronto-Danforth;
- Darija Scott, Managing Principal, Scott Associates;
- Peter Wong, Director, CitiCapital/Bankers Leasing;
- Blake Wallace, Vice-President and General Counsel, Murray & Company;
- Brian Holmes, President, City Centre Aviation Limited;
- Don Wallace, President, airNav Limited;
- Robert Stacey;
- Al Will, Executive Director, Ontario Sailing Association;
- Jerry Shiner, President, Keepsafe Storage;
- John Bessai;
- Pam Mazza, President, Toronto Island Trust;
- Marc Brien, Partner, Domicity Limited;
- Allan Sparrow, Outreach Coordinator, Community AIR;
- George Smitherman, M.P.P., Toronto-Centre Rosedale;
- Cameron Miller and Ronny Yaron, SEDERI/SLNA;
- Lester Brown, Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association;
- Drew Bowles;
- Barry Lipton;
- Glen Grenier, Director, Canadian Owners and Pilots Association (COPA);



- Alexander M. Giannelia, B.A.A., President, The Airborne Sensing Corporation;
- Anthony Pappalardo, Co-Chair, Toronto City Centre Airport Association;
- Joe Altieri;
- John Spragge;
- Brent Rogers;
- Warner Cowan;
- David Crombie;
- Paul Henderson;
- Brenda Roman;
- Mitchell Gold, International Association of Educators for World Peace;
- Max Moore, Harbourfront Community Association;
- Alison Rose;
- Janice Zemdegs;
- Malcolm King;
- Julie Beddoes;
- Trevor Shaw;
- Stig Harvor;
- Shirley Bush;
- Joan Prowse;
- Karen Tzventarny;
- Rick Persaj;
- Mark Millen, Master Mariners Company of Canada;
- Richard James, The Company of Master Mariners of Canada;
- John Stephenson;
- Michael Colgrass;
- Nola Crewe;
- Glenn Samson;
- Paul Farrelly;
- John Norris;
- Pat Fagnano, Duty Manager, Terminal A, Toronto City Centre Airport;
- Nancy Jenter;
- Sylvia Pellman, President, Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association;
- Bob Kotyk;
- Joseph Koole;
- Sharon Poitras;
- Keith Stewart, Smog and Climate Change Campaigner, Toronto Environmental Alliance;
- David Charlesworth;
- Dr. Tomislav Svoboda;
- Andrew Pierce, Bombardier Aerospace;
- Angela Calvaruso;
- Alanna McDonagh;
- Victoria Piersig;
- Allan A. Rubin, President and Founder, Canadian Air, Land, Sea Museum, Markham Airport;
- Graham Mudge;
- Terry Wong;
- Paulette Pelletier-Kelly;

- Richard L. Reinert;
- Laurie Stevenson;
- Tamara Bernstein;
- Diana Midwinter;
- Joe Lobko, Toronto Society of Architects;
- Boris Broz;
- John McClusky;
- Bill Freeman;
- Jeaninne McClenaghan, Community Air Group;
- Roger Shaw, Ontario Sailing Association;
- Marcia Douglas, obo St. Lawrence Condominium Ratepayers Association (SLCRA);
- Dr. Fred Lazar, Professor of Economics, Schulich School of Business;
- Colin Crawford;
- Tom Bessai;
- Doreen Davenport;
- Kaylie Gordon;
- Kaya Hardy;
- David Lewis;
- Johnny Sin;
- Terri Tenberg;
- Harve Sokoloff;
- Ane Christensen;
- Debby Stasko;
- Heather Osolen;
- Hamish Wilson;
- Robert E. Young, Special Projects Manager, North York Chamber of Commerce;
- Millie Greenfield;
- Christopher Wallace;
- Sue Sparrow;
- Dave Bale, Manager, Advanced Air Ambulance;
- John Colligan;
- E. Tom Sternig;
- Robert Moss;
- Dave Smith;
- D. John Magner;
- Celeste Sansregret;
- Michael Stewart, Business Wings Air Charter Ltd., Toronto City Centre Airport; and
- Victor Jasaitis.

*(City Council, at its regular meeting held on November 26, 27 and 28, 2002, and its Special Meeting held on November 28 and 29, 2002, had before it, during consideration of the foregoing Clause, a confidential joint report (November 26, 2002) from the City Solicitor and the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, such joint report to remain confidential in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act, having regard that it concerns matters related to litigation or potential litigation, save and except the following recommendations embodied therein:*

“Recommendations:

*It is recommended that:*

1. *City Council approve the proposed settlement of the litigation between the TPA, TEDCO the City, certain individuals and the Federal Government substantially on the terms contained in the Draft Minutes of Settlement attached hereto;*
2. *City Council instruct and authorize the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, the Chief Administrative Officer, the City Solicitor and the Commissioner of Urban Development Services to negotiate and conclude all necessary agreements and documents to give effect to the proposed settlement; and*
3. *City staff be instructed to report back to City Council on their discussions with respect to the unresolved issues of the harbour-user fees and the payments in lieu of taxes.”)*

*(City Council also had before it, during consideration of the foregoing Clause, a confidential Fresh as Amended Statement of Claim, Notice of Action Issued on August 1, 2001, such Statement of Claim now public, save and except the Minutes of Settlement appended thereto, which are to remain confidential in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act, having regard that they concern matters related to litigation or potential litigation. A copy of the aforementioned Statement of Claim is on file in the office of the City Clerk.)*

*(City Council also had before it, during consideration of the foregoing Clause, the following confidential documents, such documents to remain confidential, in their entirety, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act, having regard that they concern matters related to litigation or potential litigation:*

- *report (October 23, 2002) from the City Solicitor;*
- *document (November 25, 2002) headed “Objectives, Assumptions and Principles Governing a Settlement Between the City of Toronto and the Toronto Port Authority”, submitted by the Toronto Port Authority; and*
- *communication (undated) from the Chief Executive Officer and Harbour Master, Toronto Port Authority.)*

---

*(City Council also had before it, during consideration of the foregoing Clause, the following report (November 19, 2002) from the Chief Administrative Officer:*

Purpose:

*To respond to directives arising from the joint meeting of the Planning and Transportation Committee and the Economic Development and Parks Committee on October 24, 2002 on matters related to the Toronto City Centre Airport (TCCA).*

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

*The recommendation in this report has no financial implications.*

Recommendation:

*It is recommended that this report be received by Council for information.*

Background:

*At its meeting of October 24, 2002, the joint Planning and Transportation Committee and the Economic Development and Parks Committee considered two reports from the Chief Administrative Officer dated September 27, 2002 and October 22, 2002 on the TCCA.*

*At that time, the Committees:*

1. *Requested that the Chief Administrative Officer report directly to City Council for its meeting on November 26, 2002 on the process to be followed to ensure that the conditions contained in the Committees' Recommendation (1)(ii) have been met. Specifically, these conditions are:*
  - (a) *the TPA providing all necessary guarantees that any infrastructure improvements at the TCCA, including the construction of a fixed link and terminal, will be completed at no cost to the City. This should be done through a performance bond that specifically outlines such a guarantee to the City, or an alternative instrument that eliminates financial risk to the City;*
  - (b) *the TPA providing an MOU shielding the City from any shortfall in the projected cash flows available for financing infrastructure investments (the fixed link and terminal);*
  - (c) *the development of a comprehensive protocol for Emergency Medical Services (to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services) that includes traffic and bridge management procedures for emergency situations, the provision of EMS facilities on the TCCA site, and a direct link from TCCA to EMS dispatch for crash alarm notification;*
  - (d) *the TPA providing details with respect to the transit strategy required to encourage half of all airport trips to be made by transit (an assumption identified in the additional transportation information submitted by the TPA) to the satisfaction of Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, the Medical Officer of Health and the Chief General Manager of the TTC;*
  - (e) *a community advisory committee being established which would meet annually with the TPA to provide feedback on the impact of TCCA operations on the surrounding neighbourhoods and report directly to Council, and that Terms of Reference be developed for this Committee;*

- (f) *the TPA agreeing to be held liable for the cost of any damage attributable to the construction of the bridge to the dockwall on the north side of the Western Gap; and*
- (g) *the design of the fixed link being amended to include streetcar tracks.*

*The Committees also referred the following motion placed by Councillor McConnell to the Chief Administrative Officer with a request that she report directly thereon to Council for its meeting on November 26, 2002:*

*“That the report (October 22, 2002) from the Chief Administrative Officer be further amended by adding the following additional Recommendation (1)(ii)(h):*

*(1)(ii)(h) “that all aircraft be built in the City of Toronto.”*

*Other conditions applied to the construction of a fixed link and with which the TPA has taken issue include:*

- *the legal dispute between the City, TEDCO, and the TPA being resolved (Recommendation (2));*
- *the TPA agreeing to fund streetscape improvements along the water’s edge and to work with staff of UDS to develop improvements that address pedestrian and parks issues along Bathurst Quay (Recommendation (3)); and*
- *the Terminal building being constructed in a manner that will provide for direct streetcar access (Recommendation (7)).*

*This report addresses the directives arising from the joint meeting and the TPA’s response thereto.*

*Discussion:*

*1. Conditions in the Committees’ Recommendations*

*As a result of their consideration of the October 22, 2002 report from the CAO, the joint Committees recommended that City Council support the expansion to the TCCA to a maximum cap of aircraft movements as allowed under the NEF 25 contour, and authorize the TPA to construct the fixed link, subject to certain amendments to the Tripartite Agreement being implemented, and certain other conditions being met.*

*Furthermore, City staff were directed to request the TPA to confirm its acceptance of the above conditions.*

*On November 5, 2002, the Commissioner of Urban Development Services forwarded a letter to the Chairman of the Toronto Port Authority requesting details on if, how, and when the TPA intended to comply with the directives.*

*A response from the TPA was received on November 12, 2002, and is attached as Appendix A.*

*In summary, the TPA originally agreed with all conditions (on the understanding that specific wording amendments to the Tripartite Agreement will be negotiated separately), with the exception of the following:*

- (a) parking facilities on airport lands being limited to a maximum of 200, the design of the fixed link being amended to include street car tracks, the taxi service to the new air terminal being by way of an open taxi stand available to all licensed Toronto Taxis and Limousines, and the terminal being constructed in a manner that will provide for direct streetcar access.*

*The first of these conditions was recommended by staff as Recommendation (1)(i)(g) in the CAO's report dated October 22, 2002, and approved by the Committees. The remaining three conditions were incorporated by the Committees as Recommendations (1)(ii)(g), (6) and (7) in order to encourage transit use to access an enhanced TCCA and to minimize traffic impacts on surrounding communities. Transit use is a priority of the proposed Central Waterfront Secondary Plan, the Development and Business Plan of Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation, and the City's Official Plan, and is critical to minimizing automobile use in the downtown area. In previous transit information submitted to the City in October, the TPA projected that up to 50% of future airport users will arrive via some form of transit.*

*In its November 12, 2002 correspondence, the TPA indicated that these issues will be further addressed in a Transit Strategy currently being developed by Dillon Consulting Limited. It is important to note that previous traffic information prepared by Dillon on behalf of the TPA (submitted to City staff in October, 2002) identified that "the maximum passenger parking demand is approximately 182 spaces" at an enhanced TCCA with a passenger level of 900,000.*

*On November 19, 2002, the TPA forwarded additional correspondence confirming that they can "now accept condition (6)", i.e. that taxi service to the new air terminal be by way of an open taxi stand available to all licensed Toronto Taxis and Limousines. This letter is attached as Appendix B.*

*Finally, on November 20, 2002, the TPA provided its new Transit Strategy from Dillon. This letter report is attached as Appendix C. In summary, the TPA continues to disagree with the conditions related to limits on parking, the design of the fixed link being amended to include street car tracks, and the terminal being constructed in a manner that will provide for direct streetcar access. The rationale provided by the TPA for their position on each of these issues is outlined below.*

### *Parking*

*The TPA maintains that limiting parking spaces to 200 for employees, taxis and transit users only is not consistent with the modal split assumptions presented in October transit information, and indicates that "if passengers cannot park at the TCCA they will look for parking within the community. Parking at the airport reduces the impacts in the Bathurst Quay neighbourhood. It is premature to determine a parking supply due to the number of variables, but the range in demand can be accommodated at the TCCA."*

*The report further identifies that it is the number of passengers and the transit/auto modal split which affect the number of vehicles to/from the TCCA and the queuing on Bathurst Street, not whether the passengers drive and park, arrive by taxi, or are dropped off. The October transit information from the TPA assumed a 50% modal split. The current strategy indicates that this could be achieved through:*

- *additional TTC service to meet demand to serve the TCCA,*
- *a fixed link design that includes transit signal priority to ensure transit vehicles are the first to cross the bridge when queued,*
- *frequent airline-operated shuttle bus service from major points throughout the downtown,*
- *curbside drop-off/pick-up at the terminal, i.e. shuttles would have dedicated pick-up/drop-off areas,*
- *fully integrating transit with airline operations (e.g. door-to-door services from the aircraft to the Royal York Hotel or Union Station for inbound domestic flights, pre-arranged pick-up/drop-off of patrons), and*
- *additional incentives to encourage transit use and implementation of other demand management techniques to be identified by the TPA and airlines.*

*The consultants provide further details for each of these actions, which in total represent the strategy to encourage half of all airport trips to be made by transit. The joint Committees, in their Recommendation (1)(ii)(d), directed that the TPA submit this strategy to the satisfaction of Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, the Medical Officer of Health and the Chief General Manager of the TTC. This information will therefore continue to be the subject of additional review by City staff.*

*The report further concludes that “if despite everyone’s efforts, a lower transit mode split to the TCCA materializes (e.g. 40% vs 50%), there will be some increase in the number of vehicles that need to queue. This can be accommodated with the same proposed design (one southbound land onto the bridge and one additional queue lane on Bathurst Street south of Queens Quay) without affecting traffic operations in the neighbourhood.”*

#### *Streetcar Service*

*The TPA maintains that the fixed link should not be amended to provide for streetcar service, indicating that even with a 50% modal split, the transit demand “does not warrant the significant expense and buses can accommodate the demand at a lower cost and with more service flexibility”.*

*Additional concerns which were cited include prohibitive costs, and a number of design, operational, aesthetic, and maintenance complications of providing streetcar service to the TCCA. These include difficulties with providing power via an overhead wire across the bridge (the power cables would need to be “wound” as the bridge opens to avoid contact with the bridge deck. The consultants state this has never been implemented). Alternatively, “diesel*

*multiple unit” streetcars capable of operating on diesel and electric power would need to be introduced. This technology is currently not part of the TTC’s existing fleet.*

*(b) the TPA funding streetscape improvements along the water’s edge and working with staff of UDS to develop improvements that address pedestrian and parks issues along Bathurst Quay.*

*This condition was recommended by staff in the October 24, 2002 report from the CAO as Recommendation (3), and was approved by the Committees to minimize the impacts of any expansion of the TCCA on the surrounding communities which have grown considerably over the past 15 years (also Recommendation (3)). The TPA states that it will, however, “consider for inclusion any streetscape improvements that UDS puts forward in the plan for Bathurst Street, and will work with City staff to develop improvements that address pedestrian and parks issues along Bathurst Quay.” The issue of funding these improvements has not been directly addressed.*

*(c) the approval of an enhanced TCCA being conditional on the legal dispute between the City, TEDCO, and the TPA being resolved.*

*This condition was recommended by staff in the October 24, 2002 report from the CAO as Recommendation (2), and approved by the Committees on advice from the City Solicitor (also as Recommendation (2)). This issue is further addressed in a confidential report from the City Solicitor which will also be before Council for consideration at its meeting on November 26, 2002. As previously indicated, the TPA does not agree with this condition.*

## *2. Location of Proposed Aircraft Construction*

*Early in November, at the request of the joint Committees, staff of Urban Development Services forwarded letters to Bombardier Aerospace and to Regional Airlines Holdings Inc. (REGCO) requesting their comments with respect to the issue of aircraft relating to the expansion of the TCCA being built in Toronto.*

*The respective responses which were received have been attached as Appendices D and E.*

*The correspondence from Bombardier confirms that “all Dash 8 and Q Series aircraft are assembled and delivered at its facility in Downsview, Ontario which is within the City of Toronto. Bombardier Aerospace further confirms that all Q400 aircraft ordered by REGCO, or by any other airline, will be assembled and delivered at its facility in Downsview, Ontario.”*

*The correspondence from REGCO confirms that they are in final negotiations with Bombardier for the purchase of approximately 15 Q400 aircraft and that “it is expected that a deal (conditional on bridge construction) will be signed within the next 30 to 45 days.” The letter further states that “negotiations involving aircraft purchases of this magnitude are competitive, and very sophisticated in nature....We respectfully submit that under no circumstances should the city, or any other third party intervene in this process. Such interference would eliminate the competitive nature of such negotiations and could result in a failure on our part to negotiate aircraft and spare parts on a commercially acceptable basis.”*



### *3. Process to Ensure that the Conditions will be Satisfied*

*Should Council support the construction of the fixed link, it will likely be subject to several conditions, including those identified in the CAO's reports and in the Committees' recommendations. In the event that the TPA confirms that it is willing to comply with all the conditions as ultimately approved by Council, compliance will be confirmed in legally binding documents, including the appropriate amendments to the Tripartite Agreement.*

#### *Conclusions:*

*At its meeting of October 24, 2002, the joint Planning and Transportation Committee and the Economic Development and Parks Committee recommended that City Council support the expansion of the TCCA, and authorize the TPA to construct the fixed link, subject to certain amendments to the Tripartite Agreement being implemented, and certain other conditions being met.*

*Staff of Urban Development Services corresponded with the TPA, Bombardier Aerospace and REGCO requesting comments with respect to these conditions. The responses from these organizations are attached.*

*The TPA has indicated that it does not agree with certain conditions, as identified above, which relate to a "transit-first" focus and to funding improvements along the water's edge/Bathurst Quay.*

*Finally, the TPA has indicated its disagreement with the condition that the legal dispute between the City, TEDCO, and the TPA be resolved. This issue is further addressed in a confidential report from the City Solicitor which will also be before Council for consideration at its meeting on November 26, 2002.*

#### *Contact:*

*Elaine C. Baxter-Trahair, Waterfront Project Director  
Urban Development Services  
Phone No. (416) 397-4083  
Fax No. (416) 397-4088  
E-mail: ebaxter@city.toronto.on.ca*

#### *Appendices:*

- Appendix A: Correspondence from the Toronto Port Authority dated November 12, 2002*
- Appendix B: Correspondence from the Toronto Port Authority dated November 19, 2002*
- Appendix C: Letter Report from Dillon Consulting Limited re the TPA's Transit Strategy dated November 20, 2002*
- Appendix D: Correspondence from Bombardier Aerospace dated November 11, 2002*
- Appendix E: Correspondence from REGCO dated November 15, 2002)*

## APPENDIX A

Insert Correspondence from the Toronto Port Authority  
dated November 12, 2002

page 1

Insert APPENDIX A

Correspondence from the Toronto Port Authority  
dated November 12, 2002

page 2

## Appendix B

Insert

*Correspondence from the Toronto Port Authority dated November 19, 2002*

Appendix "C"

Insert

*Letter Report from Dillon Consulting Limited  
re the TPA's Transit Strategy dated November 20, 2002*

page 1

Insert  
Appendix "C"

*Letter Report from Dillon Consulting Limited  
re the TPA's Transit Strategy dated November 20, 2002*

page 2

Insert  
Appendix "C"

*Letter Report from Dillon Consulting Limited  
re the TPA's Transit Strategy dated November 20, 2002*

page 3

Insert  
Appendix "C"

*Letter Report from Dillon Consulting Limited  
re the TPA's Transit Strategy dated November 20, 2002*

page 4



Insert  
Appendix "C"

*Letter Report from Dillon Consulting Limited  
re the TPA's Transit Strategy dated November 20, 2002*

page 5

Insert  
Appendix "C"

*Letter Report from Dillon Consulting Limited  
re the TPA's Transit Strategy dated November 20, 2002*

page 6

Insert  
Appendix "C"

*Letter Report from Dillon Consulting Limited  
re the TPA's Transit Strategy dated November 20, 2002*

page 7

Insert  
Appendix "C"

*Letter Report from Dillon Consulting Limited  
re the TPA's Transit Strategy dated November 20, 2002*

page 8

Insert  
Appendix "C"

*Letter Report from Dillon Consulting Limited  
re the TPA's Transit Strategy dated November 20, 2002*

page 9

Insert  
Appendix "C"

*Letter Report from Dillon Consulting Limited  
re the TPA's Transit Strategy dated November 20, 2002*

page 10

Insert  
Appendix "C"

*Letter Report from Dillon Consulting Limited  
re the TPA's Transit Strategy dated November 20, 2002*

page 11

Insert  
Appendix "C"

*Letter Report from Dillon Consulting Limited  
re the TPA's Transit Strategy dated November 20, 2002*

page 12



## APPENDIX D

Insert  
Correspondence from Bombardier Aerospace  
dated November 11, 2002

page 1

Insert  
Appendix D

Correspondence from Bombardier Aerospace  
dated November 11, 2002

page 2

## APPENDIX E

Insert  
Correspondence from REGCO  
dated November 15, 2002

page 1

Insert  
Appendix E

Correspondence from REGCO  
dated November 15, 2002

page 2

Insert  
Appendix E

Correspondence from REGCO  
dated November 15, 2002

page 3

Insert  
Appendix E

Correspondence from REGCO  
dated November 15, 2002

page 4

Insert  
Appendix E

Correspondence from REGCO  
dated November 15, 2002

page 5

*(City Council also had before it, during consideration of the foregoing Clause the following report (November 18, 2002) from the Secretary Board of Health:*

*Recommendation:*

*The Board of Health submits the attached report (November 15, 2002) from the Medical Officer of Health with respect to Public Issues Regarding the Toronto City Centre Airport to Council for consideration.*

*Background:*

*The Board of Health, at its meeting on November 18, 2002, had before it a report (November 15, 2002) from the Medical Officer of Health, providing a public health perspective on issues arising from the proposed expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport (TCCA); advising that this report clarifies the Toronto Public Health (TPH) position on the proposed expansion of TCCA operations, with the intent of providing City Council with a public health perspective when making final decisions about the future of the TCCA.*

*(Report dated November 15, 2002 addressed to the Board of Health  
from the Medical Officer of Health)*

*Purpose:*

*To provide a public health perspective on issues arising from the proposed expansion of the Toronto City Centre Airport (TCCA). This report clarifies the Toronto Public Health (TPH) position on the proposed expansion of TCCA operations, with the intent of providing City Council with a public health perspective when making final decisions about the future of the TCCA.*

*Financial Implications and Impact Statement:*

*There are no financial implications to the City arising directly from this report.*

*Recommendations:*

*It is recommended that:*

- (1) the report of the Medical Officer of Health regarding the TCCA be referred to City Council for consideration; and*
- (2) the appropriate City Officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.*

*Background:*

*Several recent reports prepared by the City's Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) outline the history and recent developments regarding the future of the TCCA. Matters that pertain to public health considerations are summarized below. A full review of the information related to the proposed expansion of the TCCA is beyond the scope of this report.*



*In 1998, City Council approved the establishment of a “fixed link” (i.e. a bridge) to connect the TCCA with the mainland at Bathurst Street subject to certain conditions being met. These conditions were added to by the Planning and Transportation Committee in 1999 and included the submission of detailed business plans for the bridge and for the TCCA itself. The TCCA is operated by the Toronto Port Authority (TPA) under a Tripartite Agreement between the City, the TPA and Transport Canada that governs, among other matters, noise exposure for surrounding residents.*

*In 1998, Dillon Consulting (on behalf of the TPA) conducted an Environmental Assessment (EA) of the fixed link and an addendum in Spring 1999 to address marine safety issues. The EA received federal approval in September 1999 subject to the implementation of mitigation measures.*

*In January 2002, the TPA released a report by Sypher:Mueller International Inc. that outlined three options for future operations at the TCCA: baseline (modified status quo); enhancement of turboprop services; and introduction of jet services. Also in early 2002, Regional Airlines Holdings Inc (Regco) submitted an unsolicited proposal to the TPA to upgrade the airport in exchange for the right to operate a TCCA-based airline servicing up to 17 Canadian and U.S. destinations within 500 nautical miles of Toronto using 15 Q400 Bombardier turboprop aircraft. Regco projected that it would attract about 900,000 passengers per year within its first four years of operation.*

*At its meeting on January 29, 2002 the Toronto-East York Community Council requested the Chief Planner to report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on the compatibility of the current and proposed airport operations with the Waterfront Revitalization Plan, “and to consult with the Medical Officer of Health regarding the health and environmental issues that are relevant to this matter, in particular, the Toronto Cancer Prevention Coalition’s concerns”. The Toronto Cancer Prevention Coalition’s letter is attached as Appendix A. At the meeting of the Waterfront Reference Group on February 20, 2002, the Commissioner of Urban Development Services presented a report outlining the process through which staff would respond to the Community Council’s request. In summary, the Commissioner proposed to co-ordinate a full assessment of the current and proposed Island Airport operations with staff of Planning, Economic Development, Parks, Emergency Medical Services, Public Health, Environmental Services, Legal, and Finance. At that time, the Reference Group endorsed this process, which resulted in the preparation of the two CAO reports on TCCA issues. These reports were endorsed by all departments involved in their preparation, including Health. Subsequent correspondence between the Commissioner of Urban Development Services and Toronto Public Health (TPH) is attached as Appendix B.*

*On May 1, 2002 a coalition of local residents and other individuals and organisations known as Community Airport Impact Review (Community AIR) held a public meeting to oppose any expansion at the TCCA and to advocate that the facility be closed immediately and converted to parkland and other public uses. The Waterfront Reference Group requested that staff review Community AIR’s plans for TCCA lands and report on these plans to the Waterfront Reference Group in October 2002.*

*In June 2002, the TPA informed the City of its intent to move forward with plans to construct the fixed link and requested that outstanding issues related to final approval be addressed at the October 8, 2002 meeting of the Waterfront Reference Group.*

*On September 19, 2002, the TPA submitted to the City a business plan for the proposed future operations of the TCCA and information on the design and environmental assessment of the fixed link bridge. The plan was based heavily on the “expanded turboprop scenario”, i.e. no jets.*

*At its meeting on October 8, 2002, the Waterfront Reference Group considered a report from the CAO (September 27, 2002) on the financial, legal, community, health, environmental and economic impacts of various operational scenarios for the TCCA and on the status of outstanding directives related to Council’s approval of a fixed link to the TCCA. The CAO’s report identified the only viable options as being “do nothing” (which would likely result in eventual closure) or the “expanded turboprop” scenario subject to amendments to the Tripartite Agreement. The CAO’s report also incorporated comments from TPH about the impact of TCCA operations on public and environmental health (excerpted as Appendix C).*

*The Waterfront Reference Group adopted the CAO’s recommendation that additional information be submitted to the City including, “a comprehensive set of measures to mitigate the environmental and health effects of any enhancement to TCCA”. Several questions were also directed to the Medical Officer of Health for consideration and response at the joint meeting of the Economic Development and Parks Committee and the Planning and Transportation Committee on October 24, 2002.*

*The TPA provided City staff with additional information on October 8, October 11 and October 18, 2002. This included two reports by Dillon Consulting on “Environmental Mitigation Measures” and a “Traffic Management Study”, both dated October 2002.*

*In light of this additional information, the CAO’s report (October 22, 2002) to the joint committee meeting included the following recommendations to limit the health, environmental and transportation impacts arising from expanded TCCA operations:*

- (a) a cap on passenger volumes at 600,000 per year (the level identified in the EA at which a remote terminal and/or significant transit improvements would be required to mitigate the impact of traffic volumes on the surrounding community and road network);*
- (b) provision by the TPA of a detailed transit strategy to support their assumption that half of all airport trips would be made by transit; and*
- (c) provision by the TPA of additional modelling of aircraft emissions and ambient air quality impacts based on both on-site and surrounding off-site sources, and the predicted improvement in air quality that would result from specific mitigative measures to address community health concerns.*

*Recommendation 3 was included in the CAO’s report as proposed by the Medical Officer of Health. This recommendation, combined with the proposed cap on passenger volume, was intended to mitigate the environmental and health impacts of enhanced airport operations.*

*While the recommendation for development of a transit strategy was adopted, recommendations for the proposed cap and the additional air studies were defeated. The joint committee recommended adoption of the CAO's report with amendments and recommended that it be forwarded to City Council for consideration at its meeting of November 24, 2002.*

Comments:

*Almost 120 deputations were received at the October 8 meeting of the Waterfront Reference Group and another 140 deputations were received at the joint committee meeting. Many of these deputants referred to potential public health issues associated with this project.*

*Opponents of the project cited the risks to human health and the environment that would arise from increased air traffic (noise, air pollution, de-icing fluid effluents, potential air crashes), increased ground traffic (smog, congestion, safety hazards for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles) and various hazards to marine safety.*

*Proponents of the project cited the 1998 Environmental Assessment as being a definitive response to potential concerns about health and the environment. In particular, various reports noted that the Gardiner Expressway is the primary contributor of air emissions along the waterfront and that the turboprop aircraft proposed by Regco were quieter and less polluting than those currently in use. They also noted that projected passenger volumes could be accommodated within the current terms of the Tripartite Agreement that governed noise exposure (NEF-25) without the requirement for a numeric cap on future passenger volumes.*

*The results of TPH's preliminary assessment of these potential public health concerns were submitted to the CAO's office for inclusion in her reports, which were signed off by the Medical Officer of Health.*

Environmental Assessment (EA):

*The existing Environmental Assessment, including the various additional reports written to supplement the original 1998 EA do not sufficiently address identified public health concerns. The narrow scope of the EA focussed primarily on the design, construction and operation of the fixed link. Issues related to associated ground traffic, noise and emissions from aircraft were given only peripheral treatment in a series of appendices. The sections dealing with transit and parking received only cursory attention. The nature of the TPA's recently announced partnership with a new regional airline may require an addendum to the existing EA that addresses issues related to the impact of projected traffic and passenger volumes and corresponding enhancements that will be needed for terminal facilities on TCCA lands.*

Health Implications:

*Most studies on the health impacts of airports have been conducted around larger airports. However, increased air traffic at the TCCA is likely to result in increased emissions of noise and pollutants. An assessment of the impact of expanded activities on local air quality is necessary before any conclusions can be drawn on the potential health effects to people living in the surrounding community.*

*Noise:*

*The study of the health effects of noise is complex. This is partly due to the fact that the impact of noise varies depending on the characteristics of the noise, some of which are not completely understood. Studies have shown links between stress, ill health and noise. The level of noise in a community can thus have an impact on the quality of life. Airport related noise includes the noise from aircraft, ground activity at the airport and traffic.*

*Aircraft-Related Noise:*

*Noise exposure forecasts (NEF) calculate the impact of aircraft noise in the vicinity of airports. It is a measure of the daily cumulative effect of all aircraft averaged over a day. NEF calculations are adjusted to take into consideration that night-time flights are more annoying than daytime ones. The Tripartite Agreement has outlined a NEF-25 contour for the TCCA. Given the prevailing winds, most of the flights use the east-west runway, thus the NEF-25 contour is predominantly over water. Aircraft are allowed to fly over land only once they have reached a certain height to limit noise impacts on the ground. The airport authority is responsible to ensure compliance with the NEF contours as outlined by Transport Canada.*

*NEF values below 25 are considered to be similar to other background noise. At levels between 25-30 NEF, noise may interfere with certain activities and authorities receive sporadic complaints. Transport Canada does not support incompatible land use, especially residential housing, in areas affected by aircraft noise. Sensitive land uses are not recommended within the NEF-25 contour. Although current and future residential areas are outside the projected NEF-25 contour, the actual human response to noise varies depending on other factors such as existing ambient noise plus other social and environmental conditions and thus may still have a negative impact.*

*Ground and Traffic Noise:*

*The NEF calculations are used to manage the noise from aircraft during taxiing, landing and take-off. There are other sources of noise at the airport from ground support activity and plane maintenance. The TPA has noted that many complaints received about noise are related to sources of noise other than aircraft, such as the frequent firing of guns to warn off birds. It is therefore also important to discuss mitigation measures for sources of noise which are not controlled using the NEF calculations.*

*There are other sources of noise in the neighbourhood, such as trains and the Gardiner Expressway. Because of their different characteristics and the overall mix experienced in any given area, it can be difficult to compare their impact. For example, continuous noise, such as may be experienced from traffic on an expressway, is usually better tolerated than more intermittent noise such as that coming from aircraft that are landing or taking-off. Although the airport may not be the most significant source of noise in the area, it still contributes to the overall impact of noise in the neighbourhood, and will predominate in certain areas.*

#### *Air Emissions from Aircraft:*

*The pollutants found in emissions from aircraft are similar to those from other sources in the transportation sector (e.g. cars, trucks). These include pollutants contributing to smog as well as toxic pollutants, some of which are known carcinogens. Although emissions from aircraft at the TCCA may be small in comparison to total emissions in the City, air quality in the City is the result of the sum of a multitude of small sources. The transportation sector is the most significant contributor to air pollution in the City and air transportation as a whole is a growing concern related to global climate change.*

#### *Air Emissions from Ground Activities and Traffic:*

*Emissions from ground service activities can contribute about half of the total emissions from airports. The TPA Traffic Management Study identifies possible mitigative measures that the TCCA will consider to reduce the impact of air pollution from vehicles. These include investigation of alternative fuels for ground operation vehicles, encouraging only alternative-fuel taxis to provide pick-up at the terminal building, and encouraging air carriers to provide a shuttle service to downtown locations. It also states that "TPA is prepared to commit staff" to enforce the City's By-law to Prohibit Excessive Idling of Vehicles and Boats as a key means of reducing local impacts. However, it is unclear if the TPA resources being contemplated for this purpose would actually be sufficient for by-law enforcement both on and off-site.*

#### *Health Impact from TCCA Air Emissions:*

*The Medical Officer of Health has been requested to comment on the health impacts of the expansion of the TCCA. Toronto Public Health has determined that air quality in Toronto is currently linked to substantial premature death, lung disease and heart disease. The airport is only one of many sources in the area, along with the Gardiner Expressway and local traffic. Although the 1998 EA provides some information on emissions from the airport, it is not sufficient to make an assessment of the potential health impacts. There is a need to model the emissions and the resultant air quality for various levels of airport traffic (i.e. 300,000; 600,000; 900,000; 1,200,000 and more), in conjunction with the associated ground level activity at the airport and sources in the surrounding areas, and to assess the impact of various mitigative measures, such as the construction of an off-site terminal. The joint committee did not adopt the recommendation for additional air modelling made in the CAO's report (October 22, 2002).*

#### *Transportation Issues:*

*Traffic patterns, such as the number of vehicles and levels of congestion, are important considerations in determining the impact on local air quality. The assessment of the transportation impacts has relied on the study undertaken by KPMG in 1991. Although the 1998 EA notes that an annual passenger volume of 900,000 would not result in aircraft noise levels above the 25 NEF contours, it concludes that at passenger levels above 600,000 "serious impairment of local road network would occur". It therefore recommends a remote check-in facility if annual passenger numbers increase above 600,000. Such a facility would result in lower traffic impacts at 900,000 passengers per year than at 600,000, because fewer people would travel directly to the airport.*

*The construction of a remote check-in facility is not included in the TPA Business Plan. Although the Traffic Management Study finds that the conclusions of the 1998 EA are still valid, it further asserts that up to 900,000 passengers can be handled with a lower traffic volume than previously estimated. However, it provides insufficient detail on how this could realistically be achieved, including the capacity of local public transit to serve the waterfront area and other aspects that are subject to the success of future negotiations between the City and TPA.*

*The Traffic Management study states that, “transit service is a key element of the traffic management plan” (page 38). The report’s conclusion that increased passenger volumes can be accommodated assumes dramatic increases in transit use (up to 50% of trips). However, it does not substantiate the validity of this assumption. The City’s Transportation Services describes this assumption as “overly optimistic” and noted that the increase in transit use does not correspond to anticipated transit service documented in the TPA’s report. The Dillon study recommends a shuttle bus to Union Station and states that an LRT extension “could be considered”, but this would require resolution of major technical issues. A formal transit strategy has been requested to support these estimates.*

*The Study also assumes that flights will be distributed somewhat evenly throughout the day. Transportation staff state that this assumption results in “unrealistically low” peak traffic, as flight times will be driven by market demand and likely will be clustered around “rush hour” periods. This may increase the likelihood of local traffic congestion and infiltration into surrounding neighbourhoods. It is therefore unclear if the projected passenger volumes can actually be handled as proposed without the use of a remote check-in facility or other measures.*

*The CAO’s report (October 22, 2002) had recommended a cap of 600,000 passengers per year. This recommendation was not adopted as it was considered unnecessary. The NEF-25 contour was considered sufficient in determining maximum passenger volumes without undue impacts on noise and local air pollution. However, the staff recommendation for the cap was based on point sources for local traffic congestion and road safety which are not addressed by the NEF, nor adequately substantiated in the Traffic Management Study. The joint committee accepted the CAO’s recommendation that a transit plan be developed in consultation with the City and the TTC. However, until that work is satisfactorily completed, public health issues arising from ground traffic congestion will remain unaddressed.*

#### *Other Considerations:*

*Those who supported the expansion of the airport focussed on the benefits that could occur. There are many factors that influence the health of individuals and communities, including employment and income. Therefore, these benefits have the potential to contribute to overall well-being in the City.*

*Potential economic benefits may accrue through the recruitment and retention of businesses and local employment into the downtown core, increased tourism generated by easier access to Toronto, an alternative choice for regional air travel, and employment from aircraft construction. The TCCA is also used by air emergency medical services and for the training of pilots.*

Conclusions:

*As stated in the CAO's report (September 27, 2002), the Medical Officer of Health has remained neutral on the specific question of whether TCCA operations should decrease, remain the same, or expand. Ideally, the expansion of the airport would be considered within an overall sustainable transportation plan for Toronto.*

*The scientific literature has documented the health effects of airports and their associated ground operations. Air pollution and noise impacts can be expected to rise as activities increase at the TCCA. Estimated passenger volumes, peak periods and the associated local impacts from noise and air pollution remain uncertain. To date, the public health concerns of local residents and other opponents of TCCA expansion arising from the projected number of aircraft and the associated ground traffic have not been satisfactorily addressed. While the magnitude of increased health risk is said to be small, at least in relation to other sources of pollution (e.g. Gardiner Expressway), this assertion has not yet been proven.*

*Given the multiplicity of local sources, vehicle loads and the cross-border transport of air pollutants affecting the City overall, the TCCA is a relatively small contributor to poor air quality in Toronto. However, the TCCA is a significant local point source of noise and air pollution that is located in an area that provides for enjoyment of the natural environment. Moreover, these increased emissions and health risks apply in an environment that is already somewhat degraded by regional air pollution, local traffic congestion and historical soil contamination. At minimum, it is recommended that a proper assessment of current and projected air quality and noise exposures be made. Such an assessment will also provide a baseline against which to assess future health impacts on area residents and to reduce future impacts on local businesses, tourists and other visitors to the area (e.g. children on school trips).*

*The potential economic value of this project to the City through increased local employment and economic stimulation of the downtown core may have spin-off benefits in terms of the health of individuals and local communities. These should be balanced with the increasing importance of the waterfront district as a place to live, work and spend time in recreation. As such, the potential public health impacts of this project arising from exposure to increased noise and air pollution should be properly assessed and managed for the benefit of area residents and to protect and promote this area for future users and visitors to the City's waterfront.*

Contact:

*Ronald MacFarlane  
Supervisor, Environmental Health Assessment and Policy  
Telephone: 416-338-8097  
Fax: 416-392-7418 Email: rmacfar3@toronto.ca*

List of Attachments:

*Appendix A: Correspondence dated November 7, 2001 from the Toronto Cancer Prevention Coalition to the Mayor and Members of Toronto City Council.*

*Appendix B: Correspondence dated January 31, 2002 from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services to the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism.*

*Correspondence dated March 24, 2002 from Toronto Public Health to Urban Development Services.*

*Appendix C: Excerpt from the CAO's report dated September 27, 2002 entitled The Toronto City Centre Airport (TCCA.)*

*(A copy of the attachments referred to in the forgoing report is on file in the office of the City Clerk.)*

---

*(City Council, also had before it, during consideration of the foregoing Clause, the following transmittal (November 22, 2002) from the City Clerk, Task Force on the Gardiner/Lake shore Corridor:*

*Recommendation:*

*It is recommended that the Task Force on the Gardiner/Lake Shore Corridor advise City Council of its opposition to the construction of a fixed link to the Toronto Island Airport from the foot of Bathurst Street because of its deleterious effects on the Gardiner/Lake Shore Corridor.*

*Background:*

*The Task Force on the Gardiner/Lake Shore Corridor at its meeting held on November 21, 2002 held a discussion regarding the Toronto Island Airport issue.)*

*(City Council also had before it, during consideration of the foregoing Clause, communications from the following:*

- (a) (undated) from Graham Finlay Mudge, M.A., C.A., providing an analysis of the Toronto City Centre airport Business Plan; submitted by Councillor Olivia Chow, Downtown;*
- (b) press release (November 25, 2002) from the Canadian Auto Workers, expressing support for the fixed link to the Island Airport;*
- (c) (November 18, 2002) from Robert A. Fung, Chairman, Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation, submitted by the Commissioner of Urban Development Services; and*
- (d) (November 28, 2002) from Dr. Riina I. Bray, Chair, Environmental Health Committee, The Ontario College of Family Physicians, submitted by Councillor Pam McConnell, Toronto Centre-Rosedale.)*

*(City Council also had before it, during consideration of the foregoing Clause, communications received from the following pertaining to the Toronto City Centre Airport:*

- (1) (October 19, 2002) from Mary Richardson;*
- (2) (October 21, 2002) from Geoff Pickering;*
- (3) (October 22, 2002) from Bonnie Calwell;*
- (4) (October 22, 2002) from Christy Manis;*



- (5) (October 23, 2002) from William A. Roedde;
- (6) (October 23, 2002) from Paul Muldoon, Executive Director, Canadian Environmental Law Association;
- (7) (October 25, 2002) from Sandra Wood;
- (8) (October 25, 2002) from Zella Wolofsky;
- (9) (October 25, 2002) from Eliza Wong and Patrick Li;
- (10) (October 25, 2002) from Rosemary Corbett;
- (11) (October 25, 2002) from Betsy MacKinnon;
- (12) (October 26, 2002) from David Campbell;
- (13) (October 27, 2002) from Dr. Sidney Golden;
- (14) (October 29, 2002) from Douglas T. Wright, President Emeritus, University of Waterloo;
- (15) (October 30, 2002) from Joan Doiron;
- (16) (October 30, 2002) from Jerry Shiner;
- (17) (October 30, 2002) from Michael Page;
- (18) (October 30, 2002) from Malcolm King;
- (19) (October 30, 2002) from Jackie Thomas;
- (20) (October 30, 2002) from Peter Freeman;
- (21) (October 30, 2002) from Irene Grubb;
- (22) (October 30, 2002) from Peter Hendrick;
- (23) (October 30, 2002) from Lina Martin;
- (24) (October 30, 2002) from Noel Ryan;
- (25) (October 30, 2002) from Paola Ardils;
- (26) (October 30, 2002) from Josh Wiwcharyk;
- (27) (October 30, 2002) from Niki Walker;
- (28) (October 30, 2002) from Chris Williams;
- (29) (October 30, 2002) from Jamie Smith;
- (30) (October 30, 2002) from Nancy Staib;
- (31) (October 30, 2002) from Allyson Woodrooffe;
- (32) (October 30, 2002) from Gene Shannon;
- (33) (October 30, 2002) from Carl Szamosvari;
- (34) (October 30, 2002) from Gavin O'Hara;
- (35) (October 30, 2002) from Ilone Eurchuk;
- (36) (October 30, 2002) from Penelope C. Tyndale;
- (37) (October 30, 2002) from Susan Swan;
- (38) (October 30, 2002) from Catherine Nasmith;
- (39) (October 30, 2002) from Dorothy Holmes;
- (40) (October 30, 2002) from Jimmy E. Daradzikis;
- (41) (October 30, 2002) from Carol Shaw;
- (42) (October 30, 2002) from Paul Unterman;
- (43) (October 30, 2002) from Alastair Dickson;
- (44) (October 30, 2002) from Lou Ampas;
- (45) (October 30, 2002) from Christine Chan;
- (46) (October 30, 2002) from Bill Kime;
- (47) (October 30, 2002) from Christina Chen;
- (48) (October 30, 2002) from Ron Searles;
- (49) (October 30, 2002) from Kathleen Doody;

- (50) (October 30, 2002) from Shepherd C. Campbell;
- (51) (October 30, 2002) from Anne McDonagh;
- (52) (October 30, 2002) from Gabrielle David;
- (53) (October 30, 2002) from Andrew Arnold;
- (54) (October 30, 2002) from Walter Kehm;
- (55) (October 30, 2002) from Steve Robson;
- (56) (October 30, 2002) from Bruna Nota;
- (57) (October 30, 2002) from Hugh Neilson;
- (58) (October 30, 2002) from Patrick Li;
- (59) (October 30, 2002) from Eliza Wong;
- (60) (October 30, 2002) from Irene Fedun;
- (61) (October 30, 2002) from Carole Dussault;
- (62) (October 30, 2002) from Reverend Chris King;
- (63) (October 30, 2002) from Angela Calvaruso;
- (64) (October 30, 2002) from Brian Johnson;
- (65) (October 30, 2002) from Rochelle Rodney;
- (66) (October 30, 2002) from Tony St. Amant;
- (67) (October 30, 2002) from Christine Rucska;
- (68) (October 30, 2002) from France Gingras;
- (69) (October 30, 2002) from Dr. David Bazett-Jones;
- (70) (October 30, 2002) from Todd Sherman;
- (71) (October 30, 2002) from Nancy Weiler;
- (72) (October 30, 2002) from Elizabeth Thomas;
- (73) (October 30, 2002) from Denis Gibson;
- (74) (October 30, 2002) from Jason Pearson;
- (75) (October 30, 2002) from Elayne Lockhart;
- (76) (October 30, 2002) from Cathy Waiten;
- (77) (October 30, 2002) from Catharine Lyons-King;
- (78) (October 30, 2002) from Riitta Piva;
- (79) (October 30, 2002) from Donna Kim;
- (80) (October 30, 2002) from Manuel Rodolfo de la Puerta;
- (81) (October 30, 2002) from Michael Neff;
- (82) (October 30, 2002) from Heather Osolen;
- (83) (October 30, 2002) from Shaun Oakey;
- (84) (October 30, 2002) from Paul Micallef;
- (85) (October 30, 2002) from Peggy Slegers;
- (86) (October 30, 2002) from Dwight Hamilton;
- (87) (October 30, 2002) from Chris Crozier;
- (88) (October 30, 2002) from Elke O'Hara;
- (89) (October 30, 2002) from Mary Anne Brinckman;
- (90) (October 30, 2002) from Bruce Budd;
- (91) (October 30, 2002) from Craig Gilchrist;
- (92) (October 30, 2002) from Laurie Stevenson;
- (93) (October 30, 2002) from Claire Fortier;
- (94) (October 30, 2002) from Angela Kypreos-Solomos;
- (95) (October 30, 2002) from Ann Lovering;
- (96) (October 30, 2002) from Murray Hodgins;

- (97) (October 30, 2002) from Jennifer Vanderweerd;
- (98) (November 4, 2002) from Andrew Santorelli;
- (99) (November 5, 2002) from Julie Beddoes, Secretary, Gooderham & Worts Neighbourhood Association;
- (100) (November 6, 2002) from Joan Prowse;
- (101) (November 12, 2002) from Susan Collacott;
- (102) (November 12, 2002) from Arlene Clement;
- (103) (November 13, 2002) from Joel and Mary Rochon;
- (104) (November 13, 2002) from Marc Dacey;
- (105) (November 13, 2002) from George Sekely;
- (106) (November 13, 2002) from Ray Dillard;
- (107) (November 13, 2002) from Rebecca Quigley;
- (108) (November 13, 2002) from Martin Perl;
- (109) (November 13, 2002) from John Greer;
- (110) (November 13, 2002) from Tom Stephens;
- (111) (November 13, 2002) from Hugh Neilson;
- (112) (November 13, 2002) from Judith Malkin;
- (113) (November 13, 2002) from Susan Wright;
- (114) (November 13, 2002) from David Williams;
- (115) (November 13, 2002) from Chris Wilson;
- (116) (November 13, 2002) from Keith Storey;
- (117) (November 13, 2002) from William Prine;
- (118) (November 13, 2002) from Howard Cohen;
- (119) (November 13, 2002) from Patrick Flynn;
- (120) (November 13, 2002) from Janet Sugerman;
- (121) (November 13, 2002) from Louise Larouche;
- (122) (November 13, 2002) from Donald Clark;
- (123) (November 13, 2002) from Murray Gilker;
- (124) (November 13, 2002) from Margaret Clark;
- (125) (November 13, 2002) from Marlene Auspitz;
- (126) (November 13, 2002) from Susan Serran;
- (127) (November 13, 2002) from Michael Davey;
- (128) (November 13, 2002) from Don Hannah;
- (129) (November 13, 2002) from Marilyn Goodman;
- (130) (November 13, 2002) from Simon Fryer;
- (131) (November 13, 2002) from Ian Blumer;
- (132) (November 13, 2002) from Alice Bartels;
- (133) (November 13, 2002) from Mark Winston;
- (134) (November 13, 2002) from Ilone Eurchuk;
- (135) (November 13, 2002) from Raymond Mark;
- (136) (November 13, 2002) from Michelle Breslin;
- (137) (November 13, 2002) from William Freeman;
- (138) (November 13, 2002) from Richard Aaron;
- (139) (November 13, 2002) from Michael McNamara;
- (140) (November 13, 2002) from Cameron Miller;
- (141) (November 13, 2002) from Jennifer Innis;
- (142) (November 13, 2002) from Alejandro Vidal;

- (143) (November 13, 2002) from Janice Zemdegs;
- (144) (November 13, 2002) from Emily Gibson;
- (145) (November 13, 2002) from Laura Enneson;
- (146) (November 13, 2002) from Dr. Florence Gibson;
- (147) (November 13, 2002) from Lisa Cummins;
- (148) (November 13, 2002) from Marilyn Green;
- (149) (November 13, 2002) from Dr. Catherine Smith;
- (150) (November 13, 2002) from Elsie Murphy;
- (151) (November 13, 2002) from Marjorie Harris;
- (152) (November 13, 2002) from Trish Murphy;
- (153) (November 13, 2002) from Delphine Milbrandt;
- (154) (November 14, 2002) from Anna Dipede;
- (155) (November 14, 2002) from Margaret White;
- (156) (November 14, 2002) from John Flanagan;
- (157) (November 14, 2002) from Dennis Bryant;
- (158) (November 14, 2002) from Michael Dunn;
- (159) (November 14, 2002) from Hubert Budding;
- (160) (November 14, 2002) from Edgar Diaz;
- (161) (November 14, 2002) from Harold Schwartz;
- (162) (November 14, 2002) from Anne Lewis;
- (163) (November 14, 2002) from David Lord;
- (164) (November 14, 2002) from Nan Budding;
- (165) (November 14, 2002) from John Liss;
- (166) (November 14, 2002) from Dr. Judith Dick;
- (167) (November 14, 2002) from Dr. Jean-Francois Gouin;
- (168) (November 14, 2002) from Janet Highland;
- (169) (November 14, 2002) from Colleen Wagner;
- (170) (November 14, 2002) from Mary Partridge;
- (171) (November 14, 2002) from Pamela Murphy;
- (172) (November 15, 2002) from Rick Persich;
- (173) (November 17, 2002) from Paul Smith;
- (174) (November 17, 2002) from Brenda Roman;
- (175) (November 18, 2002) from Susan Low-Ber;
- (176) (undated) from Crystal Evans;
- (177) (undated) from Markus Parillo;
- (178) (undated) from Robert Keppy;
- (179) (undated) from Robert Moss;
- (180) (November 13, 2002) from Gerry Quigley, President, Board of Directors, Arcadia Housing Co-operative Inc.;
- (181) (November 19, 2002) from Janice Smith;
- (182) (November 17, 2002) petition signed by eleven residents, submitted by Councillor Jane Pitfield, Don Valley West (original on file in the office of the City Clerk);
- (183) (November 20, 2002) from The Dancers of The National Ballet of Canada;
- (184) (November 22, 2002) from Robin Askew;
- (185) (November 25, 2002) from Frank Watts;
- (186) (November 26, 2002) from Helen Riley;

- (187) (November 25, 2002) from Basil 'Buzz' Hargrove, President, (CAW TCA-Canada);
- (188) (November 25, 2002) from Michael Hren, BearingPoint LP;
- (189) (November 25, 2002) from Kathy Vanderlinden;
- (190) (November 25, 2002) from Dr. Colman Hogan;
- (191) (November 25, 2002) from Cathleen Unrau;
- (192) (November 25, 2002) from Debby Chui;
- (193) (November 25, 2002) from James Rhee;
- (194) (November 25, 2002) from Dr. Ulrich Menzefricke;
- (195) (November 25, 2002) from Diana Rowland;
- (196) (November 25, 2002) from Elizabeth Tutton;
- (197) (November 25, 2002) from Daren Foster;
- (198) (November 25, 2002) from Dr. Richard Reinert;
- (199) (November 25, 2002) from John B. Love;
- (200) (November 25, 2002) from Farokh Pavri;
- (201) (November 25, 2002) from Briony Cayley;
- (202) (November 25, 2002) from Julie Joyce;
- (203) (November 25, 2002) from Chris Wallace;
- (204) (November 25, 2002) from Patrick Hinchey;
- (205) (November 25, 2002) from Joel and Mary Rochon;
- (206) (November 25, 2002) from Christine MacLean;
- (207) (November 25, 2002) from Paul Smith;
- (208) (November 25, 2002) from Charles Marker;
- (209) (November 25, 2002) from Grant Tisdall;
- (210) (November 25, 2002) from John Webb;
- (211) (November 25, 2002) from Suzie Boudreault;
- (212) (November 25, 2002) from Peter Quinton;
- (213) (November 25, 2002) from Rev. Dr. Renate Koke;
- (214) (November 25, 2002) from Garth Douglas;
- (215) (November 25, 2002) from Melissa Jarman;
- (216) (November 25, 2002) from Sandra Dixon;
- (217) (November 25, 2002) from Grant G. Johnson;
- (218) (November 25, 2002) from Melanie Evely;
- (219) (November 25, 2002) from Rick Persich;
- (220) (November 25, 2002) from Melissa Kotton;
- (221) (November 25, 2002) from Reverend Robin Guinness;
- (222) (November 25, 2002) from Janet Quinton;
- (223) (November 25, 2002) from Alice Courtney;
- (224) (November 25, 2002) from Laurie Stevenson;
- (225) (November 25, 2002) from Susan Anderson;
- (226) (November 25, 2002) from Dr. Ian Derby;
- (227) (November 25, 2002) from Jane Brooke;
- (228) (November 25, 2002) from Kerry Black;
- (229) (November 25, 2002) from Diana Resendes;
- (230) (November 25, 2002) from Dairine Ni Mheadhra;
- (231) (November 25, 2002) from Keith Nunn;
- (232) (November 25, 2002) from Carol Lazare;

- (233) (November 25, 2002) from Walter Kehm;
- (234) (November 25, 2002) from Alexander Bondarenko;
- (235) (November 25, 2002) from Elizabeth Soroka;
- (236) (November 25, 2002) from Arlene Clement;
- (237) (November 25, 2002) from Susan Collacott;
- (238) (November 25, 2002) from Dr. O. L. MacDonald;
- (239) (November 25, 2002) from Carole Therriault;
- (240) (November 25, 2002) from Dave Taylor;
- (241) (November 25, 2002) from Jim Mercer;
- (242) (November 25, 2002) from Yvonne Parti;
- (243) (November 25, 2002) from Lynne Shuttleworth;
- (244) (November 25, 2002) from Ferdi Farrell;
- (245) (November 25, 2002) from Anna Scott;
- (246) (November 25, 2002) from Lisa Voutt;
- (247) (November 25, 2002) from Dr. Zella Wolofsky;
- (248) (November 25, 2002) from Robert Plitt;
- (249) (November 25, 2002) from Alan Chu;
- (250) (November 25, 2002) from John Elmslie;
- (251) (November 25, 2002) from Dr. Andrew Malcolm;
- (252) (November 25, 2002) from Peter Shepherd;
- (253) (November 25, 2002) from Karen Tzventarny;
- (254) (November 25, 2002) from Jesse Rosensweet;
- (255) (November 25, 2002) from Susan Walker;
- (256) (November 25, 2002) from Carol Lazare;
- (257) (November 25, 2002) from Graham Bolton;
- (258) (November 25, 2002) from Harve Sokoloff;
- (259) (November 25, 2002) from Asha Hodura;
- (260) (November 25, 2002) from R. Morno;
- (261) (November 25, 2002) from Carol Albert;
- (262) (November 25, 2002) from Tracey Weir;
- (263) (November 25, 2002) from Jean Lewandowski;
- (264) (November 25, 2002) from Daphne Lavers;
- (265) (November 25, 2002) from William Kimber;
- (266) (November 25, 2002) from Ira Rabinovitch;
- (267) (November 25, 2002) from Susan Macpherson;
- (268) (November 25, 2002) from Carol Kehm;
- (269) (November 25, 2002) from Louise Larouche;
- (270) (November 26, 2002) from Jacob Allderdice;
- (271) (November 26, 2002) from John Farrell;
- (272) (November 26, 2002) from Pattie Walker;
- (273) (November 26, 2002) from Kathleen Lawson;
- (274) (November 26, 2002) from Frank Middleton;
- (275) (November 26, 2002) from Peter Holt;
- (276) (November 26, 2002) from Susan Elliott;
- (277) (November 26, 2002) from Barbara McGee;
- (278) (November 26, 2002) from Nina Unantenne;
- (279) (November 26, 2002) from Valerie Cook;

- (280) (November 26, 2002) from Patricia Smith;
- (281) (November 26, 2002) from Sheldon Chan;
- (282) (November 26, 2002) from David Pelletier;
- (283) (November 26, 2002) from Jose Silva;
- (284) (November 26, 2002) from Helen Kenney;
- (285) (November 26, 2002) from Alvin Regehr;
- (286) (November 26, 2002) from Dr. Andrew Lam;
- (287) (November 26, 2002) from Stephen Potts;
- (288) (November 26, 2002) from Dominic Menegon;
- (289) (November 26, 2002) from Alex Mihaila;
- (290) (November 26, 2002) from Wolfram Brandstetter;
- (291) (November 26, 2002) from Cary Chan;
- (292) (November 26, 2002) from Charles Simon;
- (293) (November 26, 2002) from David Schryer;
- (294) (November 26, 2002) from Alice Briesmaster;
- (295) (November 26, 2002) from AJ Diamond;
- (296) (November 26, 2002) from Rita Devgan;
- (297) (November 26, 2002) from Daniel Tang;
- (298) (November 26, 2002) from Steve Dorey;
- (299) (November 26, 2002) from Pacita Choa-Yu;
- (300) (November 26, 2002) from Cathryn Lohrisch;
- (301) (November 26, 2002) from Naomi McCormack;
- (302) (November 26, 2002) from Andrea and Ryan Delrue;
- (303) (November 26, 2002) from Michelle Breslin;
- (304) (November 26, 2002) from Dr. Eduardo Ng;
- (305) (November 26, 2002) from Amanda Pask;
- (306) (November 26, 2002) from Joanne Schneider;
- (307) (November 26, 2002) from Sharon Oatway;
- (308) (November 26, 2002) from Laura Starr;
- (309) (November 26, 2002) from Dale Campbell;
- (310) (November 26, 2002) from Emily Tang;
- (311) (November 26, 2002) from O. John Hawkins;
- (312) (November 26, 2002) from Elsie Petch;
- (313) (November 26, 2002) from James Huctwith;
- (314) (November 26, 2002) from Jim Garganis;
- (315) (November 26, 2002) from Monica Kerr;
- (316) (November 26, 2002) from Massimo Panaccione;
- (317) (November 26, 2002) from John Leeson;
- (318) (November 26, 2002) from Melissa Kerr;
- (319) (November 26, 2002) from Norman Pancic;
- (320) (November 26, 2002) from Timothy Arnold;
- (321) (November 26, 2002) from Timothy Egan;
- (322) (November 26, 2002) from Melissa Taylor;
- (323) (November 26, 2002) from Bie Engelen;
- (324) (November 26, 2002) from Candice Craig;
- (325) (November 26, 2002) from Prof. Dr. N. Kosaric;
- (326) (November 26, 2002) from Marta Méndez;

- (327) (November 26, 2002) from *Viktoria, Rina and Alex Mirochnik*;
- (328) (November 26, 2002) from *Dr. Voon L. Chan*;
- (329) (November 26, 2002) from *Diane Burt*;
- (330) (November 26, 2002) from *Eric Ladelpha*;
- (331) (November 26, 2002) from *Linda Montemarano*;
- (332) (November 26, 2002) from *Lyba Spring*;
- (333) (November 26, 2002) from *Henry Zmudka*;
- (334) (November 26, 2002) from *Michelle Tsang*;
- (335) (November 26, 2002) from *Kenneth Seto*;
- (336) (November 26, 2002) from *Winnie Lumsden*;
- (337) (November 26, 2002) from *Mike Armstrong*;
- (338) (November 26, 2002) from *Andrew Armstrong*;
- (339) (November 26, 2002) from *Geeta Sondhi*;
- (340) (November 26, 2002) from *Irene Capobianco*;
- (341) (November 26, 2002) from *Stephen Overbury*;
- (342) (November 26, 2002) from *Adam Mezei*;
- (343) (November 26, 2002) from *Carol Pauker*;
- (344) (November 26, 2002) from *Kimberly Davy*;
- (345) (November 26, 2002) from *Mary Hay*;
- (346) (November 26, 2002) from *Dr. Lisa Grail-Hunt*;
- (347) (November 26, 2002) from *James Plaxton*;
- (348) (November 26, 2002) from *Peter Raynes*;
- (349) (November 26, 2002) from *Brenda Roman*;
- (350) (November 26, 2002) from *Jenna Maclaverty*;
- (351) (November 26, 2002) from *Joanna Thiessen*;
- (352) (November 26, 2002) from *Judy Squires-Lathrop*;
- (353) (November 26, 2002) from *Carrie MacTavish*;
- (354) (November 26, 2002) from *Dottie Creal*;
- (355) (November 26, 2002) from *Hooi Loo*;
- (356) (November 27, 2002) from *Tony Lam*;
- (357) (November 26, 2002) from *Anthony J. Swain*;
- (358) (November 26, 2002) from *Stephanie Tjelios*;
- (359) (November 26, 2002) from *David Smiley*;
- (360) (November 26, 2002) from *Ambrose Nguyen*;
- (361) (November 26, 2002) from *Judie Chow*;
- (362) (November 26, 2002) from *Sharon Howarth*;
- (363) (November 26, 2002) from *Sean Fitzpatrick*;
- (364) (November 26, 2002) from *Andy Krehm*;
- (365) (November 26, 2002) from *Susan Daly*;
- (366) (November 26, 2002) from *Sheila MacKinnon*;
- (367) (November 26, 2002) from *Linda Litwack*;
- (368) (November 26, 2002) from *Michael Jenkins*;
- (369) (November 26, 2002) from *Bina Smith*;
- (370) (November 26, 2002) from *June Quah*;
- (371) (November 26, 2002) from *Claire Hughes*;
- (372) (November 26, 2002) from *Dave Yung*;
- (373) (November 26, 2002) from *Lori Spring*;



- (374) (November 26, 2002) from Tammy Masoumi;
- (375) (November 26, 2002) from Robin Evans;
- (376) (November 26, 2002) from Sebastian Carbajales;
- (377) (November 26, 2002) from Oliver Zielke;
- (378) (November 26, 2002) from Barbara Blakeley;
- (379) (November 26, 2002) from Wendy Russell;
- (380) (November 26, 2002) from Janet Patterson;
- (381) (November 26, 2002) from Charlie Sise;
- (382) (November 26, 2002) from Ryan Barrett;
- (383) (November 26, 2002) from Brian Gay;
- (384) (November 26, 2002) from Sandra Bardocz;
- (385) (November 26, 2002) from Richard Walters;
- (386) (November 26, 2002) from Judy Kondrat;
- (387) (November 26, 2002) from Jennifer Jones;
- (388) (November 26, 2002) from Amanda Robinson;
- (389) (November 26, 2002) from Dianne Cameron;
- (390) (November 26, 2002) from Tammy Grime;
- (391) (November 26, 2002) from Ann Marie Wierzbicki;
- (392) (November 26, 2002) from Becca Whitla;
- (393) (November 26, 2002) from Geert van der Veen; and
- (394) (November 26, 2002) from Susanna Carnevale.)

---

*(Councillor Disero, at the regular meeting of Council held on November 26, 27 and 28, 2002 and the special meeting of Council held on November 28 and 29, 2002, declared an interest in the foregoing Clause, in that she is one of the parties named in a litigation matter related to the Toronto Port Authority.)*

*(Councillor Walker, at the regular meeting of Council held on November 26, 27 and 28, 2002 and the special meeting of Council held on November 28 and 29, 2002, declared an interest in the foregoing Clause, in that he is one of the parties named in a litigation matter related to the Toronto Port Authority.)*