

Summary of Questions and Comments for City of Toronto Staff
BBTCA/Porter Airlines Review June 17, 2013 Information Meeting

Please report any errors to omissions to: cdunn@toronto.ca

- Unlike other Canadian Port Authorities, the TPA relies heavily on airport revenues. Can we ensure that they are unbiased in their evaluation of airport expansion?
- Do lobbyists have access to either the City's consultant team or the City staff project team?
- Current Porter load factors are low. Porter should address under-capacity issues before pursuing the introduction of larger capacity aircraft.
- The TPA is not paying their taxes (PILTS). Will they pay their taxes in the future? What is the benefit of this proposal to Toronto if we do not receive taxes?
- It is unclear what the business case is for the Porter proposal. Will Porter make their business case and load factors public?
- The City should be meticulous and transparent in their reporting on noise issues.
- What is the dollar value of the staff time has been spent on this proposal?
- There appears to be a significant governance issue and potential conflict of interest between TPA and Porter.
- As with the Porter lobbyists, will community and residential groups be given direct access to the project team and consultants?
- Public polling and face-to-face interviews may not provide useful information. The issue is highly technical in nature; people need to be properly informed before they provide an opinion.
- The City's presentation [at the June 17, 2013 meeting] was not balanced.
- What would the City do if the study concludes that an airport in this location is a bad idea?
- Why is the airport 'greyed out' on waterfront plans? Who gave the 'grey out' order?
- How was the consultant team selected? How can we be assured that there is no conflict of interest?
- Given the significance of this proposal, and the significance of waterfront revitalization investments (\$1.5B), we should take our time to make the right decision

- We need to consider the cumulative effects on our waterfront investments. How can we do this in such a short study time frame?
- Will this proposal violate any trade agreements signed by the governments?
- There is an "institutional weakness" that has allowed us to get in the position we are in today. A lack of planning has allowed the airport to expand to its current size. City Legal and the Province of Ontario have a role to play in the review of this issue.
- Province of Ontario needs to be involved in this review. Do they own the lake bed around the airport?
- Do urban design and planning considerations factor into the decision-making process?
- Porter can fly to their proposed destinations using their existing fleet. On this basis, there is no need to modify the tripartite agreement. It is a bad precedent.
- There is no way to predict what Porter will do with the airport if their proposal is adopted.
- The Tripartite Agreement was signed on the basis of a very different historic condition/context. What were the intentions for the airport under the Tripartite Agreement?
- Why did the previous airline carriers at the airport fail?
- What was the outcome when past airport noise violations occurred?
- Improved technologies have resulted in quieter airplanes. Noise parameters should be correspondingly stricter.
- Noise violations should result in planes being 'kicked off the list'.
- Prefer no changes to the Tripartite Agreement; airport should operate consistent with existing terms. Moved to waterfront with the understanding that the Tripartite Agreement would always govern the operation of the airport without amendments.

- Will massive bird culls be required to accommodate the proposed jets?
- We need to establish a baseline for a noise study.
- A noise study is required that excludes ambient noise. Also needs to address vibration.
- Confirmation is required that Porter is in compliance with the current noise standard.
- EA noise change effects standards include 3-5dB changes as 'noticeable' and >10dB changes as 'significant'. The Porter proposal has noise change effects at 10-30dB. This should be clarified.
- Model clarification and validation may contradict the exclusion of individual airplane noise contours.
- Expanding the runway zone will require extension of the marine exclusion zone.
- The noise pollution contours do not take into account power-up and taxing requirements of the proposed jets. These issues need to be studied.
- Studies have highlighted the issue of residential compatibility with airport runoff zones. The Radisson condominiums [at 249 Queen's Quay West] are less than 300m from the existing runoff area and proposed runway extension. This issue should be considered.
- When reviewing other waterfront airports, a clear distinction should be made between "airports on water" and "waterfront airports". Few of the airports studied are in close proximity to their central waterfront areas.
- Weather conditions should be factored into the noise study. Model calibration and validation needs to be confirmed.
- Taxis should be included in the study. Current management of taxis is not addressing the problem (inconsistent policing and security staff, taxis parking in school parking lot).
- New RESA (Runway End Safety Standards) required by Transport Canada may result in increase of runoff areas past what is currently being proposed.
- The Bombardier CS-100 airplane has never been flown. How can this study be completed?
- How will the airport operate during construction of a runway extension?
- What is the role of HLT Advisory Inc. (Economic Impact consultant)?
- The safety of the proposed runway should be considered. Check out the "most extreme airports" video on YouTube for examples of difficult runways.

- Have emergency landing and contingency plans been considered for this proposal?
- What are the cumulative effects of air pollution, noise, and flight frequency?
- A 'black substance' has been observed on sailing club boats. What is impact of airport-related air pollution?
- What were the conclusions of the BBTCA and Eireann Quay Strategic Transportation Study? Will it be incorporated into the Porter study?
- Will traffic impacts to both the Spadina/Lake Shore intersection and Bathurst/Lake Shore intersection be considered in the study?
- The needs of youth, children and the Waterfront School should be considered when considering this proposal.
- Air pollution around airports is a significant health issue, and is documented in a UK study.
- The airport is an industrial use on the waterfront; need to ensure the waterfront is for the community and people.
- Economic impacts of the Porter proposal should include displacement of airport passengers and hotel business from Pearson Airport.
- Pearson Airport is currently underutilized. The Porter proposal should be considered in coordination with the Pearson Airport and planned rail link.
- The Porter proposal has impacts on broader communities in the flight path such as the Beach, Mimico and Guildwood.
- Over 40 years of waterfront development by the three orders of government will be undone if the airport is allowed to expand.
- The three orders of government have invested \$1.5B in waterfront revitalization, with further private sector investment. This investment will be destroyed by this proposal. We need to look at the economic impact of the proposal very carefully.
- The city does not acknowledge our waterfront. We need to consider the waterfront as a place for everyone, not just in terms of economics and local residents
- The airport is sitting on some of the most valuable land in the city. Instead of the airport, we should consider building an international destination such as Sydney Opera House in this location.
- The Toronto Islands is listed as one of the best parks in North America. Do we really want an airport in this location?

- Chicago closed its airport [Meigs Field] in favour of a park.
- We need to understand the impact of the Pearson rail link to this proposal. Who will use the rail link if the Porter proposal goes ahead?
- Need to factor in the importance of recreational uses in the harbour. Question the need for a second international airport on the waterfront.
- Access to harbour from the Western Channel is vital; harbour needs two means of egress.
- What is the impact on emergency services and response times in the event of an emergency at the airport or in the Inner Harbour?
- Engine run-ups and maintenance operations are not regulated by Tripartite Agreement.
- Waterfront is used by all city residents (it is the front porch to the city), not just local residents. This is a City-wide issue. Ensure equality and access for all people.
- Other communities are affected by the airport; planes do not fly over the lake, communities east and west of the airport are affected by flight paths.
- This is question of quality of life vs. business.