

August 29, 2013

To Whom it may concern,

My name is John Bacon I live at 25 Telegram Mews and I do **NOT** want to see jets at the island airport for any reason. I am happy with the noise level of existing aircraft and often fly on them but I see no need to ruin the neighborhood with jet wash, possible fuel contamination and especially jet engine noise. Thank you for your time and consideration for reading my thoughts. Hopefully the jets will stay off the island.

John

416-712-4681

From: Laura Cooper <lfcooper@sympatico.ca>

Date: August 27, 2013 10:48:06 PM EDT

To: cdunn@toronto.ca

Cc: fchapma@toronto.ca

Subject: Recent Brochure re Airport

The report makes the expansion of the Island Airport so "doable". So reasonable.

Yet so much is missing:

1. TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS. I see no reference to the already traffic nightmare along the Waterfront. I see no reference to the problems of the Gardiner and the Lakeshore where those living in the west end of Toronto are having problems getting to work as the traffic is so slow. An enlarged airport only contributes more to this problem. I see no reference to the problems surrounding airport traffic engulfing the 3 schools with pollution throughout the day and danger to those children trying to get to school. No reference to viable alternatives to bringing more cars to the Waterfront. No reference to increased tourism trying to compete with increased airport traffic. No reference to the fact that many people will not take the shuttle bus. No reference to the impact of the closing of a lane of traffic on Queen's Quay.

Your list of impacts gives the impression that transportation impacts are minor. They are not.

2. LAND USE AND COMMUNITY IMPACTS: If I made a pie graph from your brochure, it would appear that land use for parks and recreation and land use for an airport would probably have equal weight. Not true at all. The # of people using the airport compared to the # of people visiting the waterfront is small. 10% maybe. Maybe.

How can a "clean and green" area be used by one of the worst types of polluting industries? The fact is: They cannot co-exist. One does not need an extensive study to come to this conclusion.

I have read over your preliminary report brochure. These are my comments.

Did any of your investigators spend any time at the waterfront when planes were passing over every 5 minutes or so? Did they notice that you cannot hear the music in the Music Garden? Did they talk to people down the Bay and discover that often they cannot hear their TV? Did they sit at Cherry Beach and try to talk over the low-flying planes? Did they speak to the couple from North Toronto who come down every week-end to sit quietly by the water and cannot believe anyone is thinking of enlarging the airport?

Did they consider that the Port Authority has an easement on approx 1/3 of the neighbourhood park at the foot of Bathurst? Do they care?

3. MARINE NAVIGATION, COASTAL AND HABITAT ASSESSMENT.

What is said here is outrageous!!! Attached is a letter from Dr. Annelise Hagan a leading world authority on coastal waters. This letter was given to the Port Authority a year ago. At the very least, your booklet should have mentioned that not all scientists believe that filling in the bay will "represent an opportunity to improve the aquatic habitat for fish". Who did you consult for your information and why did you not mention Dr. Hagan's report?

(NOTE: Letter from Southern Environmental not attached to this email)

Do you have confirmation from Transport Canada (or whoever looks after this) that the marine exclusion zone surrounding the proposed longer runway will not be increased to meet International Standards? If not, then how can you say that the western gap will not be affected? How can you be sure that it will have "no effect on the navigation of recreational, ferry, or shipping vessels.

Why is no mention made of the outflow from the Don?

Do you have confirmation that another runway in another direction will not be required? Is this the same kind of confirmation given to the peoples of Toronto that no jets would be allowed?

I find the glossing over of "bird management" to be insulting. Not only cormorants will be affected. So too will Canada Geese (remember the Canada goose that brought down the jet in the Hudson river only a year or two ago). Will we be getting more noise guns going off? Or will we be oiling the eggs like the Star reported last year we do to the swans in the Central Waterfront? To be beside 2 bird sanctuaries, the Spit and the one currently beside the airport, and suggest putting in jets and "managing" the birds in what is supposed to be a nature place, is duplicitous.

4. BACKGROUND: Who said that "the City is considering future options for the airport"? We have a plan. It does NOT include jets.

5. AVIATION:

Who said that noise levels are presented as an average? Are you saying that if one level is loud enough to puncture one's ear drums and the others are so low as to make the 3 meet the allowed average--that this is just fine? Of course not. It does not make any sense. None of the 3 levels should be above their allowed limit.

6. ECONOMIC IMPACTS:

What proof do you have that the # of passengers will continue to grow--especially after the rail link to downtown is in place? Has Porter released its passenger figures this year to date? If not, then how do you know?

How many passengers come in for the day and go out without spending \$\$ in Toronto? Would these same people use Pearson if the airport were not there? If so, then how can one say there is an economic benefit? And are we going to ruin our Waterfront for those few who find it

convenient? We have spent over a BILLION DOLLARS on our waterfront. Why turn it into another Pearson.

Where did you get the estimated \$ spent (\$68million to \$134 million)? Why would these dollars not be spent if the people came in/out via Pearson? Is this a "net" figure? ie did you factor in the City Costs such as traffic, police, lost taxes, etc. etc in servicing the airport? What were these costs estimated to be? I have to assume that the estimated \$ spent must be "net".

What taxes does the airport pay on the land they lease? What taxes or PILT are owing the city by the Port Authority and why are we dealing with them when \$\$\$ are outstanding?

What other cities in the world have a jet airport within 400 meters of residences? Please let me know.

I was so disappointed in this preliminary report. It could have been objective. It could have been educational. It ended up appearing like the writers were looking to justify the end result that they wanted.

Laura Cooper
77 Harbour Square
Toronto

August 27, 2013

Two questions:

1. As per question 7 in your online survey could you tell me how the proposed jets are quieter on takeoff than the current Q400's? Is there an independent report that gives the comparable noise levels?
2. Since the runway is to be lengthened would it not seem reasonable that the MEZ will have to be also be expanded. Has keeping the MEZ the same (as suggested in one of the reports) been agreed to by Transport Canada? I always thought the glide path on jets would be shallower than STOL aircraft necessitating a larger area or is the current MEZ bigger than it has to be?

Thanks

Bill Peers
93 Pears Ave
Toronto

August 3, 2013

To: Toronto City Council- Mayor and City Councillors
cc. Water Secretariat and Dr. David McKeown, MOH, Toronto

We are writing you to express grave concerns regarding the proposal to expand the Billy Bishop Airport to jets. We are community health physicians and are extremely alarmed by the potential health harm of jets which will particularly impact the community that lives in such close proximity to the airport. This includes a large number of children and families including pregnant women. There is also a daycare, a community centre, outdoor recreational facilities and a public school in this vicinity.

We will outline some of our main health concerns. There are other concerns that are involved (such as increased risk from increased traffic) but we will limit ourselves to health concerns about jet fuel and noise. We have reviewed and referenced the Health Impact Assessment done on the Santa Monica Airport in 2010 researched and written by physicians. The situation in Santa Monica is quite analogous to the situation in Toronto with a community living in close proximity to the airport. This report reviews the impact of exposure to jet fuel exhaust byproducts and the increased exposure to noise pollution.

Jet fuel exhaust byproducts are numerous and include black carbon, particles- high, medium and ultra-fine and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. These byproducts are particularly of concern during airplane departures and to a lesser extent, landings.

Many studies have linked black carbon with respiratory disease. It has been shown that lung function is reduced with exposure to black carbon and associated with higher rates of asthma and bronchitis in school-aged children particularly with more prolonged exposure ie more than one year. There are also investigations that associate black carbon with direct effects on DNA which could be a link to increased cancer risks.

Jet fuel also contains particulate matter of varying sizes including ultrafine particulate. It has been shown that ultrafine particulate (UFP) results in even greater lung inflammation than exposure to larger particulates. Also, once in the lung it appears that by some yet unknown mechanism, it sets up other inflammation in the body and there is evidence that suggests that this inflammation may predispose to atherosclerosis (hardening of the arteries).

Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons are yet another group of chemicals found in jet fuel exhaust. They have been shown to be both toxic to genes and carcinogenic (cancer-causing). This raises obvious concerns especially for children and pregnant women. A study that is referenced in the Santa Monica study showed that "infants who have been exposed prenatally to the highest PAH levels scored significantly lower on the mental developmental index at 3 years of age than did those with lower levels of PAH exposure".

Although the CEO of Porter, Robert Deluce promises "whisper jets" we cannot of course rely on this in any way. This would be like physicians obtaining their information about medication from drug companies. One would assume that the level of noise is going to increase significantly. Noise itself is a harmful pollutant especially as it impacts children. It has also been shown to increase blood pressure, decrease memory and reduce attention span. One study showed that exposure to even 50 decibels of noise in the daytime is associated with learning difficulties in children. This relates to noise not just at school but within their own homes.

A large scale study is currently being undertaken on 6000 subjects to delineate the affects of noise pollution on blood pressure and cardiovascular disease. This suggests that there are very real concerns and that we have much yet to learn about noise as a pollutant. We would not like the population at the airport to be the guinea pigs.

Finally, there is always the worst case scenario of accidents or disasters. The close proximity of the community at the waterfront to the airport puts this population at serious risk of a bad outcome in this situation. Having just experienced the horrific harm to the Lac-c Megantic community, it doesn't take much to imagine a catastrophic situation when people are so close to such technology.

We have outlined some of our grave concerns. We understand that the Toronto Public Health is doing a comprehensive health care assessment and have faith in their good abilities.

We would like however to express our personal opinion regarding the proposal to increase traffic and introduce jets to the Billy Bishop Airport based on these real health concerns. Our personal assessment is to stop this proposal in its tracks.

It is unhealthy and dangerous.

Sincerely,

Dr. Miriam Garfinkle
Dr. Susan Woolhouse

Reference: Santa Monica Health Impact Assessment (HIA) February 2010