

Public Update Meeting on the Request to Expand Runways and Add Jets at Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport (BBTCA)

January 27, 2014

Summary of Questions and Comments Received

- Runway should be extended because of airport's convenience, short travel times and short wait times.
- Porter used currently for trips to Boston, Halifax, etc. and would use it for longer flights to West Coast and Caribbean; a benefit to connecting West and East Coasts of Canada and beyond.
- In the 30 years of Tripartite Agreement's duration to date, Porter is the only airline to successfully fly out of the airport.
- Bombardier jet construction would be an economic benefit to the City.
- Pearson provides plenty of jet travel opportunities, is more reliable when it comes to cancellations, and is served by a dependable bus.
- Existing operations at BBTCA are causing water pollution which should be cleaned up; expansion would result in additional pollution with an unknown additional clean-up cost
- Proposal would result in constructing Canada's 6th largest airport in the middle of Toronto.
- Expansion would increase gridlock, impact bird life, result in construction of roadways into Lake Ontario, increase fuel tank travel through residential neighbourhoods, require a wall to be constructed along the waterfront to control jet blast, and cost significant tax dollars.
- The City should move ahead with waterfront revitalization for Torontonians and not jets
- Not a significant difference in convenience between Pearson and BBTCA
- The proposal is unreasonable because what is unique and beautiful about Toronto's water is the harbour and Lake Ontario set within a beautiful city; there is nothing unique about an international airport.
- The Toronto Board of Health report indicates that there will be negative health impacts associated with BBTCA expansion, in particular its contribution of additional cancer-causing agents.
- Questions about breaches to the noise curfew at BBTCA during ice storm (*Geoffrey Wilson, TPA, advises violations are investigated and it was confirmed that 6 breaches occurred and fines were attributed*)
- Health and well-being of residents should be paramount. Proposal is not a good idea if air and water quality impacts are being ignored.
- Huge public investment required to support proposal will serve relatively few people compared with investment in waterfront revitalization which serves the City more broadly.

- Investment to support BBTCA expansion could be better used to make the City better, and eliminate more greenhouse gas emissions by building fast rail connections, etc.
- The area has very limited parking, and airport employees occasionally use street parking (including parking in bike lanes). Cars idling contribute to air quality impacts. BBTCA has significantly fewer parking spots per passenger than typical airports.
- Proposal is being unnecessarily hurried without proper plans in place, considering that the desired jets are not yet being manufactured and the necessary financing for groundside improvements is not in place.
- There is no rush for Council to decide: Council should take its time in reviewing the reports respecting the proposed airport expansion.
- Sailors add to the beauty of the waterfront. It is a relief to see the TPA's letter that buoys will not be moved, but any affect to the Marine Exclusion Zone would be detrimental.
- There is nothing constructive happening in the City – tired of saying "no", but environmental and health concerns make this a ridiculous proposal.
- Aircraft noise, particularly of turboprops revving, is much higher than ambient car traffic noise and has negative effects.
- Decision on proposal should be deferred until all information is complete and all plans are final – likely 2-3 years from now.
- BBTCA is an industrial operation on the waterfront, comparable to a power plant. BBTCA is not compatible with a clean, green waterfront and the waterfront's value is much higher.
- Having all three signatories to the Tripartite Agreement in the same room is an accomplishment, but which signatory is actually asking to change the Agreement?
- The only viable airline since 1939 to operate from BBTCA is Porter; the City suffers from a lack of vision.
- The island airport is not unique and BBTCA is part of the reason the waterfront has changed from industry to vibrant mix of uses.
- Councillors need to decide on the proposal within a set time limit, rather than just spending continuously on an ongoing review.
- Air quality report which fed into the Board of Health needs to be expanded. Need air quality studies at the person/baby stroller/balcony level.
- The institutions involved in this proposal need to be studied.
- Interest in whether BBTCA is profitable?
- There must be limits to growth, and jets don't belong on the waterfront.
- There has been a shameful expenditure of public resources and private advocacy time in relation to this proposal.
- Current BBTCA noise level is unacceptable: the Music Garden has had to triple the number of speakers for concerts as compared to concerts prior to Porter operations.
- Will there be a report on how wide the City cast its net in assessing benefits of BBTCA?

- Many positive economic impacts result from spin-off convention business. Large companies save money and time by flying participants directly into downtown Toronto to attend conferences.
- There has been a 60% reduction in airfares to cities which Porter serves. Higher usage means higher revenues for the City.
- The planning process for this expansion request has been insufficient: the airport land is designated a Park, and there is no current Master Plan from the TPA. Waterfront Toronto does have a plan for the waterfront, which is great, and it is concerned about the BBTCA expansion plan.
- The younger generation deserves a place at the table.
- Cultural attractions are not affected by airport proximity.
- Bird safety is a concern.
- People travel to New York not because BBTCA is convenient, but because of the cultural attractions. Taxpayer money should be invested in cultural events and venues in Toronto like the AGO and TIFF.
- Height restrictions on development near airports needs to be better understood. Why is there no planning from the City to guide development of BBTCA and around the airport?
- The waterfront attracts millions because it is a mixed use recreational destination. The island airport can be a destination if the original terminal is restored and designated a heritage building, which can then be used as a site to promote the history of the airport.
- Citizens have already blessed the Waterfront Toronto vision. We want a waterfront where people can come and stay. Looking for a "people case" for the waterfront that has a real cost-benefit.
- Years of waterfront consultations have resulted in a waterfront vision for residents, parks and light commercial uses. The proposed expansion of BBTCA is a quantum leap.
- Alan Sparrow stated that once we permitted the airport there would be constant requests for expansion and the City should say no.
- There needs to be balance, and vision for Toronto, to avoid BBTCA being another future Gardiner where future removal cost is prohibitive.
- Access between BBTCA and attractions via transit is excellent.
- Airport expansion will promote tourism and entrepreneurship.
- Marine Exclusion Zone buoy placement is based on safety; if runways are extended, doesn't it follow that the MEZ will expand?
- Airport expansion proposal the equivalent of flying jets into Central Park.
- Toronto needs the employment and connectivity to technological centres that airport expansion would bring.
- Expansion is too costly, too close to the City, too dangerous, and places bird colonies at risk.
- TPA seems to pursue Porter's interest.
- Waterfront parks are not impacted by the airport.

- Unemployment is a concern in the City; expansion of BBTCA would be supporting and growing a valuable asset.
- Request for Transport Canada to clarify position on existing airport.
- Questions respecting slot management: Air Canada granted limited slots and West Jet none.
- Toronto Islands are the cottage of many Torontonians.
- Although the airport is convenient, the speculative plans currently will eventually result in real impacts. Turning the airport back to parkland is not an option; the airport needs to be used to maximize benefit.
- The TPA thanked for its attendance.
- Beaches resident can see Porter planes flying overhead.
- If BBTCA contributes 10-15% of air pollutants in its immediate area as the health impact assessment found, that should be considered a significant negative impact.
- Pearson has been invested in, and is accessible currently by transit. This will improve significantly with the Union-Pearson Express.
- The Island Park is beautiful, but sailors are noticing white powder on their sails – fuel from BBTCA is going everywhere.
- Improving the health of the entire City while it intensifies should be the mission.
- Expansion is incompatible with the uses of the waterfront, including the school children who go on field trips there to learn about sustainability.
- Notion of convenience at BBTCA is highly overrated – it takes the same amount of time to get from Toronto to New York from YYZ or YTZ.
- Expanding highways and airports is the vision of the last century.
- The waterfront is a recreational facility, not a business opportunity.
- What environmental assessments would be required? EAs require evaluation of the proposal and alternatives. This should be considered.
- Planes are not noticeable on daily waterfront walks.
- It would not be hard to sail around a 200m projection.
- The impacts of BBTCA on the Bathurst Quay neighbourhood have been truly sad – noise, traffic, etc.
- Pearson is a viable alternative for jet traffic. The Islands should be preserved as a recreation area.
- Need to think in terms of lifecycle analysis of travel time between two destinations, and consider total transit impacts.
- Cyclists will notice traffic, noise and air quality impacts on the Martin Goodman Trail with an expanded airport. Focus should be on more important issues such as transit and cycling infrastructure.
- With the Union-Pearson Express link going in, health impacts of an expanded BBTCA are unnecessary.
- Condominiums are being built everywhere and those residents need transportation service. If people had voted 40-50 years ago on building 400-series highways, no one would have wanted the pollution those cause either.

- Porter is always reporting that it is doing well – expansion is not supportable.
- Children should grow up with a fabulous green park, not heavy waterfront infrastructure.
- Request for the TPA to commit to a voluntary environmental assessment. (*Geoffrey Wilson commits the TPA to following fully required EA legislation in accordance with best practices*)
- Concerned about just fuel particulate on boats and balconies. What mitigation is possible when adding to this traffic?
- Who owns the lakebed? (*City undertakes to clarify*)
- Why did the TPA submit a request for groundside infrastructure on the City's behalf, and whether the City endorses? (*Deputy City Manager advises that the City does not*)
- What is the maximum number of passengers that can be supported without lakeside improvements at BBTCA?
- Is it safe to land any jets at BBTCA?
- Clean green waterfront is proposed to be changed into an industrial airport. This is counter to the current movement worldwide to clean up waterfront areas for recreation and public access.
- Environmental assessments are desperately needed, and should include a tabulation of greenhouse gas emissions.
- Binding environmental laws require a full environmental assessment of the proposed expansion. Any discussion of amending the Tripartite Agreement should be paused until environmental law compliance is confirmed.
- Porter is the only airline that still treats people like people.
- Key questions need to be answered respecting the proposal, on pollution, planes, improvement fee, traffic congestion and accountability/enforcement.
- The waterfront is beautiful and a tourist attraction. The proposal for a new road and underground parking will impact the school, Music Garden, and Ontario Place revitalization.
- Why isn't Waterfront Toronto at the table? (*City advises that Waterfront Toronto continues to be consulted*)
- Concern about Transport Canada's safety regulatory approach.
- BBTCA expansion is comparable to Spadina Expressway; stopping that expressway resulted in the vibrant downtown we now enjoy.
- Waterfront renaissance and BBTCA expansion should be able to both proceed. Move the runway extension entirely into the outer harbour to improve aesthetics, and be more creative on aviation technology (i.e. a hybrid plane).
- The economic benefit of jobs created by BBTCA expansion is important, and would be needed job creation for the next generation.