

porter
porter
porter
porter
porter
porter

Porter Airlines Inc.
Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5V 1A1

Tel: (416) 203-8100
Fax: (416) 203-8150
www.flyporter.com

February 28, 2014

Mr. John Livey
Deputy City Manager, City of Toronto
Toronto City Hall, 100 Queen St. West
Toronto, ON M5H 2N2
Tel. 416 338 7200

Dear Mr. Livey:

Recently in various newspaper columns and reports, and at past public meetings, claims have been made about current and future operations at Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport (BBTCA). Specifically, claims about aircraft fuel dumping, additional lighting requirements for an expanded runway and walls lining the runway to protect boaters. I would like to address these untrue claims with you and the City.

Claims have been made, particularly at public meetings, that Porter's current aircraft, the Q400 dumps fuel into Lake Ontario, and this would likely be the practice of the CS100, if introduced. This is categorically not true. Neither the Bombardier Q400 currently in operation at BBTCA or the Bombardier CS100 being proposed by Porter for use at BBTCA have fuel dump capability ensuring that there is no risk of these aircraft dumping fuel into Lake Ontario. In fact, this feature was largely eliminated for narrow-body aircraft in past decades. This includes Boeing 737 (all models) and the entire Airbus A320 family.

In a recent Toronto Star editorial titled "Island airport expansion is a change in kind not a change in degree," it stated that Transport Canada would require a series of approach lighting towers to be erected 720 metres beyond the runways that would extend way into the Inner Harbour and out into the lake. Again, this is not true. The east/west runway at BBTCA (the one proposed for expansion) is classified as a Code 2 non-precision approach runway. The proposed runway changes will result in a Code 3 non-precision approach runway for both Q400 and C Series aircraft. Runway approach lighting towers like the ones referenced are only requirements for precision approach runway, and only where physically practicable. The non-precision approach runways at BBTCA have sufficient guidance provided by other visual aids.

The same editorial made references to “high and obtrusive walls lining the runways” that would be needed to shield boats from jet blast impacts. Realistically, it would be impossible for an airplane to land or take off with “high and obtrusive walls lining the runways.” Airbiz, in their report prepared for and commissioned by the City of Toronto confirms that the CS100 has a smaller jet blast impact than current generation aircraft. C2MHill in their report to the City confirmed that jet blast impacts “will not extend past the existing MEZ.” In cases where jet blasts deflectors are required for similar aircraft, they are typically only 4 metres high.

I am pleased to help dispel these myths that have surfaced via editorials and public meetings. I am happy to provide you with any additional information or clarification on the above issues.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Robert Deluce', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Robert Deluce
President and Chief Executive Officer