

September 18, 2013

Dear Waterfront Secretariat and City Councillors:

I request that this be made available on the background document list for the bbtca review.

Many Torontonians understand that the idea of jet planes at the island airport is a larger issue than noise, despite the attempt of Robert Deluce to frame it in those simple terms.

- Jets would destroy the balance between people and planes on Toronto's waterfront.
- Jets require extension of the runway, bisecting Toronto's busy harbour. This would cut off more access to the islands by the many small boats that now go back and forth.
- Jets also require extension of the runway at the west into the lake next to Ontario Place.
  - That extension could squeeze out access by boats to the Western Gap, despite Deluce's assurances. The decision on runway length and the marine exclusion zone, with its keep-out buoys, lies with Transport Canada, not Robert Deluce.
  - If boats cannot use the Western Gap, that will kill the National and Alexandra Yacht Clubs at the western end of the Gap.
- No jets airplanes "whisper". Jets fly lower longer on ascent and descent, so their roar would be heard more constantly along the waterfront and most closely by kayakers, canoeists, and other boaters.
- Jets are inconsistent with Harbourfront music and Music Garden concerts.
- Traffic approaching and leaving the airport is already a major problem for the Bathurst Quay community and waterfront visitors. Rather than working with the community to solve the problem, the airport's parking contractor proposes to take the site where the Waterfront School and Harbourfront Community Centre stand for 600 spaces of airport parking.
- The Bathurst Quay residential community of about 1000 residents was built in the 1980s around a park, on former industrial land. It is a successful mixed neighbourhood of four condo buildings, four housing co-ops, and two community housing complexes.
  - Residents were assured by Harbourfront and city planners that the Tripartite Agreement would protect them from jets at the island airport.
  - Only the condo owners can sell their units and move. Already there is too much turnover for a healthy neighbourhood in both the large Atrium condo at 650 Queens Quay W. (at Bathurst) and in the South Beach condo on Stadium Road.

- Introducing jets to the island airport would make the owner turnover much worse and depress the value of housing and its contribution to Toronto taxes.
- The airport, anticipating jet expansion, now wants for passenger infrastructure big parts of the city park around which the Bathurst Quay Community is built.

Robert Deluce can have jet planes and no one will object...at Pearson Airport.

When Deluce started Porter Airlines at the island, he assured everyone with a straight face that he was starting an airline that would work within the Tripartite Agreement. That means no jets and no runway extensions into our harbour and lake.

Please hold Robert Deluce to his promise.

Sincerely,  
Brenda Roman

September 17, 2013

Dear Council Members:

Toronto is lucky to have the islands and beautiful waterfront as a recreational and cultural area in the centre of our city. With all of the current investment in revitalizing the waterfront, it will only become more appealing and precious for Torontonians and visitors alike.

I am, therefore, shocked at the current proposal to expand the Island Airport by extending runways to accommodate more air traffic and jets. If this proposal is approved, the consequences will be profound and irreversible. Our harbour will never be the same, and the negative impact on the water, air and surrounding environment will be significant.

My concern is not only about the likely increase in noise and chemical pollutants. I urge Council members to realize the necessity of protecting our citizens from the enormous safety hazards caused by the busier air traffic involving heavier planes landing and taking off in such a limited space surrounded by so many high rise buildings, boaters and tourists.

Although I am aware that many people from Toronto and elsewhere have found using the Island airport convenient, there is no reason why they cannot continue to do so with everything remaining as it has been. Once the rail link to Pearson is completed, people should find it much easier to get to Pearson for those flights requiring jets.

Our lake and harbour are special and must be preserved. The Tripartite agreement should not be altered to allow expansion of the runways and jets at the Island Airport.

Sincerely,  
Leah R. Lambert

55 Harbour Square (#1811)  
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2L1

Phone: 416-962-0291

September 17, 2013

Thus far, I haven't had a dog in this fight but that changes tonight. I live at Harbourfront and Toronto is or wants to be a world class city. Many world class cities have two airports ie, Chicago, London and New York. The smoke created around noise and the environment are clearly not worthy of discussion because both have been proven to be Non Issues.

Canada's national airline and the new kid on the block (Porter) have proven that there is a heavy demand for their services and if they can extend those services with less noise and no harm to the environment then why in the hell is City Council even messing with this issue. Oh excuse me , I forgot .....VOTES.

There is no question that these services will go forward at some point, so why doesn't the Council as a whole make a decision NOW that is in the best interests of the city, its residents and tourists and that brings all those entities into the 21st century.

Sincerely,  
Allan L Fagan

---

August 27, 2013

Dear Sir/ Madam , I live at 260 Queen's Quay West , Suite 2108 and decided to go through all the material available to make an informed decision on the above proposed changes and in all honesty, would have to vote to the affirmative for the project to go forward. I never had any concerns about jet engines being nosier than jet props but did have some concerns about the environmental changes . I'm now satisfied that the changes to the runways would have a minimal if any impact on the environment.

I also did my homework with respect to a Toronto casino at the CNE and personally felt thought Ontario Place would be better and voted in affirmative to the CNE and the negative and hysterical types won the day .

I hope I don't wind up being 0 for 2 .

Sincerely,

Allan L Fagan

September 17, 2013

**Regarding Porter's request to amend the Tripartite agreement to allow Jet traffic at Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport, and their contention that Bombardier has a jet aircraft to suit the noise requirements.**

On the free trade agreements and their application to the Porter proposal to amend the Tripartite agreement, the 'National Treatment' clauses of the agreements: articles 105, 502, 1602 of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (FTA), and 301, 1102 of the NAFTA ensure that any U.S. company that wishes to, will be granted equal, if not preferential treatment in competing for the business that expansion of the Island airport would invite, should it go ahead. (Equal treatment is a misnomer as the U.S. companies generally swamp our companies in size).

Economic agreements already in place before the signing of the FTA and NAFTA were "grandfathered" to protect them from these "Investor Rights" clauses, but any agreement either negotiated or re-negotiated (ie, re-opened for amendment) after these Trade Agreements came into force are subject to the provisions of these agreements. This information is in the Agreements and the Implementing legislation that brought them into effect.

Article 1602: National Treatment (repeated in article 502) of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement:

1. Except as otherwise provided in this Chapter, each Party shall accord to investors of the other Party treatment no less favourable than that accorded in like circumstances to its investors with respect to its measures affecting:
  - a) the establishment of new business enterprises located in its territory;**
  - b) the acquisition of business enterprises located in its territory;**
  - c) the conduct and operation of business enterprises located in its territory; and**
  - d) the sale of business enterprises located in its territory.**
2. Neither Party shall impose on an investor of the other Party a requirement that a minimum level of equity (other than nominal qualifying shares for directors or incorporators of corporations) be held by its nationals in a business enterprise located in its territory controlled by such investor.
3. Neither Party shall require an investor of the other Party by reason of its nationality to sell or otherwise dispose of an investment (or any part thereof) made in its territory.
- 4. The treatment accorded by a Party under paragraph 1 shall mean, with respect to a province or a state, treatment no less favourable than the most favourable treatment accorded by such province or state in like circumstances to investors of the Party of which it forms a part.**

Paragraph 1 is pretty clear; that all "investors" of signatories to these trade agreements are accorded equal access for doing business in the "territories" (signatory countries).

Paragraph 4 says that a province can favour its own companies over out-of-province Canadian companies, not over American companies). This means that American companies are accorded greater rights in each province than out-of-province Canadian companies.

Trade experts such as Mel Clark, (former negotiator of the GATT, now the WTO) have called these trade agreements the economic constitution of Canada, and major business dealings are vetted through them. They bind ALL levels of government from Federal to Municipal.

Once the Tripartite Agreement is opened for Amendment, Bombardier is not guaranteed sale of its

planes to Porter, should any other aircraft company choose to participate in the Tender (and it must go to Tender). In fact, being an out-of-province company could put it at a disadvantage to U.S. companies under the National Treatment clauses of the FTA and NAFTA.

(It's worth noting that West Jet recently bypassed Bombardier's new CSeries aircraft for, "65 Boeing 737 MAX aircraft, worth \$6.3 billion (U.S.) at current list prices." (Toronto Star, Aug. 29/2013).

I would argue too, that Porter's lease itself could be "up for grabs" under the clauses of these agreements, should the Tripartite Agreement be re-opened.

Our organization, 'Citizens Concerned About Free Trade' several years ago published pamphlets on these agreements, along with a booklet, 'Free Trade: The Full Story' where we laid out the agreements article by article with explanation and analysis, and in 1992, David Orchard published a best seller, 'The Fight for Canada: Four Centuries of Resistance to American Expansionism' the culmination of some 8 years of research, which goes back through some 400 years of Canada-U.S. relations including detail of the Trade agreements.

You can read more about the book, and the trade agreements, on our site: [davidorchard.com](http://davidorchard.com)

Grant Orchard

September 16, 2013

Good afternoon,

Toronto deserves a great waterfront. This is why I am writing to ask that you oppose allowing jets to operate out of the Toronto Island Airport.

Ultimately an expanded airport will affect our waterfront community on many levels. Expanding the boutique airport with jets and extended runways will ruin our waterfront and the billion-dollar investment we have made to revitalize it.

Our waterfront is a place to live, work and play, uses that are not compatible with jets flying overhead. As a longstanding resident of over 14 years on the waterfront, I am concerned about the health issues, noise and pollution factors associated with this expansion. Our family is looking forward to many more years on the revitalized waterfront and a larger, noisier airport is not a part of that plan.

Please take a firm stand opposing the expansion based on the impact of noise, pollution, quality of life and property value decline that may affect the neighboring waterfront communities. I urge you to vote 'no' to amending the Tripartite Agreement at City Council.

Thank you,  
Nadine Sookermany  
260 Queens Quay West, Toronto

Professor  
Assaulted Women's and Children's Counsellor/Advocate Program  
Social Service Worker Program  
George Brown College  
200 King Street East  
Toronto, Ontario  
416-415-5000 ext. 3222

September 16, 2013

Dear Water front Secretariat

As a recent visitor to Toronto (TIFF 2013) I learned that there was a suggestion of expanding the downtown airport to accommodate jets.

This, to me, would be a terrible mistake because the tone of the beautiful downtown harbour area would be changed forever in a negative way.

As a visitor I have enjoyed the city very much and hope to return soon but having Jets fly into the downtown airport would change the ambiance of the city and make it less attractive ..there are many high class hotels near the harbour and it would be a shame and unnecessary for tourists to have to endure the noise of jets landing .

Could you please rethink your position and keep the Toronto downtown such a delightful place??

Yours sincerely,

Katie Daughtry  
British Columbia

To: [wps@toronto.ca](mailto:wps@toronto.ca)

Cc: [mayor\\_ford@toronto.ca](mailto:mayor_ford@toronto.ca)



September 16, 2013

Dear Waterfront Secretariat:

Recently I was in Toronto from Vernon BC to attend TIFF which I very much enjoyed. Not only were the venues well organized and clean, the volunteers super friendly and helpful, but also the attractiveness and special ambience in the festival area of the city was so welcoming.

After spending many hours viewing films, I discovered a wonderful, seemingly secret gem of an escape: the Waterfront and the Toronto Islands. A short, easy ferry trip, some bicycles to ride, and a lovely treed green space provide one a serene and quiet restfulness. And unbelievably, a major North American city busies itself in the background.

How wonderful that Toronto has seen fit to maintain this soul-refreshing experience for all its citizens and visitors to enjoy. Good job, Toronto!

The only 'glitch' in my adventure in the Islands was the loud noise of airplanes as they landed or prepared to take off. This did interrupt our quiet conversations. To my dismay, I have since read in your newspapers that Toronto is considering making major changes to the Island airport to allow jets to use this facility.

I cannot imagine anyone ever suggesting that a jet airport be built beside Vancouver's renowned Stanley Park.

I do understand the convenience of this for those whose destination is downtown Toronto but there must be other alternatives. I understand that, as Vancouver has successfully done, you are building a rapid link from Pearson Airport. Surely this will facilitate quick access to downtown?

So, please, Toronto, carefully think before you irretrievably lose this tranquil soundscape in your precious waterfront area.

Susan Lighthall

3005 24th Street  
Vernon BC V1T 4N3

September 15, 2013

Over the years, with a progressive incremental expansion under the existing operational conditions (including no jets and up to 200 flights per day overall), Porter Airlines has been an apparent financial success and a proven economic benefit to the City of Toronto. It provides relatively easy access for its customers to fly from the downtown core to eastern/central Canadian and US cities.

However this has come at a social and natural environmental cost: congestion/safety concerns, additional air pollution and increased noise levels. It is not necessarily the take-off and landing bursts of noise that are a major concern, but the preparation for take-off and taxiing to and from the ends of the runway to the terminal. Often, especially during peak flying periods, outdoor conversation along the water's edge is impossible for extended durations (up to several minutes). Small private planes are exceedingly noisy.

As well as neighbourhood residential investments, hundreds of millions of taxpayers dollars have been and are being spent by such agencies as Waterfront Toronto, the City, the TTC and Transport Canada to revitalise and beautify the waterfront from west of the Humber River to east of the Portlands to make it a tourism destination and pedestrian or bike friendly with parks and promenades. A new rail link is about to be commissioned from Union Station directly to the International Airport to reduce traffic volumes and travel times. These public works are designed to increase family and residential enjoyment of the waterfront and benefit tourism, the travelling public and the business community. As such, these investments are diametrically opposed to any plans for an increased use at the downtown airport, whether by turbo-prop or jet flights.

The bottom line question is:- Do the advantages of the proposed Porter major expansion outweigh its disadvantages? The answer is an unequivocal "NO".

The only group to gain from the proposal would be Porter Airlines at the detriment of the quality of life to the residents of Toronto. The null alternative still allows the Airlines to operate with their current business models at the Downtown airport which are based on the existing conditions. If they wish to expand their operations using jets, then they should use the International Airport, which has both the capacity and is designed for them. Soon there will be the added benefit and convenience of a direct rail link from Downtown which Porter can use to its advantage.

Should there be any conditions to the present operation of the Island Airport? Yes:- i) a solid sound barrier should be installed between the Terminal and eastern end runway; ii) the existing Tripartite Agreement must be reinforced so that the number of flights in and out should not exceed the current number allowed; and, iii) any expansion plans should not be considered for at least 25 years.

Alan Buck – 401 Queens Quay West, Toronto, M5V 2Y2

September 12, 2013

To Whom it May concern:

It just hit me why this expansion bothers me so much. Aside from the points below , which up until now had been my / our primary concern.

**One** company, is potentially going to be allowed to reap a huge profit at the expense of the entire city of Toronto's enjoyment of the Toronto Islands.

- The environmental impact is huge.
- We lose further waterfront & access to the islands.
- Our kids will ingest more fumes.
- Toronto's pollution ( which is already bad) gets worse.

All so ONE company can make \$.

Please don't allow more expansion of it.

Best regards,

Dale Wilson

**From:** [Shirley Bush](#)

**To:** [Toronto Star](#)

**Sent:** Thursday, September 12, 2013 11:59 AM

**Subject:** Incompatible jets

Dear Editor -

In Toronto Port Authority's Annual Report 2009, they said no jets at island airport "as we believe they are incompatible with a densely populated mixed-use community surrounded by recreational and cultural amenities".

If jets were incompatible in 2009, how have they magically become desirable five years later when Porter wants them in 2013? The population has mushroomed. Thousands enjoy Harbourfront activities. Recreational boating has quadrupled. Crowds gather to watch regattas and the Dragon Boat races. There are now over 60 high-rise condos in the four-square-block area above Queens Quay and more building right on the Quay. All the multiplicity of elements that were unfavourable for an expanded airline with jets in 2009, are vastly worse today.

The Tripartite Agreement, supposed to protect Torontonians from heavily expanded commercial passenger traffic, has instead become a cosy "let's protect and advance each other" Our Mayor touts "economic advantage" (doubtful); the Toronto Port Authority pops to Ottawa to get law forbidding fixed link changed to "one expressly permitting tunnel" and Transport Canada claiming no taxpayers funds used, provides airport upgrades through Airports Capital Assistance Program. Doesn't that money come from taxpayers?

In 1995, Torontonians first rejected jets. Eighteen years later, it is absolutely irresponsible to consider permitting them!

Shirley Bush  
1299 Bayview Ave. Apt. 14  
Toronto M4G 2Z8  
416-924-2825

>>> <WILLADVOCATE@aol.com> 9/11/2013 12:14 PM >>>

I thought that that may have occurred but I wanted to be sure.

I hope at your next meeting the environmental issues raised by CORRA to Council will not get short shrift due to the other matters being predominated by speakers who want to raise issues beyond the topics under discussion.

I waited patiently to ask questions for the assigned time, only to be displaced by questioners returning to other matters.

To be blunt I found your consultants studies did not adequately address the environmental issues.

Your Land Use Consultant did not appear to be dealing with the Environmentally Significant Designated Areas in the Official Plan adjacent to the Airport and the Bird Sanctuary.

Your Habitat Consultant study narrowly focused on the channel and the impacts of extending the runways but not addressing the issue of migratory birds on the Atlantic Flyway and the Toronto Island Bird Sanctuary. The suggestion that "bird strikes" being an issue and needed to be controlled is an aviation issue, from an environmental view the issue should be to ensure the flight paths do not and the airport does not negatively impact on those areas.

For that reason I found the studies done by your consultants singularly inadequate.

Yours truly,

*William H. Roberts*

William H. Roberts  
Chair, CORRA  
Barrister & Solicitor

Cc. Eileen Denny, Vice Chair, CORRA

416-769-3162

---

Dear Mr. Roberts,

I am taking the liberty of replying to your email. I am sorry that you did not have an opportunity to speak publicly at the workshops or directly with either the land use or environmental consultants as well as TRCA who were in attendance during the drop-in sessions and the actual meeting. I encourage you to review the full reports now available online at <http://www.toronto.ca/bbtca> as the presentations and display boards provided a high-level overview of the findings. As well, we are keeping a log of all questions and issues raised by the public which we hope to reasonably address in the final report to Council and I have added yours.

Sincerely,

Fiona Chapman

Fiona Chapman,  
Acting Director-  
Waterfront Secretariat  
100 Queen St. West - 12th Fl, East Tower  
Toronto, ON M5H 2N2  
Tel: 416 392-8113  
Fax: 416 392-8805  
[fchapma@toronto.ca](mailto:fchapma@toronto.ca)

---

September 12, 2013

I did review the boards and before e-mailing you, I did look at the consultant's reports and noted the same lack of specificity on the issues originally raised by CORRA.

I sent the e-mail to put our concerns on the table once more.

Thank you for noting the same.

Either I or someone else will attend from CORRA at your next meeting on the 19th.

Yours truly,

*William H. Roberts*

William H. Roberts  
Chair  
416-769-3162

Gwen Fogel [gwenfogel@rogers.com](mailto:gwenfogel@rogers.com)

9/11/2013 1:16 PM

Re: Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport Town Hall meeting rescheduled to September 19<sup>th</sup>

As city staff betrayed the trust of Toronto residents to include their concerns, neither TPA nor Porter will be interested as they have a pecuniary interest. Toronto residents do not need more time to "digest the reports".

You are obligated to stand up to the important task that you were given and write reports that are not based on bias and self promotion.

Your disregard will affect the future of our waterfront.

---

**From:** Gwen Fogel <[gwenfogel@rogers.com](mailto:gwenfogel@rogers.com)>

**To:** "cdunn@toronto.ca" <[cdunn@toronto.ca](mailto:cdunn@toronto.ca)>; "wps@toronto.ca" <[wps@toronto.ca](mailto:wps@toronto.ca)>

**Cc:** aagord <[gordfogel@rogers.com](mailto:gordfogel@rogers.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 10, 2013 11:22:33 AM

**Subject:** airport study

Please note, there are also important facts missing from the economic study, that you did not mention last night.

Since the entire waterfront is on the flight path for BBTIA and planes fly over our homes, adding jets will decrease property values across the board, by atleast 10%.

This will lower property taxes collected which will affect the economics of our city.

Thanks,

Gwen and Gord Fogel

---

**From:** Gwen Fogel <[gwenfogel@rogers.com](mailto:gwenfogel@rogers.com)>

**To:** "cdunn@toronto.ca" <[cdunn@toronto.ca](mailto:cdunn@toronto.ca)>; "wps@toronto.ca" <[wps@toronto.ca](mailto:wps@toronto.ca)>

**Cc:** aagord <[gordfogel@rogers.com](mailto:gordfogel@rogers.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 10, 2013 8:46:08 AM

**Subject:** public consultation

Dear Chris Dunn, and Waterfront Secretariat,

We attended the public consultation last night and found it a very sad occasion for our city officials.

We had looked to you to report the facts in a full unbiased manner.

We spoke to the public health representatives and the Beach is not even being considered, even though we are on the flight path and have a high incidence of asthma!

Most of the concerns brought up last night were answered with "i don't know or it's not been thought of". The room was so full, people were turned away and yet they are not listening to the community.

The economic feasibility of Porter is not being studied. Who will bankroll the tunnel if they fold?

Bird strikes are already happening and endanger the safety of jets, but it is being glossed over.

The booklet put out reads like a Porter ad. It even says, paving over the lake is good for wildlife. This is a sham.

The Via rail to Pearson is being ignored.

Will you allow our city to make the decision to ruin our waterfront in a rushed way like this when it will have a permanent impact to waterfront residents, the environment, and the quality of life in this city?! Why are you ignoring the voice of the majority of millions of Torontonians? You have a serious trust put in your hands and it's time to step up to that!

Thank you,  
Gwen and Gord Fogel

---

**From:** Gwen Fogel <gwenfogel@rogers.com>  
**To:** "wps@toronto.ca" <wps@toronto.ca>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 4, 2013 9:41:31 AM  
**Subject:** Fw: Revised Porter Airlines Proposal Submitted to the City for Review

Dear Chris Dunn and Waterfront Secretariat,

This is a massive change to the proposal and yet the public consultation starts today. This makes the study of the bay invalid. We have also reviewed the booklet and find it flawed and biased. There is no feedback from the community, only airport promotion. We had trusted you to do a fair and honest review. How are you going to handle this information to the general public?

Gwen and Gord Fogel

---

**From:** Gwen Fogel <gwenfogel@rogers.com>  
**To:** mayor-ford <mayor\_ford@toronto.ca>  
**Cc:** "cdunn@toronto.ca" <cdunn@toronto.ca>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 27, 2013 8:23:08 PM  
**Subject:** Re: information on the study for jets at BBTIA

Dear Mayor Ford

Please note that the booklet that is being provided as "factual information" on the study of jets for the island airport, is completely biased and full of misinformation. Starting with "very quiet jets" to "good for the environment." It may as well have been written by Porter themselves!

[http://www.toronto.ca/bbtca\\_review/pdf/public\\_consultation\\_booklet.pdf](http://www.toronto.ca/bbtca_review/pdf/public_consultation_booklet.pdf)

How can city council make a rational fair decision without fair, honest information? The whole process is not being respected.

Gwen and Gord Fogel

---

On 2013-08-18, at 4:28 PM, Gwen Fogel <[gwenfogel@rogers.com](mailto:gwenfogel@rogers.com)> wrote:

Dear Mayor Ford,

We voted for you in the last election and sometimes get a chance to listen to your radio program.

Today we heard you give a really big plug for the expansion of the Toronto Island Airport and for Porter Airlines, on your radio show. You said that it is good for jobs and good for the city. As we understand, there is currently a study being done to see how jets will impact the waterfront. For you to plug this expansion while the study is being done, is clearly a conflict of interest and a breach of trust to the residents of the city.



We have spoken to taxi and limo drivers from Pearson who say that the expansion of Billy Bishop will hurt their jobs and so it is not proven if these "1000" jobs are even new creations or taking away from Pearson. Further still, the study is not done and the C100's are not finished or tested.

Why are you jeopardizing the waterfront of our beautiful city for one company?!  
Why are you disrespecting the study process?!

We are quite disappointed and shocked to hear you give these free ads as part of your radio program!

Sincerely,  
Gwen and Gord Fogel

---

>>> Gwen Fogel <gwenfogel@rogers.com> 7/11/2013 10:38 PM >>>

Dear Chris Dunn, Waterfront Secretariat,  
Could you please tell me if any noise studies are being done at the moment on current noise levels from Porter and in relation to the study being done for proposed jets?

I live in the Beach and have been filing noise complaints for the last few years as Porter planes frequently fly over my home and fly quite low despite this being a Noise Sensitive Area.

I notice in the last few weeks that there are less planes (maybe summer break for MPs?) and that the planes are flying higher.

If there are noise studies being done, the public must be consulted and the studies should look at all the statistics for the last few years, not just during this "study" period. That would allow too much room for inconsistencies.

Thank you!

Sincerely,  
Gwen Fogel

**From:** Gwen Fogel <gwenfogel@rogers.com>  
**To:** Christopher Dunn <cdunn@toronto.ca>  
**Cc:** mcmahoncouncillor <councillor\_mcmahon@toronto.ca>; vaughanadam <councillor\_vaughan@toronto.ca>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2013 2:40:24 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Porter noise study

Thank you.

As there has been a sudden decrease in noise and air traffic, would that not affect the accuracy of the study?

Gwen

**From:** Christopher Dunn <cdunn@toronto.ca>  
**To:** Gwen Fogel <gwenfogel@rogers.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2013 11:37:54 AM  
**Subject:** Re: Porter noise study

Thank-you for your comments.

We are looking at aircraft noise and impacts on the community around the airport and in the flight paths. We are also looking into noise monitoring systems for the airport that identify the source of aircraft noise and provide real time measurements.

Christopher J. Dunn

**Waterfront Secretariat / City of Toronto**

September 6, 2013

I submitted the survey regarding the proposed increase of airplane traffic at Billy Bishop airport -

However, I did not include one item specifically, that would be of interest to the city's planner - walkability -

You currently have the waterfront trail, for biking and walking and other modes of recreational and general transit, and new parks along the waterfront and existent ones, and an increase in persons walking, biking and living in the area -

you want to protect that use - and yet the city is considering adding planes and more related vehicular traffic that would greatly deter that kind of usage.

thank you

Susan Aaron

**Sent:** September 5, 2013 4:28 PM  
**To:** Christopher Dunn  
**Cc:** Waterfront Secretariat; 'YQNA TPA mail list'; 'councillor\_vaughan@toronto.ca'; 'councillor\_mcconnell@toronto.ca'  
**Subject:** Fort York Public Consultation

Dear Chris,

I would like to thank you and John Livey for listening to the frustration, anger and fear expressed in the meeting yesterday and then agreeing to change the format of the “workshop” section of the meeting.

We are deeply troubled by what appears to be a City sponsored project, funded by the commercial interests that stand to benefit, that solely has the objective of determining terms and conditions which will be used to support the approval of a much expanded airport on Toronto’s iconic waterfront. Despite protestations to the contrary, the nature of the information displayed throughout the walk around boards and in the handouts clearly, to us, shows a bias towards expansion of the airport.

As an example, from the City handout, “The City is investigating potential benefits, opportunities, issues and challenges that might result from allowing jets or further expansion of the BBTCA”. There is no mention of the negative aspects on the homeowners, residents, tourists, cultural attractions and related businesses of introducing jets. The “issues and challenges” only appear to relate to the approval process.

As further evidence that Porter and the TPA believe they have control over the City, Porter writes a letter requesting a further extension of the runways one day before the public consultations begin. In the meeting yesterday, there was no discussion of ignoring Porter’s request. The message we heard was that City team would drop everything to redo work in order to address Porter’s ~~demands~~ request.

I believe during the meeting, but certainly following the meeting, there were discussions about the role of the Fairness Judge/Ombudsman in ensuring an unbiased study is performed.

Will you please provide the name and contact information of the person filling the Fairness role?

Many citizens are looking forward to the two upcoming meetings to discuss the expansion.

Best regards,

Bob Rasmussen

-----  
Robert (Bob) Rasmussen  
Co-chair, York Quay Neighbourhood Association (YQNA)

3610 - 65 Harbour Square  
Toronto, Ontario  
M5J 2L4 Canada

Telephone: +1 416-368-4258  
Mobile: +1 416-575-5730  
Email: [Bob@Rasmussen.ca](mailto:Bob@Rasmussen.ca)  
Website: [www.yqna.ca](http://www.yqna.ca)

September 4, 2013

Dear Mayor Ford and Councillors,

I am a life-long resident of the City of Toronto and have never felt the need to express my opinion regarding my personal beliefs in public policy. This time is different.

As I am unable to attend any of the scheduled public consultations, I am writing to express my strong support for Porter Airlines and their proposed runway expansion plans at the Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport.

Since its inception, Mr. Robert DeLuce and Porter Airlines have demonstrated their entrepreneurial spirit, business acumen and most importantly, their commitment to the city of Toronto and its residents. Flying Porter Airlines is a pleasure. They have done so much to promote our city and to make it easy for the business traveller and the vacation traveller to access our city.

And what better way to showcase our city to our visitors then by having them see our city as they make their approach to the island airport?

I travel frequently for business and whenever possible, I fly with Porter Airlines. Many of my American colleagues fly with Porter as well. Word has trickled out about the excellent service and convenience associated with Porter Airlines. I have many colleagues that would love to fly with Porter except their cities are not currently serviced by them.

As I understand it, the proposed runway expansion at the Island Airport would allow Porter Airlines to expand its reach and add more destinations to their flight schedules. This can only be good for the Citizens of Toronto! This proposed expansion will bring more visitors to Toronto resulting in more money being spent by these visitors. More money will be spent on hotels, taxis, restaurants, bars, sports venues, tourist attractions. More money will be collected in taxes. This is money that will stay in Toronto.

This expansion will bring more money into the pockets of our citizens that work in the above areas. As a result of the purchase agreement between Porter Airlines and Bombardier, it will also bring millions, perhaps billions of dollars into the City, the Province and the Country and help keep Canadians employed.

What an amazing way for our city to demonstrate its appreciation for all that Porter Airlines has done for us than by letting them spend more money, create more jobs and support local businesses.

As my elected representatives, I ask you to support this initiative. The city needs this more than it needs Bixi Bikes!

Yours sincerely

Martin Green

14 Rockport Drive,

West Hill, Ontario

M1C 5C2

September 3, 2013

Subject: Airport Noise Management Proposals based on Community Noise Standards. This is what we want to present to City Hall, for the Airport Expansion Report. Comments and suggestions are appreciated ... Max

### **Airport Noise Management Proposals -**

1. No engine maintenance run-ups before 8 am, or after 8 pm, except for emergency purposes, as engine run-ups are the worst noise problem.
2. No island airport commercial flights after 10 pm, as late night noise is the most disturbing noise, when the neighbourhood is wanting to go to bed.
3. Cancel city permits for overnight construction at the Island Airport, as loud overnight construction noise disturbs the sleep of neighbourhood residents.
4. The City should consider stopping the use of Adjusted DBA Decibel measurements, and use Complete DBC Decibels for monitoring airport noise. DBA decibels do not measure bass noise and airport noise is mostly bass noise.

### **Harbourfront Community Noise Standards**

It has been determined that any noise above 70 DBA = 80 DBC Decibels, is a disturbing noise. When noise reaches 85 DBC Decibels, it is a serious noise problem, especially when sustained.

#### **Noise Comparisons With Both DBA & DBC Decibel Measurements**

|   |         |                   |          |
|---|---------|-------------------|----------|
| quiet nights                                    | 40 dba  | decibels = 45 dbc | decibels |
| quiet room indoors                              | 45 dba  | = 52              | dbc      |
| quiet balcony outdoors                          | 50 dba  | = 60              | dbc      |
| passing cars on a busy street                   | 60 dba  | = 70              | dbc      |
| loud television, vacuum cleaner                 | 65 dba  | = 75              | dbc      |
| loud stereo, power lawnmower                    | 70 dba  | = 80              | dbc      |
| louder bass sounds, garbage trucks              | 75 dba  | = 88              | dbc      |
| loud motorcycles                                | 80 dba  | = 95              | dbc      |
| live concert sound systems                      | 85 dba  | = 100             | dbc      |
| fire engines, sirens                            | 90 dba  | = 110             | dbc      |
| lightning                                       | 100 dba | = 120             | dbc      |
|   |         |                   |          |
| distant airport noise, airplane flying overhead | 65 dba  | = 75              | dbc      |
| airplane takeoff, more bass noise,              | 70 dba  | = 82              | dbc      |
| airplane taxiing                                | 73 dba  | = 85              | dbc      |
| airplane landing (braking)                      | 75 dba  | = 88              | dbc      |
| engine maintenance run-up                       | 78 dba  | = 90              | dbc      |

Noise Measurement Note: Adjusted DBA Decibel readings are 15 - 20% lower than Complete DBC Decibel readings, for the same sound, as DBA adjusted decibels do not measure bass noise.

It's also important to note that airplane noise readings are taken from a larger distance than other noise comparisons. Measured up close, ie. on the runway, airplane noise readings are much higher.

Based on the Community Noise Standards, we recommend these Airport Noise Management Proposals, and hope City Council will adopt these Community Noise Standards for the Harbourfront.

Max Moore, Harbourfront Community Association  
[www.harbourfrontcommunity.info](http://www.harbourfrontcommunity.info)

September 2, 2013

Dear Chris:

I have been reading the Information Booklet that you and your staff have prepared concerning the use of Jets at BBTCA. I have many misgivings about it as I would have expected it to take a neutral stance. My comments are in [blue](#).

1995 The *Toronto City Centre Airport Viability Study* indicated that certain constraints in the Tri-Partite Agreement should be relaxed to allow jet-powered and other aircraft meeting approved noise emission standards.

This was a report prepared by the airport. How can it be unbiased? You also conveniently left out any opposition to this idea, such as the poll of waterfront residents by the Metropolitan Waterfront Coalition showing 75% opposition to scheduled jets.

2011 Toronto City Council approved the construction of a fixed link—pedestrian tunnel - to the Toronto City Centre Airport.

This is a distortion of what Council was deciding at the time. Since the TPA was going to build the tunnel anyway regardless of what the city wanted, the city allowed them to make it easier by not having to stay off of land they did not own or lease. To say that Council was approving a fixed link is deceitful.

- Air travel noise is measured in three phases— Approach, Take-Off and Flyover and is presented as an average.

Averaging is not used in the Tripartite Agreement.

- The proposed expansion project will not affect general aviation, including Medivac flights.

The present expansion has already forced out much of the General Aviation that has existed at the airport.

- BBTCA is generally viewed as a convenience by corporate customers and those residents who make regular use of the airport.

This may be true but why are you not also mentioning that it is a great inconvenience to those who live on the waterfront and citizens who use it for recreation.

- If jets are permitted, spending by visitors travelling through BBTCA is estimated at between \$68 million to \$134 million annually (taking into consideration overnight stays, business/leisure customers).

These figures, as far as I know, are not independently arrived at. What goes unmentioned is the costs of the airport to the city such as the loss of tourist revenue from citizens leaving the city to spend their money elsewhere; the cost of all the health issues from the increased air and noise pollution; the cost of traffic congestion, etc.

- The policy states that any change to the lease agreement must not result in “any adverse impact on the surrounding residential and recreational environment”

To go any further ahead in this study seems like a waste of time if there is not to be any adverse impact. How can more noise and air pollution, more speeding cabs not be adverse?

- While the airport sits within a mixed use area where conflicts arise, it also provides a convenient and accessible choice for Toronto residents and businesses.

This statement completely brushes aside the lives of those who live on the waterfront as being of no importance because a small number of repeat passengers find the airport convenient.

- Local ground side improvements would be necessary to accommodate additional passengers and better manage impacts.

Again, this problem is totally minimized. I have been one of the participants in this study and we have all seen the impossibility of making even the present volume of traffic workable. The only solution is to basically wipe out the Bathurst Quay neighbourhood. There would then be plenty of room for parking. Is this what you want to do?

Do these “improvements” include the airport taking one-third of Little Norway Park, a highly adverse impact “on the surrounding residential and recreational environment”?

Under the Marine Navigation, Coastal and Habitat Assessment, the ideas of the information booklet get even more absurd. It sounds like something written by Dillon Consulting, another whitewash.

The more I read the booklet the more disappointed and discouraged I become. When the city began the Eireann Quay traffic study, we were hopeful that the city would solve the current serious traffic problems that are having such an adverse impact on the surrounding residential and recreational environment. Instead, from the bias we see in the booklet, it appears that the city is lining up behind proposals to make living here much worse. Why did I waste my time and hopes?

Regards,

Dennis Bryant