

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

February 25, 2014

Summary of Questions and Comments Received

- Percentage of the City's population using BBTCA, answered by City and TPA respectively: 2.3 million passengers in 2012, 1 in 3 Torontonians
- Highland Creek resident concerned about overhead jet traffic impacts – would expansion add to this, answered by Porter Airlines: expects no added impact
- Whether NoJetsTO supports keeping or closing the Island Airport, and views on technological advancement; answered supports the airport continuing operations within its existing footprint
- December 2013 flight curfew violations explained through discussion of curfews and fines for infractions
- Porter Airlines level of services stated by company representatives as planned to be continued with addition of new planes
- Question about slot allocation, wondering if WestJet and Air Canada are trying to get slots at BBTCA as well; answered by TPA that any airline that meets the Tripartite Agreement obligations may operate from BBTCA
- Question about the Board of Health report on the Health Impact Assessment, with a resident concerned it was being ignored; Councillor clarified report will proceed to Council
- Number of jobs associated with proposal stated to be 1,000 directly with Porter, 1,000 spin-off
- Suggestion to consider expanding into outer harbour; noted to have previously been investigated
- Question on how far a plane travels prior to reaching altitude; answered as about 5 miles
- Discussion of glycol containment system; proceeding via a signed agreement with the City
- Question on whether the Marine Exclusion Zones (MEZ) would be amended, answered by Transport Canada representative noting that all information is not yet available but that approved MEZs would likely move modestly, laterally
- Effects and benefits for Scarborough residents: Porter Airlines representative suggests more choice, more affordability, jobs and a high level of service as outcomes
- C-Series aircraft are being considered by European airlines
- Discussion of whether proposal would improve affordable long-distance flights and use of high-speed trains; whether a downtown airport is needed when Union-Pearson Express is soon to open

- Timing and impact of tunnel completion: TPA representative suggests tunnel will be a positive improvement and may facilitate mode shift from private vehicles to shuttle and transit
- Would new jets fly lower than existing planes: Porter Airlines representative said they would not
- Question on whether Porter Airlines is seeking 50 additional flight slots with the introduction of C-Series: Porter Airlines representative stated seeking jet approval first and that potentially a request for up to 44 additional slots over two years might follow
- Discussion of how to assure that only quiet jets could be used, answered with an explanation of Tripartite Agreement limitations on noise
- Discussion of the level of investment required to support expansion, with \$500 million discussed as a potential cost and questions of whether the City would need to raise taxes. City staff indicate that anticipated "airside" cost is \$100 million, paid for by the TPA. "Groundside" costs and who would pay is less clear, but City's position is that infrastructure costs related to the airport should be paid for by the airport
- PILTs settlement raised in response to a question of why tax is not collected respecting airport lands
- Comparison of sound levels expected between jets and propeller planes discussed. Porter Airlines representative expects them to be similar
- Discussion of who makes flight path decisions: NAV CANADA representative explains that such are in accordance with regulations
- Question of whether a mid-sized airport would be better sited on the Leslie Street spit: City staff respond that, among other reasons, this is not feasible as the Spit has environmental constraints
- Discussion of studies done respecting current proposal, including study of urban airports which have been closed (i.e. Edmonton, Montreal)
- Concerns about flights crossing the Scarborough Bluffs: Porter Airlines representative indicates that such flights are generally 4,000-10,000 feet up, with 17 flights crossing that shoreline daily
- Discussion of how concurrence of all three signatories would be needed in order to amend Tripartite Agreement
- Questions respecting obstacle limitation surfaces, referencing the TPA's June 2012 Draft Master Plan
- Broader planning analysis of airport discussed, with City staff referring to stated goals of balancing the airport and other Central Waterfront activities, and the need for a net benefit to the City

- Discussion of whether a noise attenuation wall along the expanded runways adjacent to the Music Garden would be required, with TPA representatives indicating that there is no plan for such presently
- Question on what would be the impact of Pickering airport being developed: City staff noted that aviation context and planning is something that staff have been pursuing
- Discussion of whether the CS-100 has had noise levels confirmed by an independent body: City staff indicated that preliminary numbers have been received, engine testing has occurred
- Discussion of which other major North American cities have comparable airports: there is no perfect comparison, no airport located on an urban waterfront as with Toronto's, but London City and Bromma in Sweden are good comparables
- Question on how long construction would take, if expansion is approved: TPA representative notes that, with an environmental assessment, construction would likely take 3-4 years
- Question of whether the TPA would audit Porter Airlines prior to expanding: TPA representative noted that there were two fiscally sound carriers operating from BBTCA