



PORTSTORONTO

BILLY BISHOP TORONTO CITY AIRPORT

**NOISE MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE
MEETING #9**

MEETING MINUTES

January 8, 2020

7:00 pm - 9:00 pm

Billy Bishop Airport Boardroom (Mainland Passenger Transfer Facility)

Toronto, Ontario

Minutes prepared by:



PORTS TORONTO



These meeting minutes were prepared by LURA Consulting. LURA provides neutral third-party consultation services for the PortsToronto Noise Management Sub-Committee. These minutes are not intended to provide verbatim accounts of committee discussions. Rather, they summarize and document the key points made during the discussions, as well as the outcomes and actions arising from the committee meetings. If you have any questions or comments regarding the Meeting Minutes, please contact either:

Angela Homewood

Project Manager & Environmental
Specialist – Infrastructure,
Planning & Environment

PortsToronto

Phone: 416-863-2046

AHomewood@portstoronto.com

OR

Alexander Furneaux

Meeting Notetaker

LURA Consulting

Phone: 416-410-3888 x708

afurneaux@lura.ca



Summary of Action Items from Meeting #

Action Item	Action Item Task	Who is Responsible for Action Item
M#9-A1	Alexander Furneaux to incorporate Ms. Monette's feedback into NMSC Meeting #8 minutes.	Alexander Furneaux
M#9-A2	LURA Consulting and PortsToronto to draft a short summary of the NMSC activity in 2019 for review and comment by the entire NMSC, and eventual presentation to the PortsToronto CLC.	Alexander Furneaux/Angela Homewood
M#9-A3	LURA Consulting and PortsToronto to incorporate Terms of Reference revisions into the January 2019 Terms of Reference for review and comment by the entire NMSC, to be agree upon by the March 11 th 2020 NMSC meeting.	Alexander Furneaux/Angela Homewood
M#9-A4	NMSC members to email Michael David with airport operation noises they detect so these noises can be captured in the Ground Noise Study model.	NMSC/Michael David
M#9-A5	Request a similar noise summary report as an example for the NMSC to review in terms of structure, content, and accessibility of key messages.	Michael David
M#9-A6	Wayne Christian to develop 4 to 5 weather conditions to be used as example scenarios of how noise is propagated from the airport under different weather conditions.	Wayne Christian
M#9-A7	NMSC members to support the presentation of the Ground Noise Study by contributing relatable narratives to the experience of noise surrounding the airport under different conditions.	NMSC
M#9-A8	Alexander Furneaux to circulate potential dates for NMSC meetings from January 2020 to January 2021.	Alexander Furneaux/Angela Homewood

List of Attendees

Name	Organization (if any)	Attendance
COMMITTEE MEMBERS		
Hal Beck – Co-Chair	York Quay Neighbourhood Association	Present
Wayne Christian	York Quay Neighbourhood Association	Present
Max Moore	Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association	Present
Lesley Monette	Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association	Present
Bryan Bowen	City of Toronto – Waterfront Secretariat	Present
PORTSTORONTO REPRESENTATIVES		
Angela Homewood – Co-Chair	PortsToronto	Present
Gary Colwell	PortsToronto	Present
Michael David	PortsToronto	Present
FACILITATION		
Jim Faught – Lead facilitator	LURA Consulting	Regrets
Alexander Furneaux - Notetaker	LURA Consulting	Present

1. **Welcome, Farewell to Wayne Christian, Action Items from Previous Meetings, and Agenda Review** **8**
2. **Noise Management Subcommittee Terms of Reference Review** **9**
3. **City of Toronto Noise Study Scope and Case Examples** **10**
4. **Ground Noise Study Update** **10**
5. **Permanent Noise Management Terminal Installation Update** **14**
6. **Business Arising** **15**

Appendices:

Appendix A: Meeting Agenda

Appendix B: PortsToronto Noise Management Sub-Committee Terms of Reference [Revised April 2020]

Appendix C: Worst Case Noise Scenarios Developed by Wayne Christian (York Quay Neighbourhood Association)

Appendix D: Permanent Noise Monitor Terminal Product Data and Proposed Preliminary Locations

Appendix E: Tripartite Agreement Schedule F – 1990 Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) Contour Map

Appendix F: Curfew Violation Process for Fines Memo - March 6, 2020

1. Welcome, Farewell to Wayne Christian, Action Items from Previous Meetings, and Agenda Review

Angela Homewood (PortsToronto) welcomed members of the NMSC to the ninth meeting of the sub-committee. Ms. Homewood began the meeting with a farewell to Wayne Christian who will be moving away from Toronto at the end of January.

- Ms. Homewood and the members of the NMSC thanked Mr. Christian for his dedication to the NMSC and the expertise he brought to the sub-committee, particularly in the discussion of the impact of weather conditions on the propagation of sound. Ms. Homewood provided Mr. Christian with a token of appreciation from PortsToronto.
- Mr. Christian informed the NMSC that although he will no longer be in Toronto, he has arranged to continue communicating with Gene Cabral and Mike Karsseboom from PortsToronto, collaborating on passenger arrival and departure, and the noise data.
- Hal Beck also took this opportunity to thank Mr. Christian for his involvement on the NMSC and as co-chair of the York Quay Neighbourhood Association (YQNA).

Ms. Homewood provided an overview of the meeting agenda and asked for any additional agenda items for discussion.

- Mr. Beck requested that the NMSC go through the RFP and draft Ground Noise Study plan discussed by R.J. Burnside at NMSC Meeting #8 (October 17, 2019), a noise report provided by Mike Karsseboom (PortsToronto) authored by Acoustik Engineering.
- Ms. Homewood inquired whether Mr. Beck wished to have Mr. Karsseboom return to the NMSC to provide an overview of the report. Bryan Bowen (City of Toronto) wished to clarify which report Mr. Beck was referencing.
- Mr. Beck explained the report was submitted in April 2018 by Acoustik Engineering to PortsToronto and provided to the NMSC at the end of NMSC Meeting #5.5 (April 11, 2019) without presentation and discussion.
- There was some confusion over which document Mr. Beck was referring to by members of the NMSC, with some members mistaking the document Mr. Beck presented as the Annual Noise Report produced by PortsToronto. Max Moore noted that the Annual Noise Report serves as a good Public Relations document for PortsToronto but does not have an adequately detailed technical noise discussion and is seen by several on the NMSC as one-sided.
- Ms. Homewood acknowledged that NMSC community members have expressed that they feel the Annual Noise Report is one-sided, and that PortsToronto is working towards a more balanced Annual Noise Report for the 2019 edition.
- Ms. Homewood suggested that Mr. Beck's questions about the Noise Study Update could be addressed under Michael David's (PortsToronto) Noise Study Update and that the Acoustik Engineering Report could be addressed by Gary Colwell (PortsToronto) during his update.
- Ms. Homewood went over the previous meeting action items.
- Ms. Monette added that she wished to have the draft minutes from Meeting #8 revised to incorporate both the sense of hearing and feeling noise and confirm the use of the term "subsonic".

ACTION

M#9-A1 Alexander Furneaux to incorporate Ms. Monette's feedback into NMSC Meeting #8 minutes.

- Mr. Bowen informed the NMSC that he is unable to present on the City of Toronto's Noise Study Scope and Case Examples at this meeting, however he is close to confirming the attendance of a City of Toronto planner who worked on the Daniels City of the Arts project which is regarded as a strong standard for noise mitigation in construction addressing stationary noise. Mr. Bowen wished to defer his action item to be addressed at NMSC Meeting #10 (to be held in March 2020).

2. Noise Management Subcommittee Terms of Reference Review

Ms. Homewood introduced the review of the Noise Management Subcommittee Terms of Reference. The January 2019 Terms of Reference is included in **Appendix B**.

The NMSC Terms of Reference indicates the following under Section 3.2:

"It is anticipated that it will take a period of approximately one year to fulfill the mandate of this committee. The committee's mandate will be re-evaluated on a yearly basis by virtue of committee members. If there is a desire for the committee to continue with a new mandate, a new terms of reference would be required. The focus of this committee is to fulfill the mandate outlined in this terms of reference."

- Ms. Homewood suggested that the Term be extended by 6 to 12 months. Lesley Monette (BQNA) in turn suggested that it should be extended by at least 12 months given the time it has taken to get the noise monitors installed. Ms. Monette indicated that she feels it is important to have the NMSC to discuss the data gathered by these monitors which would likely take at least 12 months if not more.
- Mr. Beck acknowledged that this is an important discussion to have to ensure NMSC members do not suffer from burn-out. He indicated his willingness to continue participating in the NMSC if Ms. Monette and Mr. Moore are also willing to continue.
- Mr. Moore added that Section 5.2's definition "the Noise Management Subcommittee will disband at the discretion of the BBTCA, once there are no noise related topics of interest brought forward by the subcommittee members or BBTCA." is a more accurate definition that emphasizes that the NMSC should only be disbanded if there are no longer topics of interest.
- Mr. David identified that he interpreted the Terms of Reference to see Section 3.2 and 5.2 as not being mutually exclusive.
- Mr. Bowen suggested that the NMSC should provide a short summary at the end of each year documenting how the NMSC is fulfilling its mandate, and provide this document to the CLC. Mr. Christian requested that he also receive this annual update.

ACTION

M#9-A2 LURA Consulting and PortsToronto to draft a short summary of the NMSC activity in 2019 for review and comment by the entire NMSC, and eventual presentation to the PortsToronto CLC.

ACTION

M#9-A3 LURA Consulting and PortsToronto to incorporate Terms of Reference revisions into the January 2019 Terms of Reference for review and comment by the entire NMSC, to be agreed upon by the March 11th 2020 NMSC meeting.

3. City of Toronto Noise Study Scope and Case Examples

Bryan Bowen (City of Toronto – Waterfront Secretariat) requested that this item be deferred to the next NMSC meeting on March 11, 2020. Mr. Bowen has requested a planner from the City of Toronto to attend the meeting as a guest speaker on stationary noise mitigation efforts implemented at Daniels City of the Arts. Mr. Bowen explained that the presentation will address the process the City followed, and which now serves as a gold standard in Toronto for mitigating stationary noise on the waterfront.

4. Ground Noise Study Update

Michael David (PortsToronto) provided an update on the Ground Noise Study. Mr. David will be issuing a letter to committees, boards, and property owners of buildings identified by R.J. Burnside and the NMSC for the installation of non-invasive temporary noise terminals. Mr. David also informed the NMSC that the first full day of meetings with airport stakeholders took place earlier in the week with a second meeting scheduled next week with Nieuport, Air Canada Jazz, and Porter Airlines. These meetings are being conducted to acclimatize Colin Novak (Acoustik Engineering) and Harvey Watson (R.J. Burnside) to the airport environment. Following these meetings, Colin and Harvey will begin a three-week process of gathering source noise measurements to inform the development of the noise model. These source monitoring exercises can be done independent of weather conditions and are conducted by getting as close as safely possible to the source of ground noises to gather peak noise measurements. Mr. David concluded by asking that if members of the NMSC notice any notable noises created by airport operation, they should let Mr. David know so that the consultants can gather measurements on these noise sources to create a representative noise model.

ACTION

M#9-A4 NMSC members to email Michael David with airport operation noises they detect so these noises can be captured in the Ground Noise Study model.

- Mr. Beck noted that the Ground Noise Study discussion in Meeting 8 felt “out of flavour” with prior NMSC meetings, noting that the appeal of the NMSC has been to learn collectively. In contrast, Mr. Beck felt the meeting with Harvey Watson felt more confrontational with more emphasis placed on a one-way exchange of knowledge coming from the consultant to the NMSC.

- Mr. Beck inquired whether there is an image of the temporary noise monitors. Mr. David responded that he has a picture of the temporary noise monitor which will be circulated in the email to committees, boards and property owners of buildings requested to receive a noise monitor.
- Mr. David wished to inquire with Ms. Monette as to whether she has perceived the auxiliary diesel power units used by planes at the gate. Ms. Monette responded she was not sure whether she noticed that noise distinctly, however she noted there is a lot of ground noise in the morning.
- Ms. Monette noted that she has observed a lot of smaller aircraft near the new hangar that is being constructed by Stolport which generate a lot of noise when they wait behind Porter aircraft. Mr. David indicated that these smaller aircraft were previously in Hangar 4 on the western end of the airport. Once the new hangar is finished, the smaller aircraft will be moved off the apron.
- Ms. Monette inquired about the impact of Q400 aircraft being reversed towards the water generating disturbances on the water's surface and exhaust concerns. Mr. David noted that the disturbance on the water is prop wash from the aircraft not exhaust. Mr. Colwell agreed, adding that engine exhaust is directed upwards on Q400 aircraft. The prop wash can be quite pronounced when generating the initial thrust to taxi.
- Ms. Monette added that she can tell what type of aircraft is taking off at the airport based on the sound of a granite and glass structure in her apartment vibrating from the noise. Mr. Colwell added that the harmonics of an aircraft can change depending on how the props are calibrated which can sometimes lead to greater noise.
- Mr. Beck inquired whether a summary of the peak source noise measurements will be provided. Mr. David indicated these measurements will be included in the report as appendices and built into the noise model.
- Mr. Moore inquired how DBA and DBZ measurements will be recorded. Mr. David explained that both DBA and DBZ can be recorded simultaneously. Mr. Moore indicated he was relieved to hear this rather than DBZ being calculated in post-processing.
- Mr. Beck referenced in the Acoustik Engineering report that there are several appendices with DbA and DbZ values and spectral event data from 3rd octave bands 12.5hz to 12,000hz. Mr. Colwell explained these are collected through Noise Desk broken down. Mr. Beck inquired how the NMSC should be looking at this data. Is this a logarithmic representation of what is seen on meters? Mr. David informed Mr. Beck that they would need to ask Harvey or Colin, and that his guess would be that they are cumulative. How should we look at this data given the interest in bass frequencies at a given moment in time.
- Ms. Monette proposed that once the data has been collected, the NMSC should meet to discuss the data, understand it better, and use some established formulas to apply against the data to see if any patterns emerge. Mr. David agreed there absolutely needs to be a more digestible way to interpret this data.
- Mr. Beck inquired how the data would be presented. Mr. David explained it would be shared as Excel CSV data and as a data output from the consultant's analytic software.
- Mr. Beck inquired if there are any example summaries to look to as a reference point for what to expect. Mr. Bowen added that these summaries should be meaningful to someone

who has never sat in on a NMSC meeting and may have little understanding of noise, and should have a narrative that is digestible. Mr. David explained that the data will be included in an appendix and that the role of the report is to identify how best to mitigate. He will ask Colin Novak and Harvey Watson if they have an example of a similar report to share with the NMSC. Ms. Homewood added that she believes there might be a good example from noise studies on wind turbines which explored noise, health, and perception. Mr. Christian added the summaries should be short and digestible, and easily identify the weather conditions. Mr. Christian requested to see these summary reports to look at the correlation between weather and the measurements.

ACTION

M#9-A5 Request a similar noise summary report as an example for the NMSC to review in terms of structure, content, and accessibility of key messages.

- Mr. Christian added that abbreviated weather conditions should be included with noise data measurements including wind direction, wind speed, temperature, and relative humidity. Ms. Homewood suggested they take an average day noise level accompanied with the weather conditions, and an extreme average day noise level accompanied with weather conditions to understand. Mr. Christian expressed that he felt it would be challenging to gather an accurate average given that the wind blows 360 degrees creating different noise conditions.
- Mr. Beck asked Mr. Christian why relative humidity should be used when inputting weather conditions. Mr. Christian explained relative humidity is important because it is the measure used in the aviation industry and measures the amount of moisture molecules in the air compared to the maximum amount of moisture in the air possible. Mr. Christian provided a short but detailed explanation of the relationship between temperature, dew point, and relative humidity. Mr. Colwell added that there are so many weather measures relevant to aviation such as adiabatic lapse rate, which is the rate at which atmospheric temperature decreased with increasing altitude in conditions of thermal equilibrium.
- Mr. Beck reiterated that when looking at the summary reports of noise, it is important to not only look at the number of aircraft slots but also the meteorological conditions, something Mr. Christian strongly supported as well. Mr. Beck suggested that the four-criteria Mr. Christian suggested (wind speed, wind direction, temperature, and relative humidity) should be examined in terms of two or three prevalent conditions found at the airport to sort noise conditions.
- Mr. Christian described that in his opinion the worst case noise scenario would be a Falcon-10 coming over the Toronto inner-harbour towards Lake Ontario landing with a southwest wind, 40km/h gusting 60km/h with warm air on top of cold air and a slight fog and you're having a drink at Amsterdam Brewery. Mr. Beck requested that this scenario would be given consideration as a worst-possible noise scenario. Mr. Colwell added that denser winter air will propagate sound more, in some cases if you go to the Portlands in the winter as the aircraft is throttling back on descent to the airport you might be able to hear the sound of air over the aircraft wing.

ACTION

M#9-A6 Wayne Christian to develop 4 to 5 weather conditions to be used as example scenarios of how noise is propagated from the airport under different weather conditions.

Mr. Christian's 4 weather condition examples are included in **Appendix C**.

- Mr. Bowen added that he feels it is important and useful to have what Mr. Christian described to create a set of composite scenarios to understand how noise is propagated under different conditions. He also added that these are great narratives for individuals to understand the products of this study and serve as a reference point to capture environmental impacts on noise. Mr. David explained that while the scenarios would illustrate the decibel values at various points around the airport, he agrees it would be helpful to develop a narrative in plain English articulating how that noise might be perceived. It was suggested that the NMSC could help contribute to these narratives given their experience with noise.

ACTION

M#9-A7 NMSC members to support the presentation of the Ground Noise Study by contributing relatable narratives to the experience of noise surrounding the airport under different conditions.

- Ms. Homewood added that when PortsToronto was consulting on the Ground Run-Up Enclosure (GRE), the City of Toronto requested that the consultants preparing the design provide a series of seven views of the proposed structure from various points along the waterfront for the public to interact with to understand the visual impact the GRE would create. Mr. Bowen added that this study should do the same in terms of narrative but for how noise is experienced. Mr. Christian indicated he would be happy to provide 4 to 5 scenarios.
- Several NMSC expressed their concerns about the process of how measurements about data would be collected and how different factors such as weather and multiple aircraft influence the model. Mr. David explained that for the temporary noise monitors, the team will be collecting measurements on seven days of within tolerance data. For the source monitoring, measurements will be taken as close as safely possible to noise sources. These can be inputted into the model being developed by the consultants which can vary conditions such as distance and weather to illustrate how noise propagates. Mr. David noted that at many times there can be hundreds of different perceivable noises that contribute to the noise profile of the area.
- Mr. Bowen inquired whether it would be possible to join the orientation with Nieuport, Air Canada Jazz, and Porter Airlines. Mr. David indicated it could be possible but that he would quickly need to coordinate clearance with Mr. Bowen. Other members of the NMSC indicated interest in joining.

5. Permanent Noise Management Terminal Installation Update

Gary Colwell (PortsToronto) provided an update on the installation of permanent noise monitors along the waterfront near Billy Bishop Airport. As of the beginning of January, three of the five permanent noise monitors were received by PortsToronto for installation pending permission from the property owners of the requested sites. Mr. Colwell indicated that the noise consultant installing the equipment would like to take the existing noise monitor from the roof of the airport terminal and place it on Mr. Beck's building, however he requested conducting a site visit prior to the installation which should occur on Wednesday January 15, 2020. Mr. Colwell is waiting for a letter of agreement from Ontario Place for the installation of the terminal there. This should be a quick installation as it involves affixing the monitor to a light standard approximately 7 feet from the ground with the microphone another 5 feet up the light standard. Mr. Colwell provided the product data on EMS Noise Monitoring Terminal Types 3639 and 3655, and images of the proposed preliminary locations which are attached in **Appendix D**.

- Mr. Colwell inquired whether the responses to the questions he received were satisfactory. Mr. Beck indicated he was pleased with the responses and provided them to the YQNA board for review.
- Mr. Bowen inquired who Mr. Colwell's contact with Ontario Place is. Mr. Colwell indicated their contact has been good, the delay has stemmed largely from the need to work between different departments to get approval for installation and that this has never been done before. The goal is to have everything done and installed before the end of January.
- Mr. Moore commented that the location of the Ontario Place monitor is farther along than he initially understood based on the discussion in NSMC Meeting #8 which he thought would place the noise monitor on the pagoda. He expressed concern that the location indicated on Mr. Colwell's aerial image would be unlikely to pick up aircraft noise. Mr. Colwell explained that the site was selected because PortsToronto wished to know about the noise impacts of Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) days. He also explained that PortsToronto initially wanted a site near the entrance of the Bill Davis trail but was unable to place the noise monitor there due to power restrictions, and the background hum of the transformer on the nearby washrooms.
- Mr. Beck inquired as to how the temporary noise monitors would be installed. Mr. Colwell explained the temporary noise monitors are similar to the permanent noise monitors in that they are housed in a box with a microphone that extends from the box. The principle difference is that the temporary noise monitors run on a battery whereas the permanent monitors draw their power from a continuous stable source. The temporary noise monitors are also less intrusive and do not require drilling into the structure they are affixed to.
- Mr. Moore inquired whether the measurements of the permanent noise monitors would be averaged. Mr. Colwell indicated the measurements will not be averaged.
- Mr. Beck inquired whether they were discussing the ICAO (International Civil Aviation Organization) locations suggesting that in the Tripartite Agreement under the contour reports, points X (near the southern-most point of Ontario Place) and Y (near the clothing-optional beach at Hanlan's Point) would be good spots to expect 25 NEF for average hour.

Mr. Beck specifically noted that Point Y would be important to understand the noise impacts on park and open space areas on the Island. The contour report from the Tripartite Agreement is attached in **Appendix E**.

- Mr. Beck inquired about the ICAO lateral, fly-over, and approach references mentioned in the Acoustik report near Unwin Avenue in the Portlands. Mr. David indicated the point is located near the jog in the road along Unwin Avenue. Mr. Colwell indicated that it is in an open area on the Marine Terminal Property where the sugar stockpile and ORM Concrete plant is, which could pose an interference problem. This location was identified initially as one of the recommended locations. Mr. Colwell suggested that once the first round of permanent noise monitors are in place, the NMSC can discuss additional sites such as this.
- Mr. Beck indicated he felt the Turning Basin point would likely be useful for Waterfront Toronto purposes. Mr. Bowen indicated that McCleary district will remain primarily low-rise as a quantum of land was consolidated for industrial uses east of the Don Roadway to offset the land dedicated for flood protection. Further west on Villiers Island, building heights will be below the 35 storeys. Mr. Beck concluded that the Turning Basin point would not be useful for flyover noise.
- Mr. David explained that Harvey Watson's (R.J. Burnside) and Colin Novak's (Acoustik Engineering) companies are partners on the Noise Study. Harvey is local with lots of noise background; however Colin has more aviation background that's part of why PortsToronto selected R.J. Burnside's proposal. Mr. Beck indicated that Harvey was one of the most impressive consultants that have come to these meetings.
- Mr. Beck noted that one of the IKO points is roughly directly centred over the Turning Basin which he feels is likely more helpful to Waterfront Toronto than PortsToronto. Mr. Colwell also noted that aircraft cannot fly any closer to the Turning Basin given the Hearn smokestack, new procedures are being introduced on the descent into BBTCA (these were covered in CLC meetings #35 and #36 by NAV Canada).

6. Business Arising

- Mr. Christian informed the NMSC that he went to the old PortsToronto headquarters the other day to gather measurements to calculate the size of the Ground Run-Up Enclosure. Mr. Bowen indicated that rather than going through a lengthy process to triangulate the size of these structures, he can provide CAD files for every building in Toronto on request.
- Mr. Colwell informed the NMSC that PortsToronto received a self-reported curfew violation from Porter Airlines on December 21st when a plane arrived 62 seconds after the 11:00 p.m. curfew. The aircraft was arriving from Montreal. PortsToronto is awaiting a response from Porter Airlines to understand the cause of the curfew violation. Mr. Colwell noted that Porter Airlines has made great attempts to reduce their curfew violations by adjusting their schedules. Ms. Homewood reminded the NMSC that this is the first curfew violation since the community fund was created. Once an investigation is completed and the fine levied, Mr. Colwell will provide an update to the CLC who will be tasked with determining where the money collected from the fine should be directed to. Mr. Beck inquired whether a list of potential organizations to receive funding was ever finalized. Ms. Homewood indicated she is unsure and that this is more in the realm of Deborah Wilson (PortsToronto member of the

CLC). Ms. Homewood reminded the NMSC that a memo was issued by Deborah Wilson on March 6th, 2020 to the CLC outlining the process (attached in **Appendix F**). In previous meetings, the community school and waterfront centre had been discussed as potential recipients. Mr. Bowen indicated for the general awareness of the NMSC (not to invalidate the importance of the school and waterfront centre) that the City of Toronto recently committed \$400,000 to the school and community centre, suggesting that if there are other organizations that have not been the recipients of funding recently that these would also make strong candidates from the money.

- Ms. Monette added that she has noticed that except for the odd occasion fewer aircraft are queuing and taking off at 6:45am as they were in the past. Most now abide by the 7am start time. Mr. Christian noted that there are often less people flying at this time of year meaning less of the airport's slots are used.
- Ms. Homewood informed the NMSC that she attended a site visit with Waterfront Toronto, the Toronto and Region Conversation Authority, and Ellis Don in the Portlands near the future Villiers Island. She reached out to the project manager at Ellis Don to inquire about accessing data from their noise monitor located at Commissioners Street. This noise monitor was installed for worker health and safety during flood plain construction and for workers at the nearby Canada Post and TTC sites as well as activity north of the construction area. Mr. Beck added that he feels this data would not be useful as it is too far from the flight path however he would defer this assessment to Colin Novak for advice.
- Responding to Mr. Beck's request for greater detail on the Acoustik Engineering Report, Mr. Colwell explained that this report was conducted to get a preliminary sense of where noise management terminals could be installed, this was always intended to be followed by consultation with the community on where they felt the noise management terminals should be located. Mr. Beck identified that there should be a good correlation between the Report's recommendation, Harvey Watson's recommendations, and community input to provide noise management terminals that can be found at different elevations and distances from the airport to understand the worst possible noise conditions.
- Mr. Furneaux and Ms. Homewood suggested Wednesday March 4, 2020 (which has now moved to Wednesday March 11, 2020 due to a conflict with Bryan) for the next NMSC meeting as well as future meetings in May 2020, September 2020, November 2020, and January 2021. Exact dates to be circulated for review before next meeting.

ACTION

M#9-A8 Alexander Furneaux to circulate potential dates for NMSC meetings from January 2020 to January 2021.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:15 p.m.