



**PORTSTORONTO**

**BILLY BISHOP TORONTO CITY AIRPORT**

**NOISE MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE  
MEETING #15**

**MEETING MINUTES**

January 26, 2022  
7:00 PM to 8:30 PM  
Zoom Online Meeting  
Toronto, Ontario

Minutes prepared by:





These meeting minutes were prepared by LURA Consulting. LURA provides neutral third-party consultation services for the Ports Toronto 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  
Billy Bishop Airport

**PortsToronto**

[AHomewood@portstoronto.com](mailto:AHomewood@portstoronto.com)

OR

**Alexander Furneaux**

Meeting Facilitator

**LURA Consulting**

Phone: 289-768-5561

[afurneaux@lura.ca](mailto:afurneaux@lura.ca)



### Summary of Action Items from Meeting #15

Action Item	Action Item Task	Who is Responsible for Action Item
<b>M#15-A1</b>	Michael MacWilliam to reconnect with Dr. Novak regarding a suitable location for the permanent noise monitor on Windward Co-Op.	<b>PortsToronto (Michael MacWilliam)</b>
<b>M#15-A2</b>	Michael MacWilliam to provide confirmation to Mr. Beck on which permanent noise monitor model will be installed at Windward Co-op.	<b>PortsToronto (Michael MacWilliam)</b>
<b>M#15-A3</b>	PortsToronto to consider maintaining the noise monitor on the ferry building for at least three months following the noise monitor at Windward Co-op being installed.	<b>PortsToronto (Michael MacWilliam)</b>
<b>M#15-A4</b>	Mr. Moore to select the top six key topics/questions that the NMSC would like to put forward to ICAO to address.	<b>Mr. Moore</b>
<b>M#15-A5</b>	Alexander Furneaux will send a poll to NMSC members on preferences for 2022 meeting dates, and will coordinate these dates to align with the Ground Noise Study.	<b>LURA (Alexander Furneaux)</b>
<b>M#15-A6</b>	Alexander Furneaux to follow-up with Bryan Bowen regarding city planning presentation on noise.	<b>LURA (Alexander Furneaux)</b>
<b>M#15-A7</b>	Include in the Airport Slots Follow-up Meeting minutes the list of topics that Transport Canada would be asked to present on.	<b>LURA (Alexander Furneaux)</b>

## List of Attendees

Name	Organization (if any)	Attendance
COMMITTEE MEMBERS		
Hal Beck – Co-Chair	York Quay Neighbourhood Association	Present
<i>Vacant position</i>	York Quay Neighbourhood Association	N/A
Max Moore	Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association	Present
Lesley Monette	Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association	Present
Bryan Bowen	City of Toronto – Waterfront Secretariat	Present
PORTS TORONTO REPRESENTATIVES		
Angela Homewood – Co-Chair	PortsToronto	Present
Michael David	PortsToronto	Present
Michael MacWilliam	PortsToronto	Present
Gary Colwell	PortsToronto	Present
FACILITATION		
Alexander Furneaux – Lead Facilitator	LURA Consulting	Present
Sayan Sivanesan - Notetaker	LURA Consulting	Present
GUEST		
Harvey Watson	R.J. Burnside	Present

1.	<b>Agenda Review and General Updates</b>	<b>4</b>
2.	<b>Ground Noise Study 101</b>	<b>4</b>
3.	<b>Commercial Service Update</b>	<b>9</b>
4.	<b>Permanent Noise Monitor Terminal Update</b>	<b>9</b>
5.	<b>Business Arising</b>	<b>10</b>

## Appendices:

Appendix A: Meeting Agenda

Appendix B: Ground Noise Study Presentation

Appendix C: Letter to ICAO re: Airport Ground Noise Measurement Standards

## 1. Agenda Review and General Updates

Alexander Furneaux (LURA Consulting) welcomed the members of the Noise Management Subcommittee (NMSC) to their 15<sup>th</sup> meeting held virtually via Zoom. Mr. Furneaux provided an overview of the agenda and asked if the committee had additional items to add. The meeting agenda is included in **Appendix A**.

- Mr. Beck noted his desire to discuss potential guests for future meetings and inquired about plans to invite a Transport Canada representative to discuss Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) modeling with the NMSC.
- Mr. Furneaux confirmed that potential guests can be discussed as part of the Business Arising agenda item. Mr. Furneaux indicated that Gene Cabral (PortsToronto) would work on requesting the right person from Transport Canada to join.
- Mr. Beck noted that the NMSC should do some preparation as a committee in advance of the discussion with the Transport Canada representative, so that the meeting can be productive.
- Ms. Homewood confirmed that Gene Cabral (PortsToronto) reached out Transport Canada following the airport slots meeting (January 13, 2022) to arrange this meeting and agreed with Mr. Beck that the NMSC should prepare for this meeting.
- Mr. Furneaux noted that the draft meeting minutes for NMSC Meeting #14 were circulated for review and asked if the committee had any comments on the minutes. Hearing no concerns, Mr. Furneaux indicated that the minutes would be finalized and posted on the PortsToronto website.

## 2. Ground Noise Study 101

Harvey Watson (R.J. Burnside) provided a presentation on the Ground Noise Study, which included a review of the project scope and methodology, responses to feedback received from the NMSC, and project progress to date. Mr. Watson noted several key points:

- The scope of the study is to measure background noise, measure ground noise sources, develop a noise propagation model, assess the impacts of noise using this model, and identify and prioritize mitigation measures.
- Data from the study will be reported in both dBA and dBZ decibels, as requested by the NMSC.
- The model that is used in the study accounts for environmental factors including wind direction, the surfaces sound is absorbed or reflected by, and the size and orientation of buildings. The model always assumes that the noise source is upwind and the receiver is downwind.
- Vibration is outside of the scope of this study, however, the low frequency spectrum is accounted for in the model, and the study also accounts for an annoyance factor.
- Assessment methods beyond 1-hour LEQ are being implemented so that peak noises will also be available, in addition to the 1-hour average.
- The Ground Noise Study is focused on noise made by anything at the airport while it is touching the ground, so fly-by noise is not within the scope and will not

be captured. PortsToronto is aware of the request to capture fly-by noise and can consider this in future studies.

- Airborne aircraft noise will be scrubbed from the background noise monitoring program of the study so that it does not inflate the background noise measurement.
- PortsToronto will discuss with the NMSC on how to present the study findings so it is relevant to individuals with a low and a high degree of noise understanding. This may include offering digestible summaries as well as raw data.
- The consultant team has measured many noise sources to-date to input into the noise propagation model, however others are still being gathered, subject to their availability.

Mr. Watson's full presentation is included in **Appendix B**.

- Mr. Beck asked for clarification on what "POR" stands for in the last slide.
- Mr. Watson clarified that POR stands for Point of Reception.
- Mr. Beck noted that the NPC-300 noise guidelines suggest that the worst predictable noise impact location is supposed to be examined.
- Mr. Watson clarified that this guideline is with respect to places where people are. He noted that sensitive receptors are any places where people sleep or expect quiet, such as residentially-zoned areas, churches, libraries and schools. Mr. Watson added that in these areas measurements are typically taken at the plane of the window and the outdoor points of reception, which is any place on the property within 30 metres of the building. However, in condominiums and apartment towers, the outdoor point of reception is generally defined by the developer and in downtown Toronto these may not be defined. Mr. Watson indicated that he looked for the identified outdoor points of reception and did not find any. Mr. Watson noted that because most people spend most of their time in their homes, his team determined that the windows of the various residences would be the primary point of interest in this study, and these were selected to the exclusion of any outdoor locations.
- Mr. Beck indicated that the pier and boat rental service at the foot of Spadina Avenue, where residents often set off canoeing or boating, is an outdoor location that is of concern to York Quay Neighbourhood Association (YQNA) members. Mr. Beck noted that YQNA members have complained about extreme noise and fumes in the early morning, coming from the east end of the airport runway.
- Mr. Watson responded that this location would not be covered by the NPC-300 noise guidelines, and that it falls outside of the radius originally specified in the study's Request for Proposal (RFP). However, he indicated that he would talk to his team and that they would consider it.
- Mr. Beck noted that as far as 55 Harbour Square Centre, which is east of Harbourfront Centre, he has heard complaints from people about ground noise from the airport.
- Mr. Watson responded that anything east of the POR 20 location in the Ground Noise Study will have a reduced noise impact, and so any mitigations that help POR 20 and locations west of it, will help locations east of POR 20 as well.

- Mr. Moore indicated that having access to the dBZ reporting would be more helpful to the community than dBA reporting, for the community to report to City Hall on the precise level of noise being made by the airport.
- Mr. Watson confirmed that everything that is recorded by the Ground Noise Study will be recorded in both dBA and dBZ, and that both recordings will be provided in the results.
- Mr. Moore added that the 1-h LEQ is inadequate in capturing the impact of noise peaks and indicated that the community is interested in peak noise measurements.
- Mr. Watson agreed with Mr. Moore on the limitation of the 1-h LEQ. He confirmed that the study will not exclusively use 1-h LEQ on the advisement of the NMSC, and that the study is looking at ways to capture peak noise.
- Mr. Beck noted that the NEF standards use half-second measurements. He indicated that in his experience of being woken up early in the morning by peak noise, that a half-second makes a difference compared to one-second. Mr. Beck inquired whether peaks will be measured in one-second, half-second, or smaller time increments.
- Mr. Watson responded that the team is working to determine how noise peaks will be measured but confirmed that the study will assess the disturbance from these events.
- Mr. Beck noted that during the feasibility study before the current larger ferries were implemented at the airport, he learned that even a half-second average did not capture the instantaneous peaks that woke him up. Mr. Beck suggested that when reporting on peaks in the study, rather than averaging out a peak over a few seconds, that the study try to capture the instantaneous peak.
- Mr. Watson responded that dealing with instantaneous peaks is not trivial, but his team will do what they can to account for this. He noted that they are continuing to work on how this will be addressed.
- Mr. Beck noted that during the hours that the airport is operating at constant steady peaks, above a certain decibel this noise becomes disturbing even if the noise is constant.
- Mr. Watson agreed, noting that the World Health Organization states that the threshold for constant noise before it becomes disturbing to sleep indoors is around 45 decibels. Mr. Watson added that the guidelines from the Ontario Ministry of Environment, Conservation, and Parks (MECP) aligns with the World Health Organization numbers.
- Ms. Monette noted that during the summer months, pre-pandemic, when the airport was most busy, there would be multiple planes lined up to take-off that would be idling and produce intermittent loud noise continuously for about three hours. She asked for clarification on when the study would stop considering these planes as ground noise, given that there is a period of idling and revving engines before planes take-off.
- Mr. Watson replied that the study stops considering the planes as ground noise when the wheels leave the ground.

- Ms. Monette then expressed concern about whether the level of noise and disturbance of the planes lined up during busy times would be accurately captured by 1-h LEQ measurements. She noted that though the busiest activity lasts for about three straight hours, there are breaks in the peak noise levels.
- Mr. Watson responded that the study would identify the locations and operating conditions where high levels of disturbances would happen, such as when multiple planes are in queue waiting to take-off. The study would then be able to consider mitigation options, including operational changes such as determining locations where the planes can be idle to minimize the noise impact.
- Ms. Monette informed Mr. Watson of additional locations that are not residential buildings but have lots of people that are affected by the airport noise and pollution. She noted that the Toronto Music Garden is on the waterfront parallel to the airport's east runway, and that it is full of visitors and music performers on weekends. She also noted that there are people that live in their boats in the marina that are also impacted.
- Ms. Monette then noted that sometimes when the planes are getting ready to take-off, their tails are facing north, and the exhaust and noise from the engines direct straight at the waterfront. Ms. Monette expressed that this is another disturbance that she hopes the study can help to address.
- Mr. Bowen thanked Ms. Monette for raising points he wanted to express as well. Mr. Bowen agreed that the Toronto Music Garden should be included in the study as a Point of Reception (POR). He expressed concern that not including popular outdoor gathering spaces along the waterfront may lead to the public discounting the results of the study. He strongly recommended that the study include the Toronto Music Garden now, rather than be pressured to include it later. He noted that the north end of the Toronto Music Garden is raised, so the POR located further north of this is buffered by the music garden. However, where people sit at the music garden is facing the southwest towards the airport runway, so this would be a location where noise study results would be meaningful to people that visit or live in the neighbourhood.
- Mr. Bowen also noted that concerns about airplanes lining up at the ends of runways has been raised in the Air Quality Study as well. He indicated that if the Air Quality Study and the Ground Noise Study find that this operational procedure presents significant issues, then there should be a review of how to mitigate or adjust these operations. Mr. Bowen suggested that the study model different scenarios that illustrate what it would look like if planes were taking off without being in a queue versus when multiple planes are stacked on the runway.
- Mr. Bowen also inquired if there is an ability to model what the mitigation impact of a noise wall at the end of the runway would be.
- Mr. Watson replied that the model is great at adding noise walls and that the height and length can be completely customized, but he identified that it is not technically permitted to put a noise wall there because it is too close to the runway. He indicated that the study is going to have enough to assess, so looking at mitigation measures that are not technically feasible is not something they would be exploring.



- Mr. Bowen elaborated that there is a need in the future for PortsToronto to add a runway end safety area (RESA), and potentially lakefill around the end of the runway to do this. Mr. Bowen indicated that this might present a cost-effective opportunity to widen the shoreline as needed to accommodate a noise wall, so knowing the benefits of a noise wall would be helpful to informing that discussion in the future. Mr. Bowen added that in the context of that discussion, the study would be criticized by airport stakeholders if the benefits of a noise wall were not considered.
- Mr. Watson responded that if there is a possibility of adding some land and then putting a noise wall on the new land appropriately setback from the runway, then this is something that can be easily done in the model. He noted that this is a different mitigation then putting a noise wall on the existing land which he was told the airport cannot do.
- Mr. Bowen then expressed his belief that this study is the opportunity to assess whether the benefit of a noise wall is enough to warrant a discussion by PortsToronto and airport stakeholders on considering widening as part of the RESA addition so that a noise wall could be incorporated.
- Michael David (PortsToronto) agreed with Mr. Bowen's point. Mr. David also clarified that he had told Mr. Watson that a noise wall would not fit in the runway area but has not yet briefed Mr. Watson on the possible future scenarios for the area.
- Mr. Watson indicated that there are many people that will have to give direction and information on what mitigation scenarios to consider. He noted that the study will first build the model to identify what noise sources are causing the most disturbances and provide measurements of the impacts. Based on the disturbances identified, there can be a list of mitigations that are proposed for the study to consider.
- Ms. Homewood noted that PortsToronto has already committed to completing a full Environmental Assessment process if the RESA conversation moves forward, and that this would include doing another noise and air quality study. That said, Ms. Homewood agreed that it would be good to model the noise wall mitigation as part of the current study.
- Mr. Beck suggested that it might be helpful to consider scenarios based on the Toronto Music Garden's performance schedules, to determine windows of time where there won't be any disturbances to performances due to aircraft takeoffs.
- Mr. Beck then noted that the committee would like to get an idea of what the report would look like and get familiar with the kinds of technical data that would be available. He inquired if there are any example reports available and noted that the committee is interested in learning about how the results can be presented.
- Mr. Watson responded that there would be huge amounts of numbers and data tables included, because there are six heights and 20 POR locations, and multiple frequencies that can be looked at. Mr. Watson noted that there would also be graphic representations that can show noise contours at different heights, which would be more helpful in understanding how noise sources impact the

community. He indicated that due to the large amount of data, a matrix of noise impacts should be used to prioritize which ones get represented graphically.

- Mr. Beck indicated that the subcommittee would be interested in seeing examples of the data tables.
- Mr. Watson responded that because this study is not following the provincial standard, they do not have any prior examples.
- Mr. Beck noted that permanent noise monitors are starting to get implemented, and that these monitors can produce short and long reports. Mr. Beck indicated that it would be nice to have the reports in-sync so that the subcommittee can learn and understand what technical information is available.
- Mr. Watson replied that the study would use the permanent noise monitors for measuring noise from airplanes that are in the air. He noted that these monitors are designed to not pick up ground noise, so this creates a limitation on the data that can be used from them.
- Mr. Moore indicated that the reason why he is interested in seeing the raw data of peak noise measurements is because he believes that dBA reporting makes it appear that the airport only generates 55 to 65 decibels of noise, while the measurements he takes at his home in dBZ show 65 to 85 decibels. Mr. Moore expressed that he would like City Hall to receive the noise reports showing 65 to 85 decibels, because this more accurately reflects what the community is experiencing.
- Mr. Furneaux reiterated that the reporting would provide the results in both dBA and dBZ outputs, and that the results can be presented in various formats including tables or graphical representations to best suit the audience.
- Ms. Homewood noted that the MECP regulations specify dBA as the form of measurement that is used when evaluating compliance.

### **3. Commercial Service Update**

Michael MacWilliam (PortsToronto) suggested that the Commercial Service Update can be dropped from this meeting to allow more time for other agenda items. Mr. MacWilliam noted that Gene Cabral (PortsToronto) had provided committee members several updates on the topic in recent weeks, including at the last CLC meeting (#44) on November 24) and the Airport Slots Follow-up Meeting on January 13, 2022. Mr. Furneaux asked the committee if there was any opposition to proceeding to the next item. The committee agreed to move on.

### **4. Permanent Noise Monitor Terminal Update**

Michael MacWilliam (PortsToronto) provided a short update on the Permanent Noise Monitor Terminal installations. Mr. MacWilliam noted that there have been no responses from Ontario Place to emails and phone calls by PortsToronto and expressed that he would be personally reaching out to make contact with Ontario Place. He explained that a new contract would need to be negotiated with Ontario Place for the noise monitor installation, because the original contract was only for a one-year term. As part of the contract renegotiation, PortsToronto would request for the monitor to be located closer to the point indicated in the Tripartite Agreement. Mr. MacWilliam also noted that he has not yet had a discussion with Dr. Colin Novak about the preference for installing the noise monitor at Windward Co-op (Mr. Beck's building) on the building's wall instead of

on the roof. Mr. MacWilliam confirmed that he would be reaching out to Dr. Novak, who would make the final decision on this. Mr. MacWilliam concluded that the noise monitor machines are ready, and so installations can move forward quickly once the installation points are confirmed.

**M#15-A1** Michael MacWilliam to reconnect with Dr. Novak regarding a suitable location for the permanent noise monitor on Windward Co-Op.

- Mr. Beck asked for confirmation on which permanent noise monitor model would be installed at Windward Co-op.
- Mr. MacWilliam responded that he will check and get back to Mr. Beck to confirm.

**M#15-A2** Michael MacWilliam to provide confirmation to Mr. Beck on which permanent noise monitor model will be installed at Windward Co-op.

*Following the meeting, Mr. MacWilliam confirmed that the model number is [Brüel & Kjær 3639](#), which is the same as the existing units used by PortsToronto*

- Mr. Beck noted that there was previous discussion around moving the noise monitor on top of the ferry building. Mr. Beck expressed his desire that this monitor can remain there for awhile longer, so that there can be at least three months where both Windward Co-op and the ferry building have monitors simultaneously and any differences in measurements can be compared.
- Mr. MacWilliam took note of the request and indicated that PortsToronto would consider it.

**M#15-A3** PortsToronto to consider maintaining the noise monitor on the ferry building for at least three months following the noise monitor at Windward Co-op being installed.

## **5. Business Arising**

Alexander Furneaux (LURA) began the discussion of Business Arising topics.

- Mr. Furneaux noted that LURA will prepare a Year-In-Review document. He noted that a Year-In-Review had been written for 2019, however, a Year-In-Review was not prepared for 2020 due to the subcommittee not meeting as often that year. As a result, the 2021 Year-In-Review will capture the NMSC's discussions and work over the past two years.
- Mr. Beck inquired who the target audience is for the Year-In-Review.
- Mr. Furneaux replied that the target audience is the Billy Bishop Airport (BBTCA) Community Liaison Committee (CLC), and that it serves as an update to the CLC regarding what the NMSC has been working on. Mr. Furneaux noted that the 2019 Year-In-Review was also published on the PortsToronto website.
- Ms. Homewood added that the Year-In-Review is not a marketing piece. She indicated that it is meant to highlight what work had been completed, as well as what the NMSC is working towards.

- Mr. Furneaux indicated that a draft of the 2021 Year-In-Review would be ready for the committee to review by the next NMSC meeting.
- Mr. Furneaux noted that the next topic for discussion is related to a letter that Mr. Moore drafted, addressed to the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) (this letter is included in Appendix C). Mr. Furneaux gave the floor to Mr. MacWilliam and Ms. Homewood to share updates on this topic.
- Mr. MacWilliam noted that the committee had discussed requesting a subject matter expert from ICAO to speak with the NMSC. Mr. MacWilliam indicated that PortsToronto would take the lead in contacting ICAO to organize this but requested that the committee prepare a list of up to six questions that they would like to ask the ICAO subject matter expert.
- Mr. Beck indicated that it would be valuable to receive a generic public-facing presentation from ICAO, explaining what the organization does.
- Mr. MacWilliam indicated that he had tried to look for such a presentation and was unable to find one.
- Ms. Homewood indicated that Mr. Moore's discussion paper submitted in May 2021, and Mr. Moore's letter that was received in January 2022, could be used to draft key questions that can be shared with an ICAO presenter to structure their presentation around.
- Mr. Moore responded that it would be great to have someone from ICAO to speak with the NMSC but pursuing this was not the intention of his letter. Mr. Moore noted that the purpose of his letter was to ask ICAO to consider developing ground noise measurement standards. He also clarified that he had not intended for the letter to be sent from this committee because he believes this gives the impression that PortsToronto is making the request to ICAO. He indicated that he believes ICAO would respond to the letter more favourably if it came from the community organizations represented in the committee.
- Mr. MacWilliam noted that the first step would be to establish a contact person at ICAO and make ICAO aware of the existence of the NMSC. Once the door to communication is open, then the community groups would be able to make a submission to ICAO if they wanted.
- Mr. Moore agreed with Mr. MacWilliam that opening the door to communication would be a good first step.
- Mr. Beck expressed that it would be important for the request to ICAO to be focused and clear, so that it is not dismissed.
- Mr. MacWilliam agreed and asked if Mr. Moore could select the top six points from his letter that he would like ICAO to address and share this with the committee.
- Mr. Moore confirmed that he would do this and noted that other committee members could add to these points.
- Ms. Homewood noted that these points would help ICAO to determine the best person to send to respond to the points.
- Mr. Furneaux noted that the list of points identified by Mr. Moore would be circulated to the NMSC members for their review and input.

**M#15-A4** Mr. Moore to select the top six key topics/questions that the NMSC would like to put forward to ICAO to address.

- Mr. Furneaux noted that the NMSC would continue to schedule quarterly meetings in 2022, and that he would send a poll to gather member preferences for potential meeting dates.
- Ms. Homewood noted that some of the meeting dates may need to be adjusted, or additional meetings may need to be scheduled, based on when preliminary results from the Ground Noise Study are prepared, so that the NMSC can review the information sooner.
- Mr. David agreed and suggested that the NMSC meeting schedule for 2022 should be aligned with the milestones of the Ground Noise Study, so that feedback from the committee can be collected soon after a milestone is completed and inform the following stages of the study.
- Mr. David noted that he is working with Mr. Harvey to determine the study's 2022 schedule. He suggested that the next NMSC meeting can follow the quarterly pattern, and then the following meetings can be adjusted based on the milestone dates for the study.
- Mr. Furneaux indicated that he and Mr. David could discuss this further when the 2022 schedule for the study is more defined. Mr. Furneaux noted that the other consideration for scheduling is that the NMSC is looking to invite presenters from external organizations such as ICAO.

**M#15-A5** Alexander Furneaux will send a poll to NMSC members on preferences for 2022 meeting dates, and will coordinate these dates to align with the Ground Noise Study.

- Mr. Furneaux indicated that he would follow-up with Mr. Bowen regarding inviting someone from the City to present on how noise is reviewed in development.
- Mr. Beck expressed his belief that Mr. Bowen was planning to present on this himself.
- Mr. Furneaux clarified that he has spoken with Mr. Bowen who is looking for some support on this presentation within City Planning due to how busy he is with work related to the Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Plan (BQNP).

**M#15-A6** Alexander Furneaux to follow-up with Bryan Bowen regarding city planning presentation on noise.

- Mr. Beck asked if the group can discuss meeting with Transport Canada.
- Ms. Homewood noted that Gene Cabral (PortsToronto) reached out to Transport Canada two weeks ago and is waiting to hear back.
- Mr. Beck suggested that to prepare for the meeting with Transport Canada, the subcommittee should review the chapter on aircraft noise in the Transport Canada [TP 1247 document](#). Mr. Beck noted that the chapter is short and can be reviewed quickly.

- Mr. Beck also suggested that the subcommittee should review the 1996 [NEF Validation Study](#).
- Mr. Beck expressed his belief that the TP 1247 and the NEF Validation Study are foundational documents in Canada, and that the NMSC should be familiar with them. He added that reviewing these documents may help generate some questions to ask Transport Canada.
- Mr. Beck noted that the NEF Validation Study is comprised of three volumes and covers a broad range of issues. The study confirms that the NEF process is still valid to be used in Canada, compares the NEF to other types of contour modelling formulas used around the world, and discusses why the NEF is preferred.
- Mr. Beck also noted that the study recommends that Transport Canada develops noise criteria for smaller airports. Mr. Beck indicated that he would want to ask the Transport Canada representative about how this noise criteria for smaller airports is progressing. He indicated that this noise criteria should have been developed within the 10 years following the publication of the study in 1996.
- Mr. Beck concluded that the NMSC could review the two studies as a committee at a high level, and then members could individually read parts in detail based on their interests.
- Ms. Homewood asked for clarification that LURA would be preparing meeting minutes for the Airport Slots Follow-up Meeting.
- Mr. Furneaux confirmed that LURA will be sending those meeting minutes to Mr. Cabral for review, after which they will be shared with the attendees of the meeting as well as posted on the PortsToronto website.
- Ms. Homewood indicated that the topics that the Transport Canada representative would be asked to present on should be included in the Airport Slots Follow-up Meeting minutes as well.

**M#15-A7**                      Include in the Airport Slots Follow-up Meeting minutes the list of topics that Transport Canada would be asked to present on.

- Ms. Homewood indicated that depending on the timing of the meeting with Transport Canada, the suggested reference material may be a lot to review.
- Mr. Beck agreed that the NEF Validation Study is a lot of material but suggested that the NMSC could review it at a high-level, such as discussing the table of contents as a group to become familiar with what it covers.
- Mr. Beck then inquired whether the regulations of slots could be a topic at a future NMSC meeting.
- Ms. Homewood responded that this is something that should be brought up at the CLC meeting on February 16, 2022, because the topic is not specific to noise.
- Mr. Beck noted that the number of slots is calculated to manage noise based on the volume of aircrafts flying at the airport.
- Ms. Homewood responded that noise is just one component of slot regulation and the calculation of slots, so a presentation on this would be more appropriate

at a CLC meeting. Ms. Homewood indicated that the NMSC could be invited to attend this meeting.

- Mr. Gary Colwell (PortsToronto) then shared that this would be his last NMSC meeting as he is retiring soon.
- The NMSC members congratulated Mr. Colwell and thanked him for his contributions to the committee.
- Mr. Furneaux thanked the NMSC members for their participation and called the meeting to a close.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 PM.

**Appendix A**  
**Meeting Agenda**  
**Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport**  
**Noise Sub Committee Meeting 15**

Wednesday January 26, 2022  
7:00 PM to 8:30 PM  
Zoom Virtual Meeting

**AGENDA**

- 7:00 Welcome
- 7:05 Agenda Review
- 7:10 Ground Noise Study 101 (Harvey Watson, R.J. Burnside)
- 7:55 Commercial Service Update (Michael MacWilliam)
- 8:05 Permanent Noise Management Terminal Update (Michael MacWilliam)
- 8:15 Business Arising
  - 2021 Year-In-Review
  - Request by Max for ICAO's involvement
  - Meeting planning for 2022
- 8:30 Adjourn



**Appendix B**  
**Ground Noise Study Presentation**

**Appendix C**  
**Letter to ICAO re: Airport Ground Noise Measurement**  
**Standards**

**Prepared by Community Subcommittee Member Max Moore, January 8, 2022**