

# Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport

## Noise Management Sub Committee Meeting on Annual Noise Reporting Summary

April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2019  
7 pm-9 pm

Billy Bishop Airport Boardroom  
(Mainland Passenger Transfer Facility, above Aroma Café)

### **PARTICIPANTS**

Hal Beck – Co-Chair (York Quay Neighbourhood Association)  
Angela Homewood – Co-Chair (PortsToronto)  
Gary Colwell (PortsToronto – Noise Management Office)  
Mike Karsseboom (PortsToronto)  
Wayne Christian (York Quay Neighbourhood Association)  
Lesley Monette (Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association)  
Max Moore (Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association)  
Alex Lavasidis (Lura Consulting - Notetaker)

### **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION**

The following section provides a summary of discussion at the Noise Management Sub Committee (NMSC) meeting on Annual Noise Reporting. This is not a verbatim account of the discussion. The meeting was structured around Mike Karsseboom's, PortsToronto, presentation on Annual Noise Reporting, which is included in **Appendix A**. When relevant to the discussion, slide numbers are provided.

- Mike Karsseboom, PortsToronto, noted that his presentation was revised based on 2018 comments from the York Quay Neighbourhood Association (YQNA) representative. He thanked the NMSC for hosting him for the first time and explained that PortsToronto hired consultants to undertake a study to identify locations for new noise monitoring terminals. The locations suggested in the report are not final, as PortsToronto would like feedback on the proposed locations from community members, including the NMSC. Many suggested locations in the report are tied to flight paths, but PortsToronto understands that there are locations the community would like to see noise monitoring terminals located that are not directly related to flight paths. PortsToronto will work with the community to decide upon the location of noise monitoring terminals.
- Hal Beck, YQNA, noted that he is happy with that approach. He highlighted that measuring stationary source noise should be goal of the noise monitoring terminals

(rather than measuring ground-based noise). He explained that the altitude of the monitoring terminals will have an implication for those living in and around the York Quay neighbourhood; the lateral noise offset continues as the plane trajectory goes up, therefore measuring ground-based noise is not appropriate for the waterfront community.

- Mike responded that stationary source noise will be measured at the monitoring terminals.
- Angela Homewood, PortsToronto, noted that ground-based noise is not defined in NPC 300.
- Hal responded that it is not, but stationary source noise is defined on page 16 of the NPC document.
- Angela responded that defining terms is important to ensure all participants on the NMSC are on the same page, so this discussion is well-understood.
- Hal agreed and stated that the notes from each NMSC meeting should showcase the committee's learnings.
- Mike noted that if a noise management terminal is installed on the side of a residential building, PortsToronto would expect cooperation from the building (e.g. providing electricity and assisting with permits). The noise monitoring device, other than requiring a small electricity feed, is largely self-contained and can be fixed to the side of a building.
- Hal inquired if the Noise Report outlines the type of noise monitoring technology that can be mounted to buildings along the waterfront.
- Mike responded that all monitoring equipment will be compatible with the existing PortsToronto noise management systems. PortsToronto will be responsible for purchase, installation and maintenance of the device.
- Hal recommended PortsToronto look for technologies that are appropriate for different locations (e.g. that provide wind protection, that are appropriate for glass buildings, etc.).
- Mike noted that the installation process will depend on the location of the monitoring device. Once the location is selected, installation of the monitoring devices will be left to the experts.
- Lesley Monette, Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association, inquired if all of the monitoring equipment will be installed outside, and if that would be a problem depending on the existing building façades.
- Mike responded that monitoring equipment will be installed outside. He noted that the installation experts will determine how to best mount the monitoring units depending on the façade of each building. He noted that current monitoring stations are on the tops of buildings, but they do not have to be.
- Lesley inquired where the microphone on the monitoring unit would be located if the unit were installed on a balcony, if the building had a glass or cement front.
- Mike responded that he was not sure, but that was a question installation experts would be able to address.
- Hal highlighted that microphone placement is important to ensure proper readings.

- Max Moore, Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association, inquired if the cable from the existing monitoring units feed into the buildings they are installed on.
- Mike responded that the unit sits outside and feeds into the building. Gary added that there is a unit on the waterfront fire hall that has a microphone located on the outside of the building, which transmits to a data recording unit located inside the building.
- Hal inquired how large that existing external unit is.
- Mike responded that the existing unit contains a 6 to 8 ft boom with the microphone on top.
- Lesley noted that her building has a very specific design and that her community would not want to put a large box on the façade, as that would take away from the aesthetic of the building.
- Mike responded that specifics around installation can be planned once locations are selected.
- Lesley noted that it is important for her to understand the installation options as her building's board is unlikely to approve of a large box affixed to the outside of her building.
- Lesley and Hal both have volunteers from their buildings who would be open to locating noise monitoring devices in or around their units.
- Lesley requested a digital copy of the Noise Monitoring Terminal Study Report.
- Mike noted that he will provide a digital copy of the report to all members of the NMSC. He noted that the report can be shared with the wider community.
- Angela highlighted that the locations suggested in the report are not where PortsToronto believes community members will want noise monitoring terminals located. She emphasized that potential locations will be updated based on community preferences.
- Hal requested that point be included in the email when the digital report is distributed to members.
- Lesley inquired if "total movements" (Slide 5) includes general aviation and helicopters?
- Mike responded that it includes general aviation, helicopters, and any medivac flights (everything except Porter and Air Canada flights).
- Wayne Christian, York Quay Neighbourhood Association, inquired if certain areas of the airport are growing or if takeoffs and landings are increasing.
- Mike responded that growth at the airport includes increased small commercial flights with Fly GTA, an increase in Island Air flight training, and an increase in itinerant aircraft.
- Max noted that growth of small aircraft at the airport is interesting, as three to five years ago people thought that Porter Airlines was trying to push out general aviation.
- Mike noted that while he could not speak to efforts and intentions five years ago, currently, PortsToronto are trying to make general aviation feel more welcome because of those previous criticisms.
- Hal suggested editing all slides that show year over year comparisons to add two rows to showcase the increase with the overall increase and the percentage increase (or decrease) year over year.

- Mike noted that in 2017 there was a decrease because there were less aircraft left waiting for gates due to policy changes made by PortsToronto.
- Hal noted that in 2013 it seemed like a large jump in complaints, but that was likely due to the Porter Airlines jet proposal which was that same year; people were filing a lot of complaints because of that issue being top of mind. This point demonstrates that there are reasons noise complaints increase and decrease that are not necessarily reflective of their noise levels in the community. Hal also suggested that the declining numbers over time could be reflective of complaint fatigue.
- Lesley agreed with Hal's comment on complaint fatigue, noting that some people in her building feel the process is too complicated, while others are just tired from reporting often without seeing any positive changes. She also highlighted that the noise complaint forms do not include an option to report every-day ground noise.
- Max inquired what year the Ground Run-Up Enclosure (GRE) was completed.
- Mike responded that the GRE was completed in April 2017.
- Max noted that he would have thought that would have had a larger impact on noise complaints.
- Lesley inquired if the noise complaint form could be used to register complaints against party boats that go by after 11 pm.
- Mike responded that yes, noise complaints against party boats can be registered through the Billy Bishop Airport system, and that they will pass those complaints on to the Harbour Master.
- Hal noted that an immediate resolution would be to call the marine police unit.
- Max inquired where the heavy maintenance work was now being completed, since Porter moved operations away from Billy Bishop Airport.
- Mike responded that Porter Airlines relocated heavy maintenance to Thunder Bay and Sudbury. There is a full operating base in Thunder Bay as well. The move was in part due to a shortage of technically-trained staff in the Greater Toronto Area.
- Hal noted that Wayne had previously mentioned a discussion with Ken Lundy about defining a run-up.
- Wayne responded that he wanted to look at high-powered engine runs versus other types of engine runs. He understood that it was more likely that a complaint be filed around a high-powered run. However, Wayne noted that before he made any further comment, he would like to review information on the topic.
- Mike noted that it could be advantageous to track each type of run-up, but that he would wait for comment from the NMSC before changing the tracking system.
- Wayne noted that at a certain point, the recorded number of total engine runs nearly doubled because a different method was used to tabulate the total.
- Gary noted that there is a need to cut out the ambiguity surrounding run-up types so that there is consistent naming and accounting.
- Hal inquired if the airport maintenance run procedures had been updated to reflect this need to reduce ambiguity. He noted that the 2017 Noise Report still lists different types of run-ups.

- Mike responded that PortsToronto will have to review the engine run procedures. That may be a 2-year review cycle. He will double check and see if the document can be updated (and any associated timelines).
- Hal noted that it would be interesting to see the types of run-ups displayed in the charts provided, with different bars for different types of run-ups.
- Max noted that it may not be possible for people reporting noise complaints to know what type of run-up they are hearing, therefore skewing counts.
- Mike noted that whenever a noise complaint is made, PortsToronto staff try to pin down a cause based on the time the complaint was made and what was occurring at the airport at that time (e.g. a certain type of run-up).
- Hal inquired if it is worth tracking non-power run-ups.
- Mike responded that they are tracked because the duty managers must make note of those regardless, so the data should exist.
- Lesley inquired why some run-ups occur with engines facing the waterfront community.
- Hal inquired what is recorded when pilots rev their engines.
- Mike responded that an engine rev is not a run-up and is not recorded as it is just a normal part of the pre-flight process.
- Max noted that engine revs are a noise source the community experiences, suggesting it should be recorded and named.
- Mike noted that he can look into that.
- Lesley inquired why some pilots rev their engine for a very short period while others rev their engines for a longer period of time.
- Hal suggested that if there is an update to the procedures around engine revs and run-ups, engine rev procedures can be more clearly defined, and a definition of each run-up can be posted.
- Mike noted that PortsToronto can provide clarification, but that the definitions would mostly be used by the airport duty manager, not the community.
- Max agreed, noting that the airport would correlate the run-up type with the time a noise complaint was made to ensure accurate data was recorded. Community members would not be responsible to identify the type of run-up they were hearing when making a noise complaint.
- Mike noted that PortsToronto would have to meet with Porter Airlines and Air Canada to better understand why some pilots do a small rev versus a long rev. Mike is not certain if there are requirements around engine revs.
- Hal suggested that the noise complaint form should include a drop-down menu for people to select the type of noise they are hearing.
- Max cautioned against this, noting that it may make the form seem too onerous and discourage people from reporting.
- Angela noted that the time is the key detail required, and that additional descriptive detail is helpful but does not have to pinpoint the exact cause of noise, if it is unknown.
- Hal asked that the NMSC and CLC be notified if there are details that would be helpful for the community to include in their noise complaint descriptions.

- Mike noted that it may be helpful for PortsToronto to develop guidelines on what type of information would be helpful to have from community members when they register a noise complaint.
- Gary agreed, noting that the more information PortsToronto is provided, the easier it is to identify a noise source.
- Wayne inquired if all run-ups occurred within the enclosure in 2017.
- Gary responded that the one noise complaint related to run-ups received in 2017 was related to a run-up that occurred outside of the enclosure, as pilot had yet to be trained on use of the enclosure.
- Mike added that one run-up recently occurred outside of the enclosure due to wind direction, but there was no noise complaint registered during that time. He explained that the GRE was built to be useable through most wind directions, however there are certain wind speeds and angles in which the GRE cannot be used. The guarantee is 85% usage. Currently, the usage is about 91-92% of wind conditions. Mike offered to provide the wind charts for the GRE, so NMSC members can see when it is useable.
- Wayne noted that while he is happy the GRE wind chart will be provided, he would like a disclaimer included that notes that it is not 100% accurate to correlate the number of complaints to GRE use.
- Mike agreed.
- Angela suggested this disclaimer be added to the footnotes of the presentation.
- Hal requested that on slides 8 and 10 a new row be added to the end of each table to show total complaints per year. Additionally, Hal requested that the number of each type of aircraft movement be added to the existing tables.
- Mike noted that he can break down movements further, but that he cannot include military movements as these are untracked by the airport (e.g. if a military helicopter lands, it is only counted as a helicopter, not specifically a military helicopter).
- Hal noted that he sometimes hears flyovers on Saturdays over his building but is never able to see the plane making the noise.
- Mike noted that this could be a C130, however he cannot be certain.
- Hal inquired how the complaint would be counted.
- Mike explained that if the plane is one that lands or takes off from Billy Bishop Airport, the flight would be tracked and could therefore be counted. If it is only a plane flying over the community, the airport would not have any control over that, so if it were just a flyover, it would be traced and would be recorded as a general complaint.
- Hal noted that last year statistics on noise complaints included an “uncorrelated” line.
- Mike noted that “uncorrelated” is included in the “general” count. He explained that Gary had greatly reduced the number of “uncorrelated” counts since he arrived at PortsToronto. The current figure is around 7.
- Gary noted that sometimes there are noise complaints that aren’t airplanes and it is hard to track down the source.
- Hal suggested creating an introductory section to the report with definitions and descriptions including “general aviation”, “scheduled commercial”, “military flights”, “helicopter flights”, “curfew violation”, etc.

- Mike agreed and noted that this would be advantageous for everyone.
- Angela noted that regarding a definition of “curfew violation”, timing hasn’t changed, but the specificity of explanation of the violation time has become more specific. The fine is incurred after 11:00:59 pm. Therefore, it was previously said that the fine was incurred at 11:01 pm. The time regulation itself has not changed, only how it is explained.
- Hal noted he had never heard of this before.
- Angela noted she also recently understood that it was 11:00:59 pm instead of 10:59 pm.
- Lesley inquired why the cut-off is not 10:59 pm.
- Angela responded that she is not certain but that the cut-off time has never changed.
- Lesley and Hal both noted that they had never heard it explained that way before.
- Angela responded that this would be a good discussion point for a future CLC meeting.
- Lesley noted that she believes it should be 10:59:59 pm because some community members watch the clock to the second. She noted it seemed bizarre that the cut-off was 11:00:59 pm.
- Angela noted that there have been less noise violations over time, and currently, if a plane will land anywhere close to the cut-off time, they land in Hamilton to avoid the potential fine.
- Lesley noted that she doesn’t think the additional 59 seconds is the issue, but is more concerned with the overall noise reduction needed.
- Hal noted that he is more disturbed by the 6:45 am airport opening.
- Mike noted that Pearson Airport opens at 6:30 am.
- Hal noted that noise standards in the City are 7:00 am to 10:00 pm, 11:00 pm around the airport. He explained that there are 3 to 4 flights that regularly take off between 6:45 am and 7:00 am, which were grandfathered in. He noted that those should not have been grandfathered in.
- Max noted that the grandfathering would have occurred in the late 1990s, when there were fewer residents in the area.
- Hal noted that the heading definitions on the presentation charts are confusing and complaint numbers appear low (e.g. for scheduled service).
- Gary noted that previously, there were more complaints due to scheduled services because it was more of a catch-all.
- Wayne noted that any complaint he had filed was always related to the Q400 aircrafts. He has never formally complained about the medivac jets.
- Mike noted that it would make sense to develop definitions for those headings and post them to the website under the complaints section, to give people an idea of where they should file different types of complaints. If people understand what they are complaining about, they may be able to better classify their complaints.
- Mike will create a list of definitions that will be brought to the NMSC for review, and then posted online.
- Lesley noted that some people can’t see the plane making the noise and input the complaint under “general”.

- Mike noted that there is no way to absolutely avoid that situation. Gary added that he investigates each “general” noise complaint to identify whether the complaint can be connected to a specific event or flight, based on the time of occurrence.
- Wayne suggested including a note on the presentation that stated that when a complaint noise source is undetermined, it is placed under general.
- Hal inquired if scheduled service is only considered a Q400 based noise. He suggested this be included in the definition of scheduled service.
- Max inquired if general aviation includes private aviation.
- Mike responded that yes, general aviation includes private aviation.
- Max suggested that “general” be renamed to “unidentified noise”.
- Angela added a further suggestion to rename the category to “unidentified aircraft noise”.
- Hal inquired if Porter Airlines is flying some non Q400s. He mentioned that he had been told that some smaller Porter Airline flights were classified as general aviation flights.
- Mike responded that they are all Q400s as far as he is aware of. He suggested that it is some Fly GTA flights that are considered general aviation flights, not Porter Airline flights.
- Lesley inquired if pilots are reminded that when they move slowly they need to single engine taxi.
- Mike responded that this is standard procedure for Air Canada and Porter but is not possible when there is precipitation. Overall, single engine taxis are a win for everyone, as there is less noise, less greenhouse gas emissions, and less fuel use.
- Max noted that when it is misty or humid it seems noisier.
- Hal inquired if they could discuss the objectives of the two Annual Noise Management Reports. He continued to state that the first Annual Noise Management Report he thoroughly reviewed was in 2017. Hal questioned why the report was not called an Annual Noise Complaint Report. He suggested the NMSC presentation be appended to the existing report. He also inquired what the objective of the annual noise report is. Hal explained that from a community perspective, the report it is not about noise management, because if it were, all the complaint data would be appended to the report, along with the NEF contours and airport run-up maintenance procedures. Hal noted that he would also like to see noise data collected over 24 hours for the busiest and quietest day. He noted that overall, his requests may require 10 pages of data, but this is what would be required to showcase what noise levels are like over the course of a day.
- Mike inquired about what that data would look like.
- Hal responded that he would like to see data reflective of the busiest and quietest airport days including associated flight data and meteorological conditions. He noted that currently, the report seems more political and self-congratulatory rather than a report for the community that is meant to lead to recommendations for corrective actions.
- Angela replied that the report is a summary of noise complaints received annually. The format is likely based on the format that other airports use in their own reports.



- Hal noted that calling this document a noise management report is incorrect, as it is more of a public relations document. He also noted that the document claims that there is a limit on total daily flights, when in fact the limit is based on NEF noise restrictions. He highlighted that the claim in the report is that Billy Bishop Airport is one of the most noise restricted airports in North America is extremely alarming to hear.
- Angela noted that the Billy Bishop Airport is one of the most noise restricted airports in Canada; it is the only airport that operates under NEF contours.
- Hal noted that 25 NEF contours are national standards, so all airports must operate within that restriction. He noted that the NEF contour is not just a land use planning tool but is also reflective of limits based on noise energies.
- Angela noted that these standards are meant to prevent residences from being built near airports, based on anticipated noise disturbances.
- Hal noted that the Billy Bishop Airport is less restricted now than it would have been in 1938, when there were many more flights west. Hal also noted that the water surrounding the airport acts to increase the noise disturbances from the airport in residential neighbourhoods.
- Max suggested that a list of outstanding issues be added to the end of the Noise Report. He noted that the average peak of noise in his neighbourhood was around 84 decibels. Max explained that since Gary Colwell arrived at the airport, the noise complaints have gone down. He would like a mitigation page to be added to the Noise Report to show what mitigative actions the airport has taken to reduce noise complaints. Overall, Max noted that he agrees with Hal that the document should become more of a “working document” highlighting what has been and what needs to be resolved. This would also provide interesting noise reduction case studies.
- Hal noted that decibels should be included in the report, reflecting the busiest day and the quietest day. This would allow readers to see changes year over year.
- Mike suggested the document be retitled to “Noise Summary Report”.
- Hal suggested the document be retitled to a “Noise Complaint Report”.
- Mike noted that in his view, the target audience is the general public. Therefore, there may be an opportunity to adjust the report, given the audience, to provide more wholesome data.
- Max noted that other airports could read the document and learn from Billy Bishop Airport.
- Hal highlighted that when people search the internet for the airport’s Noise Management Report, they are likely to only find the single document, and not the data being presented at this NMSC meeting. He suggested the data being presented at the meeting be attached to the report so it can be easily found.
- Mike recognized that there are shortcomings to the report and Hal’s point that technical data should be appended to the report, along with a more fulsome breakdown of information and more appropriate name to the report.
- Hal noted that those changes would help create a document that is focused on improvements and all parties learning.

- Gary noted that ongoing input from the NMSC is very helpful to help guide the development of the report. He commended the members of the NMSC for being thoughtful and active representatives of their communities. He noted that NMSC meetings are some of the most productive meetings he has been a part of in the last 30 years. Gary reflected that the Noise Report is a growing document that will improve moving forward. He believes the document is an important one that will help build trust between the community and the airport.
- Max and Hal both commended Gary for making a clear effort to quantify noise complaints since joining the PortsToronto team.
- Mike noted that PortsToronto does care about being a responsible neighbour and understands that data is the first step in trying to manage noise issues. He explained that the eventual noise study will provide more data to better understand what mitigative measures should be taken to help reduce noise levels experienced by community members.
- Max inquired if PortsToronto would be able to use DBZ for measurement of noise moving forward. He explained that his main concern is that noise measurement has not been accurate. He suggested DBZ is the most accurate measure of noise.
- Mike noted that the upcoming noise report will use whatever measure the NMSC decides is most appropriate. He stated that as long as everyone is using the same terms and measures, the outcome will be a positive one.

## **Review**

### **Future NMSC Meeting Topics**

- Reviewed list of noise source definitions (developed by PortsToronto).
- Confirm unit of measure for future noise monitoring (suggested DBZ).

### **Future CLC Meeting Topics**

- Curfew Violation Time Frame.

### **Follow-Up Actions**

- Noise Monitoring Study:
  - Measure stationary source noise at monitoring terminals.
  - Measure the noisiest/busiest day of the year as well as the quietest, year over year. Include this DBZ reading in the Annual Noise Report.
  - Measure noise in DBZ (if found to be appropriate by NMSC).
- Annual Noise Report Edits:
  - PortsToronto to create an introductory section to the report with definitions and descriptions including “general aviation”, “scheduled commercial”, “military flights”, “helicopter flights”, “curfew violation”, etc.
  - Consider renaming “Noise Summary Report” or “Noise Complaint Report”.
  - Within the report, flag ongoing issues that need to be resolved as well as highlighting mitigative actions that have been effective at reducing noise.
  - Moving forward, show noise measurements in DBZ.

- Attach the NMSC presentation (with requested edits) to the Annual Noise Report, along with any additional data available.
- Provide documentation:
  - Mike to provide a digital copy of the report to all members of the NMSC (the report can be shared with the wider community). Include a note that the locations suggested in the report are not where PortsToronto believes community members will want noise monitoring terminals located; potential locations will be updated based on community preferences.
  - Mike to provide the wind use charts for the Ground Run-up Enclosure, with a disclaimer included that notes that it is not 100% accurate to correlate the number of complaints to GRE use.
- Presentation Edits:
  - Mike to edit all slides that show year over year comparisons: Add two rows to showcase the increase/decreases as numbers and percentages year over year.
  - Mike to add a disclaimer which notes that it is not 100% accurate to correlate the number of complaints to GRE use.
  - Mike to add rows to the end of each table on slides 8 and 10 to show total complaints per year.
  - Mike to add the number of each type of aircraft movement being added to existing tables.
  - Mike to clarify that when a noise complain has an undetermined source, it is included under a “general” category”.
    - Consider renaming “general” to “unidentified noise” or “unidentified aircraft noise”.
- Common Definitions:
  - Mike to review PortsToronto run-up procedures and identify if the document can be updated to reduce ambiguity around types of run-ups (and any relevant timelines for updating that document).
  - PortsToronto to meet with airlines to better understand, define, and begin to track engine revs as a noise source.
- Noise Complaint form:
  - PortsToronto to develop guidelines on what type of information would be helpful to have from community members when they register a noise complaint.