

**Toronto  
Port  
Authority**



**Administration  
Portuaire  
de Toronto**

60 Harbour Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5J 1B7  
Tel/Tél: 416.863.2000 • Fax/Télécopieur: 416.863.4830 • [www.torontoport.com](http://www.torontoport.com)

April 15, 2013

Councillor Shelley Carroll  
Councillor Gord Perks  
City of Toronto  
Toronto City Hall  
100 Queen Street West, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Toronto, ON  
M5H 2N2

Dear Councillors:

Re: Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport Marine Exclusion Zone

I wanted to write to you today regarding comments that each of you separately made regarding the Toronto Port Authority (“TPA”) and its Marine Exclusion Zone (“MEZ”) project.

The comments I refer to in the case of Councillor Carroll are:

*“First we need to address that they lied about the dirt previously. So how do we get facts now. #TOpoli #FairyTaleRunway”*

This comment via the Councillor’s Twitter account on April 10, 2013 was in response to a comment by “Dave”: “Is it too much to ask for a reasoned discussion on @porterairlines expansion plans? I want facts. I see pros and cons to be weighed. #TOPoli”.

The comments I refer to in the case of Councillor Perks were reported by CFRB 1010 on April 9 and 10, 2013<sup>1</sup>:

*“I don’t want to accuse them of (lying) until I hear tomorrow what the jets are for,” Perks says. “If it turns out that they have been planning this all along... nobody, whether they’re an elected official or a community member, takes it kindly when a federal agency lies to your face.”*

We were very disappointed to read that you both suggest that the TPA “lied” or may have lied “to your face” regarding the MEZ project. As the TPA has advised earlier, the

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.newstalk1010.com/News/localnews/blogentry.aspx?BlogEntryID=10528395>

environmental assessment regarding the Marine Exclusion Zone did not arise due to potential changes that may eventually come to Canada's Runway End-Safety Area regulations (RESA)<sup>2</sup>, nor Porter's recent announcement of its new business aspirations.

The MEZ project was launched in May 2012, on the heels of the March 2012 kick-off of the Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport pedestrian tunnel project, which preceded last week's Porter announcement by about a year.

The purpose of the TPA's May 2012 Marine Exclusion Zone sub-surface lakefill project is to bolster the safety and utility of the eastern MEZ by better deterring boat incursions at the east end of the airport. Enhancing safety within the MEZ with a physical deterrent – in addition to the existing series of “Keep Out” buoys – has been an objective of the TPA for several years. The project also presents an opportunity to enhance marine wildlife habitats. Of note, it was unnecessary to undertake a similar project within the airport's western Marine Exclusion Zone due to the existence of a sandbar that serves as a naturally-occurring version of the project being undertaken at the eastern end.

This proposal was designed to further improve the safe use and operation of the BBTCA by improving the MEZ. The TPA thought it wise that if material from the separate tunnel project is suitable and available for use, it will be used, particularly if that would provide even further benefits to the environment and local residents.

While the proposal, under 2012 Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, did not require an Environmental Assessment (“EA”), the TPA wanted to be thorough in examining all aspects this proposal and conducted a full Environmental Assessment last year. The EA considered effects, both in the construction and over time, on the environment, the significance of such effects, public comments, and measures to mitigate adverse effects. A Notice of Commencement of an Environmental Assessment for this proposal was posted on the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency's website on May 16, 2012. The TPA also reached out to local waterfront City Councillors' offices and City administration staff in May last year to preview the project's benefits.

The environmental assessment concluded that any direct or cumulative effects of the project would not result in significant adverse effects on the environment. It did recommend some mitigation measures and monitoring activities to minimize the potential minor, localized and short-term project construction related nuisance effects such as temporary turbidity in the water.

Furthermore, the MEZ project is also an opportunity to reduce the frequency of construction vehicle trips for the benefit of our neighbours. Recognizing that some residents have concerns about the noise and congestion associated with the truck traffic along Eireann Quay that accompanies the construction of the BBTCA pedestrian tunnel.

---

<sup>2</sup> See our Feb. 13, 2013 correspondence with Mayor Ford, Ministers Denis Lebel and Glen Murray et al at [http://www.torontoport.com/getattachment/d9ef7d17-5487-4737-b240-38c970eaccec/Letter-to-Mayor-Rob-Ford-\(1\).aspx](http://www.torontoport.com/getattachment/d9ef7d17-5487-4737-b240-38c970eaccec/Letter-to-Mayor-Rob-Ford-(1).aspx)

The diversion of suitable rock from the pedestrian tunnel project to the MEZ project also provides this collateral benefit.

The TPA remains committed to balancing the needs of the residential community, which has grown up around the airport, with those of our airport users. You'll be interested to know that the BBTCA and TPA were the first airport, Port Authority and/or agency with a link to the federal government to use one hundred per cent green electricity from Bullfrog Power, Canada's green electricity retailer. The BBTCA / TPA also monitors aviation noise sources with latest radar-based technologies, has developed new fish habitats (at a cost of more than \$1 million of non-taxpayer dollars), provides financial support for the World Wildlife Federation's Great Canadian Shoreline Cleanup, and generally works hard in a variety of ways to ensure that the environment is well looked after for future generations.

More broadly, we have undertaken every one of the 2009/2010 Jacobs Consultancy Report's 16 recommendations<sup>3</sup> aimed at mitigating the impact of the BBTCA on the neighbourhood. The TPA remains open to any feasible ideas that would further mitigate the impact of the BBTCA on the neighbourhood and, among other things, has established an Airport Community Liaison Committee with membership from community groups and the local councillors for this purpose

It is worth outlining the results of the independent "noise capture" engineering study undertaken by Jacobs Consultancy in July 2009. The study was done from six different Waterfront locations between May 13 and May 22, 2009. It found, for example, that all of the following elements of life in the City of Toronto generated a decibel reading equal to or greater than a Q400 in either take-off or landing mode at the BBTCA:

- i. the Don Valley Parkway and the excavation of the West Donlands (for neighbours at Queen and River Street);
- ii. noise from the Gardiner Expressway and nearby construction vehicles (for residents at City Place); and
- iii. a motorcycle on Stadium Road (for the condo owner on the balcony of 680 Queen's Quay, unit 702).

We are highly sensitive to the impact of the airport's ambient noise on the broader community. Indeed, we established a Noise Management Office in 2011, modelled on and with specific expertise from Pearson Airport's own successful model. The office implemented internationally regarded radar-based software technology to be able to accurately track and identify most any aviation-related source noise. We note from the 2012 statistics, out of a total of 354 noise complaints received, only 119 (i.e. one third) were related to scheduled commercial operations by Air Canada and Porter, and that our commercial carriers experienced no night curfew violations in 2012.

---

<sup>3</sup> Such as the construction of the BBTCA noise sound barrier and measures to restrict aircraft engine run-ups and idling.

In all cases, we are committed to continuously managing and seeking ways to curb the impacts of aircraft noise, traffic congestion, and environmental effects from the airport's operations. An example of this came on September 3, 2009, when the TPA Board of Directors asked NAV CANADA to improve and expand the designated Noise Sensitive Areas in order to extend such protections over *all* of the Toronto Islands, and not just the eastern portion (as had been the case for many years). This was a TPA initiative and not in response to any request or public complaint. I followed-up on this request via letter to NAV CANADA Board Chair Nick Geer in May 2011 (which is available at [www.torontoport.com](http://www.torontoport.com), along with many other items of executive correspondence). Our view was and remains that all Torontonians should benefit from a more protected Toronto Islands, not just the permanent residents on Algonquin Island, for example. I regret that we have not yet succeeded in getting NAV CANADA, which has jurisdiction for such things, to agree to expand the Noise Sensitive Areas.

Please accept our appreciation for your interest in our activities. I hope this information will ensure that no further accusations are made regarding the intents and purposes of the TPA in its stewardship of its assets, and its desire to be a good neighbour. Do not hesitate to contact us should you have any questions regarding this letter or the details therein.

Respectfully,



Mark McQueen  
Chairman