



PORTSTORONTO

BILLY BISHOP TORONTO CITY AIRPORT

NOISE MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE

MEETING #22

MEETING MINUTES

March 19, 2025
7:00 PM to 8:00
Zoom
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
Environmental Project Manager
Billy Bishop Airport
PortsToronto
AHomewood@portstoronto.com

OR

Geoffrey Mosher
Meeting Facilitator
LURA Consulting
Phone: 416-206-2454
gmosher@lura.ca



Summary of Action Items from Meeting #22

Action Item	Action Item Task	Who is Responsible for Action Item
M#22-A1	LURA will update NMSC members on the file name for the draft meeting #21 minutes.	LURA
M#22-A2	PortsToronto/RJ Burnside will review the suggestion to look for opportunities to make the report language more accessible to the general public.	PortsToronto/RJ Burnside
M#22-A3	RJ Burnside will add an explanation in the report about community concerns regarding the noise impacts of UPS from gates 10 and 11.	RJ Burnside
M#22-A4	Members will send finalized report comments by May 28.	Noise Management Sub-Committee

List of Attendees

Name	Organization (if any)	Attendance
COMMITTEE MEMBERS		
Hal Beck	York Quay Neighbourhood Association	Present
Max Moore	Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association	Present
Lesley Monette	Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association	Present
Jay Paleja	City of Toronto – Waterfront Secretariat	Present
PORTS TORONTO REPRESENTATIVES		
Angela Homewood	PortsToronto	Present
Michael MacWilliam	PortsToronto	Present
Noah Meneses	PortsToronto	Present
FACILITATION		
Geoffrey Mosher – Lead Facilitator	LURA Consulting	Present
Nico Zucco – Notetaker	LURA Consulting	Present
Marissa Uli - Notetaker	LURA Consulting	Absent
Hasnaa Maher – Notetaker	LURA Consulting	Absent
GUESTS		
Harvey Watson	RJ Burnside & Associates	Present
Brent Miller	RJ Burnside & Associates	Present

1. Agenda Review	4
2. Action Item Review	4
3. Purpose of the Draft Study	6
4. Business Arising	7

Appendices

Appendix A: Meeting Agenda

Appendix B: NMSC Member Email

1. Agenda Review

Geoffrey Mosher (LURA Consulting) welcomed attendees to the 22nd Noise Management Subcommittee (NMSC) meeting, held virtually on Zoom. Mr. Mosher noted that minutes from the previous NMSC meeting (meeting 21) were sent out in mid-February. Mr. Mosher encouraged members to respond to the email if any changes were needed; the minutes will then be finalized.

YQNA representative Hal Beck inquired about the file name of meeting 21 draft minutes, which had the word “updated” in the file name. Mr. Mosher responded that he would confirm the correct version of the minutes sent out.

M#22-A1: LURA will update NMSC members on the file name for the draft meeting #21 minutes.

2. Action Item Review

M#21-A1: RJ Burnside will consider renaming the second column on the Mitigation Case Ranking Table from “Description” to “Noise Mitigation Recommendations.”

- MR. Beck (YQNA) expressed the need to differentiate between the terms "options" and "recommendations" within the table.
 - Harvey Watson (RJ Burnside) stated that their team has renamed the column from “recommendations” to “options”. It was highlighted that the word "recommendation" could not be used because some options are mutually exclusive, so they cannot all be recommended.
 - Mr. Watson also noted that the RJ Burnside team has simplified the resolution process to ensure the accurate representation of the noise mitigation options discussed.
- BQNA representative Max Moore questioned the breadth of the study's title and proposed a change to "Noise Mitigation Study" to encapsulate the focus on noise mitigation better.
 - PortsToronto representative Angela Homewood clarified that the study title had been discussed a number of times at previous NMSC meetings. It was agreed and deemed appropriate to call this study the "Ground Noise Mitigation Study at Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport", as it encompasses the noise monitoring, analysis, and research conducted.

M#21-A2: Mr. Moore (BQNA) will send RJ Burnside and Associates some examples of sound absorptive materials to be considered for Mitigation Case #6 in the Mitigation Case Ranking Table. (See Appendix B for the email)

- Mr. Watson conveyed that the effectiveness of the materials shared is limited due to the small and sub-optimally located surfaces of the buildings in question, suggesting that any improvements from using absorptive materials would be minimal and cost-ineffective unless the materials are provided free of charge.
 - Mr. Moore (BQNA) expressed a degree of disappointment but an understanding of the reasoning behind the decision.

- Brent Miller (RJ Burnside) reaffirmed these findings, noting that even with an ideal absorptive surface, the expected improvements in noise mitigation are minimal according to their tests. The consensus highlights the impracticality of using absorptive materials for substantial noise reduction in this context, given the constraints of surface area, location, and cost.

M#21-A4: RJ Burnside will provide details regarding the assumptions built into the calculation of each mitigation case score improvement.

- Mr. Watson explained that RJ Burnside provided details on the assumptions built into the mitigation case score improvement calculation in Section 11 of the report. He noted that every mitigation case is listed, along with what was done to the model to investigate it and come up with the ultimate results.
 - Mr. Mosher reminded the group that they can refer to the report and contact RJ Burnside for any missing or unclear information.
- City of Toronto representative Jay Paleja pointed out that the report's technical language could be challenging for the general public to understand, suggesting that more accessible language be used.

M#22-A2: PortsToronto/RJ Burnside will review the suggestion to look for opportunities to make the report language more accessible to the general public.

M#21-A3: RJ Burnside will inquire about modeling Ms. Monette's (BQNA) suggestion regarding relocating the run-up area, **and**

M#21-A5: PortsToronto will provide details confirming if some potential mitigations are regulatory or operational decisions.

- Ms. Monette clarified that the action item was related to the inconsistency in aircraft positioning during run-ups, noting that angled approaches towards the runway increase noise and fume exposure on land, especially near gates 10 and 11. A suggestion to close down the two gates was made.
 - Michael MacWilliam (PortsToronto) explained that executing a straight pushback without turning would require significant power to transition forward, potentially exacerbating noise issues, while a controlled angle allows for a smoother transition with less impact. Mr. MacWilliam noted operational challenges in implementing this change, including the need for more power for sharp turns, terminal space, and traffic constraints. He also explained that operational issues arise with the suggestion of closing the two gates, making this option unfeasible and therefore not possible.
- Mr. Moore (BQNA) suggested including that these gates are significant areas of concern for the community in the report appendices, and to review current procedures for potential improvements.
 - Mr. Watson clarified that gates 10 and 11 are not the highest-ranking noise areas identified in the study. He agreed to identify the gates as a resident concern in the report appendices after noting that the study team does not have a solid estimate of how much more energy and time it

would take to reposition the aircrafts, therefore making the assessment of this option challenging.

- Mr. Mosher confirmed that plans already exist to document committee member concerns and in the report. Additionally, there will be a section in the main report that discusses comments that were made during the draft review, which will include this discussion.
- Mr. Paleja (City of Toronto) suggested that a distinction be added between impacts from the east, west, and south gates in the report, as they are not the same operationally and in the ways the community experiences them.
 - Mr. Miller suggested adding a paragraph to the report stating that 90-95% of the impact comes from the eastern gates, which would keep it simple and avoid the optional analysis.

M#22-A3: RJ Burnside will add an explanation in the report about community concerns regarding the noise impacts of UPS from gates 10 and 11.

3. Purpose of the Draft Study

Ms. Homewood reminded the subcommittee that the meeting intends to seek feedback on the draft study before finalizing, aiming to incorporate committee comments by mid-March to avoid overlap with the Environmental Assessment (EA) draft release and subsequent public comment periods. Ms. Homewood then asked where the committee members were currently in their review and if another meeting would be required for any outstanding questions.

- Ms. Monette (BQNA) asked if there have been any changes in the report since it was received.
 - Mr. Watson confirmed that the report is the same except for additional points that will be added from this meeting.
 - Mr. Moore (BQNA) shared that he had reviewed the report and that it looks great, other than the outstanding debatable point from this meeting.
- Mr. Mosher suggested a deadline of April 16th with a meeting for April 30th.
 - Mr. Beck asked if there would be a problem with a June deadline.
 - Ms. Homewood responded that the EA Draft will be released for comment at that point and that an overlap would be undesirable. She also outlined the standard 30-day public comment period for EAs and the need to translate the report, expressing a desire to complete feedback before a typical summer release, aiming to receive public feedback by May/June.
- Mr. Beck (YQNA) asked for clarification regarding what the EA will discuss in their report.
 - Ms. Homewood confirmed that the EA report will address air quality, noise, and socioeconomic factors, with some overlap from this noise study, which will be beneficial for comprehensive feedback.
- A tentative date for finalizing comments and meeting was set for May 16th, with an initial feedback deadline of May 28th.

M#22-A4: NMSC members will send finalized report comments by May 28.

4. Business Arising

Mr. Mosher encouraged the committee members to send suggestions or further questions by email and thanked everyone for their efforts and collaboration.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00 PM.

Appendix A **Meeting Agenda**

Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport Noise Management Sub Committee Meeting 22

Wednesday February 19, 2025

7:00 pm to 8:00 pm

Zoom

<https://lura-ca.zoom.us/j/65406765881?pwd=eRVFhnotTjRznat7NivZLZH8v6PSZN.1>

AGENDA ITEMS

- 7:00 Welcome
- 7:02 Agenda and Action Item Review
- Noise Absorber/Hangar Question
- 7:07 Scope and Purpose of the Draft Ground Noise Study
- 7:12 Ground Noise Draft Mitigation Questions or Suggested Mitigations
- 6:50 Business Arising
- Next Steps and Next Meeting TBD, 6:30-8:00 PM (Virtual - Zoom)
- 8:00 Adjourn

Action Items

M#21-A1	RJ Burnside will consider renaming the second column on the Mitigation Case Ranking Table from “Description” to “Noise Mitigation Recommendations”.	RJ Burnside	Complete
M#21-A2	Mr. Moore (BQNA) will send RJ Burnside and Associates some examples of sound absorptive materials to be considered for Mitigation Case #6 in the Mitigation Case Ranking Table.	Max Moore (BQNA)	Complete
M#21-A3	RJ Burnside will inquire about modeling Ms. Monette’s (BQNA) suggestion regarding relocating the run-up area.	RJ Burnside	Pending
M#21-A4	RJ Burnside will provide details regarding the assumptions built into the calculation of each mitigation case score improvement.	RJ Burnside	Complete
M#21-A5	PortsToronto will provide details confirming if some potential mitigations are regulatory or operational decisions.	PortsToronto	Pending

Appendix B

NMSC Member Email



RE Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport Noise Management Subcommittee Meeting #22.msg
