



TORONTO AVIATION NOISE GROUP

KEY ELEMENTS OF OUR INTERACTIONS

WITH

AIRPORT NOISE AUTHORITIES: 2012-2015

INTRODUCTION

For over three years the Toronto Aviation Noise Group has been seeking relief from the excessive aviation noise over our residential communities in midtown Toronto as the result of a route change, implemented by Nav Canada in February, 2012. What follows is a summary of the many misleading, sometimes false and frequently missing information which we have encountered in our interactions with the authorities responsible for the management of aircraft noise.

The many authorities involved seem to have reached an impasse. In our view we are at the point where third party adjudication is needed in order to ensure a fair and balanced examination of the issue and a resolution which considers the importance of citizens in the process of noise management.

Noise: May 31st, 2012

1. * John Crichton, CEO, Nav Canada "But I can tell you as someone who has been in this business all my life, there's less noise as a result of the changes we made than before." (Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities: 040: 1st Session: 41st Parliament. May 31st 2012)

Neil Bennett, Nav Canada acknowledged, in response to a question by S.Rokin, CENAC resident rep., that new communities would be affected by the flightpath change and the people under the new path would consistently have more traffic than before. The path would be narrower and more concentrated." (CENAC Minutes, Feb. 1st, 2012)

T.A.N.G. and the many citizens we represent know from experience that Mr. Bennett's statement is accurate.

2. * N. Bennett stated that "the planes would be descending more quietly so when they are turning there will be less noise." (Ibid.)

From the lived experience of the citizens under the path this statement is patently untrue. The planes screech and whine as brakes and flaps are used to descend the planes to low altitude over our neighbourhoods. The turns are particularly egregious. (Captain David Inch, 2015)

Consultation and Noise: 2012: Briefing Note to City Manager from Nav Canada

3.* Nav Canada claims meetings were held with city councillors.....and overall noise levels would not increase because of planes descending at lower power. (Letter to Toronto City Manager from Nav Canada in response to motion MM26.19, Oct 2,3 2102)

*Both statements are untrue. Meetings were not held in Toronto with **midtown** councillors and MP Carmichael was not informed. The Nav Canada language is misleading by implying that the changes were small. "The southern and western downwind were moved slightly." Nav Canada also stated that flight volumes will remain unchanged. (Nav Canada Briefing Note/PP Presentation Sept 20th 2011)*

From the experience of citizens noise has INCREASED because of the unprecedented concentration, increased flight volumes and the use of aircraft flaps and speed brakes at low altitudes.

A day care operator informed us that she had to bring the children indoors during their outdoor time because they were afraid of the aircraft noise.

Flight Volumes: January, 2013

4.* MP Carolyn Bennett asked if flight volumes had increased as a result of the change. (House of Commons: Question #1042: 01/13)

Nav Canada responded that "flight volumes on the downwind would not have changed with the relocation of the flight path." (Letter to MP Bennett from M. Bishop, Nav Canada, Jan 17th 2013.)

Flight volumes on R24 R/L have INCREASED by 20% or 14,253 flights annually which represents an increase of 6% of ALL Toronto arrivals. (CENAC Statistics) (See Runway Utilization- Chart Attached)

The increased numbers have added to the already high burden of flight FREQUENCY. For large blocks of time the sound of one plane has not ended before the roar of the next arrives.

Consultation: January, 2013

5. MP Bennett asked in the House about the consultation process regarding these changes.

Nav Canada responded that announcements were placed in various newspapers. In all cases these grossly inadequate, small scale advertisements lacked sufficient details and information to fully understand the personal impact of the change. In the case of the local midtown papers, announcements were inappropriately placed in the classified section near the dog walking ads.

In addition Ms. Bishop of Nav Canada wrote "HOWEVER, NONE OF THIS (the consultation) CHANGES THE OVERRIDING FACT THAT NAV CANADA MUST ENSURE FLIGHT PATHS MEET INTERNATIONAL DESIGN STANDARDS AND THE STANDARD REQUIRED THE PREVIOUS FLIGHT PATH TO BE RELOCATED. **CONSULTATION INPUT WOULD NOT HAVE MATERIALLY ALTERED THAT FACT**". (Letter to MP Bennett from M. Bishop of Nav Canada, Jan 17th, 2013)

T.A.N.G. would argue that no one in our neighbourhoods, many kilometres from the airport, could have had any sense of the impact of the changes on our communities. To the best of our knowledge NO ONE was aware of what was proposed. In addition we argue that pre implementation, NO ONE could have imagined the magnitude of the change.

*In any event, as noted above, our input on the matter would **NOT HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED**. In addition Captain Inch reports that the airlines were also not considered despite the fact that industry representatives voiced pre implementation concerns about the unwanted design.*

Noise: May 2013

6.* Nav Canada's Michelle Bishop wrote to MP Carmichael that "there are many communities more affected than Leaside for which mitigations simply are not possible." (Letter to MP Carmichael May 10th, 2013)

This is not true. Considering the distance we are from the airport and the volume of unnecessarily low flying aircraft we endure, there is NO more affected community than us. We have the highest arrivals percentage at 40%. We double any other runway. Next closest is 20%.

In addition we now know that mitigation is possible.

Altitude of STAR: May 2013

7.* "There are no operational reasons why an aircraft would want to be lower than the published approach...Raising the altitude at this point in the approach 5,500ft ASL, as was suggested, would require too steep a descent for safe operations, or alternatively, would require aircraft to extend the downwind leg much further from the airport, before turning back to intercept the glide path. This would have the effect of requiring the aircraft to burn more fuel and fly over many more homes en route" (Ibid)

Captain Inch has provided numerous examples of safe, practised approaches at these altitudes at other international airports.

Nav Canada Responsibility for Noise: August 2013/ January 2015

8. Nav Canada has NO RESPONSIBILITY for aviation noise: (Library of Parliament: Research Publications No. 2013-08-E).

This statement was repeated to Captain Inch by Nav Canada staff at a meeting at Pearson, January 2015

The Toronto Aviation Noise Group believes this to be an essential problem with the oversight structure of Nav Canada and that change is required.

Transport Canada Responsibilities 2013

9. "Transport Canada regulates aviation activities, enforces regulations pertaining to aircraft noise, investigates reports of infractions and issues money penalties in cases of proven infractions."
(Aircraft Noise Management in Canada. No. 2013-08-E)

In 2013 there was ONE noise penalty levied in Canada, in Montreal. In 2014 there were NONE.

10. Noise abatement and controls at Canadian airports may include: "aircraft departure and arrival procedures designed to minimize the noise impact on surrounding communities." (Ibid)

The flight path over midtown Toronto (86,436 low flying planes in 2013) has no such procedures in place. CENAC also has no mandate to effect change because of the inadequate Ground Lease Agreement that limits their role to a number gathering and reporting committee.

11. "Transport Canada has also developed a process by which stakeholders, such as airports and community groups, may request changes to the established noise abatement controls and procedures at airports. Proposals to change established procedures and controls must be made in consultation with stakeholders and NAV Canada and must be approved by the Ministry of Transport." (Ibid)

T.A.N.G. has been trying, unsuccessfully, for over three years to have the flight path under which we live amended. NO CHANGE HAS BEEN MADE. Engagement with the authorities is virtually impossible. However Calgary International Airport has somehow sought and achieved quick resolution of their aviation noise problem only 6 months young!

Use of the Lake: Jan 17th, 2013

12.* "It is also not possible to relocate the downwind leg of the approach south of the city over Lake Ontario." (Letter from Nav Canada to MP Carmichael January 17th, 2013)

We have MANY examples from WebTrak of this flight path in use.

Required Navigation Performance: Various Dates

13. (a) PBN will be implemented at Pearson no sooner than 3-5 years because of the volume of traffic and complexity. (CENAC Feb. 2014)

(b) Nav Canada is working with Jeppesen, Sandersen, Boeing Design Services to plan for RNP. (Nav Canada , Techwatch, Winter, 2015)

(c) "Eventually, maybe in a long time, once we have everyone equipped and the technology deployed appropriately-we hope we will be able to do this everywhere." (Nav Canada CEO Crichton. Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, May 31st 2012.)

RNP or NO RNP? Very mixed messages. The likely midtown route, Captain Inch informs us, is over some of the same communities affected by the current path.

Continuous Descent Approach: 2014

14. * Nav Canada, S. Ghobrial and D. Dolezal, GTAA claim that CDA is used at Pearson. (CENAC Nov. 19th, 2014)

Nav Canada (Kurtis Arnold et al) told Captain Inch that CDA is not possible at Pearson because of the HI/LO rule

Changes to the WTM Corridor

15. R. Jacoby asked about the possibility of amendment to the WTM corridor. GTAA's L. McKee noted that there may be opportunities to make changes where all interests intersect. (Ibid)

No such commitment from Nav Canada

Protocol on Consultation and Communication Jan 2015

16. John Crichton announced that extensive work has been done to develop a draft proposal for consultation and communication of significant airspace changes, focussing especially on potential noise impacts and mitigation measures...will come into effect early 2015. (Nav Canada AGM Jan. 2015)

NO announcement or change

T.A.N.G. Proposals for Change: Jan 2015

17. Extensively documented proposals for change, prepared for us by Captain David Inch, were presented by T.A.N.G. to the Minister. Captain Inch then discussed these proposals with Nav Canada and Transport Canada staff in January, 2015

No response of any kind from Nav Canada or response to Captain Inch's email inquiries. We have received a letter of acknowledgement only from Transport Canada.

Nav Canada Seeking Solutions: Mar 2nd 2015

18. MP Bennett reports in a letter to the Minister that Nav Canada had told her that "they were aggressively reviewing other possible mitigation measures related to aircraft noise over St. Paul's."

NO results to date.

Update from MP Carmichael April 1st 2015

19. MP Carmichael wrote to T.A.N.G. to update us on the issues on which he has been working ie. altitudes, consultation, CENAC

No meaningful change to date on any of these issues

Nav Canada CENAC Briefing April 22nd 2015

20. Nav Canada made their presentation in camera.

T.A.N.G. was not invited even though Captain Inch's proposals were discussed.

T.A.N.G. Presentation at CENAC April 29th, 2015

21. We presented Captain Inch's proposals. In the Q/A M. Evans pointed out that Nav Canada had yet to acknowledge that there is a problem in midtown with aircraft noise.

T.A.N.G. HAD TO INSIST THAT CENAC HEAR OUR PROPOSALS. WE WERE NOT INVITED BY THE COMMITTEE.

Nav Canada remains silent on the matter.

Follow Up to CENAC Presentation May 2015

22. Robyn Connelly of GTAA writes that the meeting was "an important step in improving our lines of communication and shifting the dialogue...towards a dialogue of collaboration around potential solutions." (Email April 30th 2015)

No news of any further steps being taken although we had been told ahead of the meeting that CENAC would have initiatives to present.

Request for Follow Up Meeting May 1st, 2015

23. M. Evans wrote to GTAA V.P. Hillary Marshall requesting a follow up meeting with GTAA staff to cover issues not dealt with at CENAC.

Response from Ms. Marshall ignores the request for a meeting and states that "we will continue to make ourselves available to you and your colleagues as this matter progresses."

What does the above mean? Who is moving the process along? Is T.A.N.G investing valuable time and resources with a committee that selectively chooses our participation and ultimately can't help?

Email sent in Error to T.A.N.G. Member

24. "You are not aware of the changes that are being considered and if implemented would go some way to dealing with some of your issues. Your voice is being heard. Trust me." (Johan van't Hof ,May 6, 2015)

Interesting but unproductive comment. We find it astonishing that our COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE is instead representing Nav Canada and the GTAA. Trust? We don't think so!

Letter from Minister Raitt to MP Bennett: May 7th, 2015

25. This is the standard Ministry letter including how to make a noise complaint and visit CENAC. It DOES include a sentence about "...a proposal. The Minister is going to determine if it is sufficient and whether or not to move forward in the near future."

NO information on whether or not the proposal has anything to do with noise mitigation in midtown Toronto.

City of Toronto and Nav Canada/GTAA May 8th, 2015

26. "Nav Canada spoke briefly about the modelling they are undertaking to find ways to reduce airplane noise given the 2012 changes, including modelling suggestions from the community. We are planning a follow up meeting to get more information on the issues discussed in February." (From City Manager, via Councillor Matlow's office re meeting in Feb 2015 involving TPH, the city manager's office, the GTAA and NAV Canada.)

No follow up action by the city or information from Nav Canada.

* These items refer to misrepresentations related to the specifics of the flight path which is of particular concern to the Toronto Aviation Noise Group.

Toronto Aviation Noise Group

May 20th, 2015