



TORONTO AVIATION NOISE GROUP

RESPONSE TO THE EVENTS OF June 17th, 2015 RE AIRCRAFT NOISE

The Toronto Aviation Noise Group feels compelled to write to you regarding the media announcement by the Minister on Wednesday, June 17th, 2015 and the CENAC meeting on the same day about the new *Airspace Change Communications and Consultation Protocol* and the *Toronto Noise Mitigation Initiatives*.

On Tuesday June 16th, 2015 we were surprised to learn, from the CENAC agenda which was forwarded to us on that day, that both the issue of a new consultation protocol and a process to address relief from the problem created by the 2012 flight path changes, were to be presented at the CENAC meeting on Wednesday June, 17th 2015. We were not aware that these matters had reached that stage of development and had expected that these important announcements would be made by the Minister.

Shortly thereafter, we were alerted to the fact that the Minister, accompanied by MP Carmichael and others, was going to address these issues at a press conference on Wednesday midday.

We tuned in to CPAC to await the announcement and were very pleased to hear what the Minister had to say. At her direction the appropriate authorities had developed a protocol for future prior consultation about flight path changes which is to include “a big place” at the table for citizens. In addition, that evening at CENAC, consideration would begin on mitigation strategies to achieve relief from the “disaster” created **at Pearson** by the 2012 changes. While the government always has the ability to legislate, the Minister said, that has not been necessary in this case.

The chair and vice chair of T.A.N.G. , on behalf of our members, were relieved that our three year effort had produced the hoped-for result. Citizens would be heard and our particularly egregious problem would now be addressed immediately.

Following the media announcement T.A.N.G. representatives travelled out to Pearson for the CENAC meeting at 6:30 that evening.

We heard the two presentations related to our particular issues.

NAV CANADA

Michelle Bishop made the presentation about the Airspace Change Communications and Consultation Protocol. Her power point presentation contained four content slides out of a document of fifteen pages.

She covered none of the technical aspects of the protocol including the limits on Nav Canada's need to consult which NAV Canada has built into the process. The link to the purported Nav Canada presentation at CENAC is in the agenda link at the end of this material, June 17th, **second item** under **Additional Materials**

THE PRESENTATION SHOWN HERE IS NOT THE PRESENTATION GIVEN AT CENAC. THE TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF THIS PROTOCOL WERE EXCLUDED BY MS BISHOP AT CENAC. CONSISTENT WITH PREVIOUS PRESENTATIONS BY NAV CANADA (EG THE REASONS FOR FLIGHT PATH CHANGES ARE CHANGED AS TIME GOES ALONG) THE INFORMATION PROVIDED BY Nav Canada WAS ALTERED BETWEEN THE PRESENTATION AT CENAC AND THE POSTING ON THE WEB. We assume that the exclusion of the information at the meeting was done to avoid any need to deal there with these very important and likely contentious technicalities.

It is of note that only the three members of T.A.N.G. who were at the meeting, in addition to, presumably the Nav Canada staff, had read the protocol before the meeting. We know because we asked for a show of hands. The GTAA staff and political and citizen members had not. Such lack of attention to the content of the agenda confirms our longstanding opinion of the ineffectual nature of this committee.

Several members were absent including our one and only Toronto Councillor appointee who, in his term at CENAC, has never contacted T.A.N.G. and has attended less than 30% of the scheduled meetings. One councillor representative fell asleep and a senior member of Nav Canada's staff gave a good deal of attention to his telephone correspondence.

In addition no copies of the protocol were provided at the meeting. Therefore, with the minimal and misleading information provided by Ms Bishop, discussion of the document in detail was not possible.

Ms Bishop asked that we email her with our inquiries. Given that we have yet to receive responses from our previous email requests dating back to July/September 2014, we have little confidence that this process will be successful. More importantly our questions need to be discussed IN PUBLIC.

This is the **ANTITHESIS of a TRANSPARENT PROCESS** as envisaged by the Minister in her announcement. Obfuscation rules the day at Nav Canada.

GTAA

Robyn Connelly provided the presentation on *Toronto Noise Mitigation Initiatives: Public Participation Plan*. During Ms. Connelly's remarks there was discussion **ONLY OF PROCESS**, one that is to take **A MINIMUM OF A YEAR**. The process proposed appears unnecessarily circuitous and designed to delay, for as long as possible, actually doing anything about our problem.

THERE WAS NO MENTION WHATSOEVER OF THE MITIGATION STRATEGIES REFERENCED BY THE MINISTER IN HER MORNING PRESENTATION. The presentation about the mitigation strategy process at Toronto Pearson is also in the agenda link at the end of this material, June 17th, **third item** under **Additional Materials**.

When staff was asked, *twice*, who was in charge of this process, NO ANSWER was offered. Following a thorough consultative study by Earncliffe last year, CENAC's attempt to earn respect, build trust and be accountable has not been achieved.

In the carefully controlled open part of the agenda there were no favourable comments from the floor on this process. Those who spoke were appalled at the length of the process and the apparent inability of the appropriate authorities, after three years and many well documented proposals having been put forward, to present for timely consideration the best proposals for mitigation of the 2012 created problem.

The plan to begin consultation over the summer months, when resident groups and municipal politicians are on vacation, is inefficient and unsatisfactory. One well organized month of consultation in the Fall with the half dozen affected areas would accomplish what they suggest would require a full year. In addition, many of T.A.N.G.'s proposals don't require any consultation about flight path location. They are aircraft technologies that can be implemented immediately.

After over three years wait we need a TIMELY PROCESS. A year or more does not do it.

OUR CONCLUSIONS RE THE TORONTO PROCESS

This approach to addressing our over three years "disaster" is completely unacceptable, in our view. The new protocol itself speaks of a 45 day comment period.

We are dealing here with a problem that is of long duration and has had many proposed mitigation strategies put forward by T.A.N.G. and we believe others. The planning of a lengthy series of events (workshops, they were called) around the GTAA for at least a year is an outrageous approach to our issues.

A citizen suggested at the meeting that, since CENAC is SUPPOSED to have a mandate to deal with these matters, a better approach would be that CENAC be the public and single locale for a discussion of mitigation strategies for the midtown and west GTHA problems. This suggestion makes very good sense to T.A.N.G. provided that CENAC can assemble the expertise and energy to manage that process.

FINALLY

In general Wednesday June 17th was a noteworthy day!! It began with the high point: a public statement addressing the need for change in the management and mitigation of aircraft noise from a Minister who fully understands the issue and has chosen to deal constructively with it. It ended at the low point of hearing from air industry staff who gave every appearance of having no interest whatsoever in living up to **the letter and spirit of the Minister's message**.

Our collective task is by no means completed. We appeal yet again to the Minister to use the authority of her office to ensure that these processes match her own high expectations for the outcomes of her initiatives. Without her further intervention we do not believe that these outcomes will be achieved.

The Minister's clear directive has been lost in translation.

As we proposed in our last letter to the Minister, T.A.N.G. believes, more strongly than ever, that we may be at the stage where, at the very least, third party oversight of the implementation of these plans is required.

<http://www.torontopearson.com/en/cenacpastagendasandminutes/##>

June 22nd, 2015