



**PORTSTORONTO**

**BILLY BISHOP TORONTO CITY AIRPORT**

**NOISE MANAGEMENT SUB-COMMITTEE**

**MEETING #23**

**MEETING MINUTES**

May 28, 2025  
6:30 PM to 8:00  
Zoom  
Toronto, Ontario

Minutes prepared by:



# PORTS TORONTO



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](mailto:AHomewood@portstoronto.com)

OR

**Geoffrey Mosher**  
Meeting Facilitator  
**LURA Consulting**  
Phone: 416-206-2454  
[gmosher@lura.ca](mailto:gmosher@lura.ca)



## Summary of Action Items from Meeting #23

Action Item	Action Item Task	Who is Responsible for Action Item
<b>M#23-A1</b>	LURA/RJ Burnside to locate and forward the appendices section referencing DBZ data and examples.	<b>LURA/ RJ Burnside</b>
<b>M#23-A2</b>	PortsToronto will make the “Report a Complaint” label more prominent on the Airport’s main page, along with a link to WebTrak.	<b>PortsToronto</b>
<b>M#23-A3</b>	PortsToronto will forward an example of an actionable and detailed complaint to the committee members.	<b>PortsToronto</b>

## List of Attendees

Name	Organization (if any)	Attendance
<b>COMMITTEE MEMBERS</b>		
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
<b>PORTS TORONTO REPRESENTATIVES</b>		
Angela Homewood	PortsToronto	Present
Michael MacWilliam	PortsToronto	Present
Noah Meneses	PortsToronto	Present
<b>FACILITATION</b>		
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
<b>GUESTS</b>		
Harvey Watson	RJ Burnside & Associates	Present
Brent Miller	RJ Burnside & Associates	Present

<b>1. Agenda Review</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Action Item Review</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Ground Noise Draft Mitigation Questions or Suggested Mitigations</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. Contact Noise Management Office Form</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5. Business Arising</b>	<b>10</b>

## **Appendices**

Appendix A: Meeting Agenda

## 1. Agenda Review

Geoffrey Mosher (LURA Consulting) welcomed attendees to the 23<sup>rd</sup> Noise Management Subcommittee (NMSC) meeting, held virtually on Zoom. Mr. Mosher noted that minutes from the previous NMSC meeting (Meeting 22) were sent out May 13<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Mosher encouraged members to respond to the email if any changes were needed; the minutes will then be finalized and translated into French the following week.

## 2. Action Item Review

- **M#22-A1:** LURA will update NMSC members on the file name for the draft meeting #21 minutes.
  - This item is closed. The file sent to the committee members was an older version that hadn't been renamed, but its content was the same as the updated version now shared with the group.
- **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.
  - This item is ongoing. There is recognition that the language in the report could be improved for clarity and understanding.
- **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.
  - This item is ongoing. Additional comments will be discussed further in this meeting before being finalized in the report.
- **M#22-A4:** Members will send finalized report comments by May 28.
  - This item is closed. LURA/RJ Burnside/PortsToronto received comments and questions back from City of Toronto representative Jay Paleja, and Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood Association representatives Lesley Monette and Max Moore. The aim of this meeting is to address remaining feedback.
    - York Quay Neighbourhood Association representative, Hal Beck, noted that he has not fully reviewed the report yet, but had skimmed the executive summary and has a list of items to follow up on during this meeting. Mr. Mosher encouraged Mr. Beck (YQNA) to send comments by email for inclusion in the final review.

## 3. Ground Noise Draft Mitigation Questions or Suggested Mitigations

Mr. Mosher opened the floor to the committee members for their input on the Ground Noise Study draft mitigations. The conversation was structured by asking the members for their top three items of concern. Comments from each committee member, as well as corresponding responses, are captured as follows:

- Mr. Paleja (City of Toronto):
  - 1) Noise walls were proposed in the RESA project, but other future proposals are still possible and should be acknowledged in the report.
  - 2) A global scan of best practices at other airports could help identify effective solutions to consider in a future airport master plan.

- 3) The language in the report should be improved to make it more accessible and easier for the public to understand.
- Ms. Monette (BQNA):
    - 1) The report should include a section on operational noise solutions, not just physical ones - such as adjusting aircraft angles or relocating helicopters - - to explore quick, low-cost fixes using existing infrastructure.
      - Ms. Monette (BQNA) emphasized the importance of including operational noise solutions, such as working with pilots to adjust landing techniques and idle procedures, which can significantly reduce noise without major costs. She also mentioned newer noise-reducing technologies used at larger airports, though they may not be compatible with older aircraft operating at the Airport.
      - Max Moore (BQNA) asked if one-engine taxiing is still practiced at the Airport.
      - Harvey Watson (RJ Burnside) confirmed that 95% of planes at the Airport use one-engine taxiing, with the remaining 5%, typically Air Canada aircraft, unable to do so due to mechanical or safety reasons.
      - Mr. Moore (BQNA) added that reducing aircraft congestion on the runway - to avoid multiple planes idling simultaneously - can further reduce cumulative noise and should be considered in operational planning.
      - Michael MacWilliam (PortsToronto) emphasized that while operational solutions are always considered, some changes may not be feasible due to the unpredictable and fast-changing nature of airport operations. He stressed the importance of being realistic and transparent - he won't commit to an operational change unless it can be done consistently, safely, and reliably. He acknowledged the value of exploring non-cost solutions but noted that operational limitations - such as flight delays and real-time changes - can make some strategies impractical.
      - Mr. Paleja (City of Toronto) suggested adding a clear upfront statement in the report to explain that while many operational solutions are considered, limitations like efficiency, safety, space, and logistics may prevent some from being implemented. He referenced earlier mentions of gate usage and emphasized the need for more descriptive context from RJ Burnside to help readers understand why certain solutions may or may not be feasible.
    - 2) Reorganizing Table 6 by highest to lowest noise reduction impact would make it clearer for readers to understand which solutions are most effective.
    - 3) Include estimated costs for each mitigation option - whether it's operational or construction-based - to help evaluate their feasibility and impact.
      - Mr. Beck (YQNA) suggested creating an additional table, reordering it based on impact - per Ms. Monette's (BQNA) suggestion - and

adding a column for estimated costs, with a cost-effectiveness ranking (e.g., cost per unit of impact).

- Mr. Paleja (City of Toronto) suggested including cost information in the executive summary for easier reference and clarity. He also noted that the most impactful findings feel buried mid-report and should be moved to the top of the executive summary.
- Brent Miller (RJ Burnside) explained that while Table 6 uses general cost categories (low, medium, high), detailed cost estimates are provided in Sections 13.1 to 13.19 for scenarios where reliable estimates exist (e.g., barriers and equipment). Procedural changes, such as operational solutions, often don't have cost figures.
- Mr. Watson (RJ Burnside) clarified that precise cost figures were avoided due to variability and uncertainty. They opted for high/medium/low labels to avoid misleading comparisons, given that many estimates come with significant caveats that affect actual costs.
- Mr. Miller (RJ Burnside) added that the difficulty in placing too much emphasis on specific numbers when prioritizing mitigation options, is due to potential changes over time and unforeseen costs. Costs must be prorated by year, and unexpected tariffs or conditions can affect estimates unpredictably. It is difficult to forecast these variables accurately, and while footnotes could be used to indicate uncertainties, the ability to confirm the accuracy of percentage fluctuations remains limited.
- Angela Homewood (PortsToronto) highlighted the ongoing procurement processes the Airport must adhere to. They will consistently send out bids and request quotes or conduct Requests for Proposals for projects. The primary concern is the potential reduction in noise impact to the community, informed by significant investments (e.g., the GRE project, which cost over \$8 million and promised to mitigate community disturbances). Despite the usefulness of broad cost categorizations, these will not be decisive factors in their procurement decisions, as the Airport will still engage in thorough exercises to secure the best quotes for work. The focus remains on understanding and minimizing the noise impact on the community, which is a critical aspect of the study's evaluations. She suggested including estimated costs based on 2024 pricing with a clear footnote in the table, to provide transparency and traceability.
- Mr. Mosher concluded the discussion, summarizing that while cost estimates are important for evaluating the feasibility of noise mitigation options, there is strong consensus that they should be presented as high/medium/low ranges rather than exact figures, due to cost uncertainty and potential misinterpretation over time. The report should prioritize noise reduction impact, with cost shown

as a secondary factor - noted in the executive summary and detailed further in the body with clear qualifiers (e.g., 2024 pricing).

- Mr. Moore (BQNA):

- 1) Main concerns surround using DBA vs. DBZ decibel measurements.
  - Mr. Moore (BQNA) clarified that while this isn't critical for the current report, he hopes DBZ will be prioritized in future regular noise reporting. He then inquired about how DBZ data will be reflected in the report.
  - Mr. Miller confirmed that comparisons between DBA and DBZ are included in Sections 5.2 and 7.33, with examples showing how results would differ using DBZ. He added that all relevant data, including DBZ examples, are in the appendix, and the team will distribute the specific section to the group once located.

**M#23-A1:** LURA/RJ Burnside to locate and forward the appendices section referencing DBZ data and examples.

- Mr. Beck (YQNA):

- 1) Add summary tables to the executive summary - one for the 32 operational scenarios and another for the 19 mitigation measures, with the nine key recommendations highlighted. Additionally, the term "operational scenario" is confusing and should be renamed to "airport noise-generating activity."
  - Mr. Miller responded to the renaming suggestion, noting that the current term was invented flexibly and can be changed. The term was intended to be concise and general enough to encompass a wide range of differing scenarios.
  - Mr. Watson suggested simplifying it further by dropping "airport" and "generating," since both are implied. The group was in agreement over this name change.
- 2) Clarify the definition of background sound levels in the executive summary, including exactly what noise data was excluded when analyzing ground-based noise sources. An explicit statement should be added to the executive summary that the study's background sound level differs from that in NPC-300, and that aircraft idling and taxiing were included as part of the background sound for this report.
- 3) State in the executive summary that only two residential addresses were available for noise data collection, and that the microphone placement (on balconies near reflective surfaces) resulted in approximately 3 dB higher readings due to reverberation, compared to open-window conditions per NPC-300.
  - Mr. Paleja (City of Toronto) added on to Mr. Beck's (YQNA) suggestion, clarifying that the key point is to explain why these measurements can't be directly compared to data from other studies or past reports, due to differences in assumptions, methodology, and context.

- Mr. Beck (YQNA) added that this is the first study at this Airport to use actual noise measurements, and not just modeling. This makes the collected data valuable for future studies. However, if background sound levels appear inflated, it could be misleading.
- Mr. Miller explained that background noise levels were used to set a threshold. If a noise source didn't rise above this level, it was assigned zero points in impact scoring. This helps focus mitigation on distinct, disruptive noises, not constant ambient ones. He acknowledged that reflections from balcony surfaces may have slightly inflated background measurements, but noted this could only account for a maximum overestimation of 3 dB - and likely less in practice. He added that there's no perfect way to place microphones in residential settings without some distortion, but efforts were made to collect data as accurately and consistently as possible.
- Mr. Moore (YQNA) pointed out the complexity and limitations of noise measurement, and that the study's data should be seen as a foundation for a future, more precise noise measurement study.
- Mr. Watson explained that ISO 3746 standards were followed for source measurements, which were then modeled at receptors. As a result, the background inflation didn't affect the key outcomes, namely the top 10 priority noise sources or their corresponding mitigation considerations.
- Mr. Beck (YQNA) raised concern that the constant roar from taxiing and idling aircraft is being inaccurately labeled as "background noise" in the report. He emphasized that this does not align with the intent or standards of NPC-300 and should be clearly stated as such in the report.
- Mr. Miller acknowledged this as a valid criticism, agreeing that the study's definition of background sound does not fully align with NPC-300 standards. He supported including a clarifying statement in the report to explain why full NPC-300 compliance was not feasible in this context.
- Ms. Monette (BQNA) added that the duration of noise is missing from the analysis. She stressed that while the Airport noise might not always be at peak levels, the extended duration (e.g., 10-20 minutes of steady roar) negatively affects quality of life.
- Mr. Paleja (City of Toronto) suggested including a dedicated paragraph outlining what the study does not address, to provide clarity on its limitations and scope.
- Mr. Beck (YQNA) emphasized the importance of expanding the Executive Summary, noting that it will be the most-read section of the report. He recommended making it 4-5 pages longer, including summary tables that clearly present what was studied, key findings, and aspects that do not align with NPC-300.

#### 4. Contact Noise Management Office Form

Mr. Mosher opened the floor to Noah Meneses (PortsToronto) to present the contact noise management office form. The presentation, as well as corresponding comments, are captured as follows:

- The online noise report form used by community members was updated in collaboration with Vortex to improve clarity, plain language, and usability, based on feedback from the NMSC members. Those key changes are noted as follows:
  - 1) Title adjustments:
    - “Problem” = “Activity Type”
    - “Area” = “Location”
  - 2) Terminology updates:
    - “BQNA” = “Bathurst Quay Neighbourhood”
    - “YQNA” = “York Quay Neighbourhood”
    - “GA” = “General Aviation”
    - “Engine Run – Scheduled Service” = “Engine Run” (since “scheduled service” already exists)
    - “General” = “General Disruption”
  - 3) Layout updates:
    - Reorganized fields so that “Problem” (now Activity Type) appears above Aircraft Type and Area (now Location).
- Despite renaming and restructuring, historical data remains intact - past entries will map accurately to the new terminology in future reports.

Mr. Beck (YQNA) inquired about a confusing reference to “nautical miles” in the Location dropdown on the noise report form. Mr. Meneses responded that the five nautical mile radius (about 9.4 km) represents the Airport’s jurisdiction for noise management, but the dropdown option has since been removed due to lack of use and relevance.

Mr. Moore (BQNA) noted that it’s difficult for users to locate the airport noise complaint form online, especially when searching terms like “airport noise complaint” on Google. He suggested updating the website’s meta tags to direct users straight to the form and making the link more prominent on the landing page. Mr. Meneses responded that improvements have been made to simplify the process, and the form is accessible within a few clicks from the main noise management page. Mr. Meneses explained that the bookmark for the complaint page was updated late last year to meet accessibility regulations. He encouraged frequent users to save a direct bookmark to simplify access, but acknowledged that first-time users still need to navigate through the “Community Noise Management” section.

**M#23-A2:** PortsToronto will make the “Report a Complaint” label more prominent on the Airport’s main page, along with a link to the WebTrak.

Mr. Paleja (City of Toronto) asked whether the website changes had already been made live, as when he searched online, he still saw “Contact the Noise Management Office” rather than a clear “Report a Complaint” option. He suggested walking through the site navigation in a future NMSC meeting for clarity. Mr. Paleja (City of Toronto) also raised a broader concern, noting that most complaints come from just three people. To make

the data more meaningful, he emphasized the need for greater participation and accessibility so more individuals can report noise concerns.

Mr. Beck (YQNA) asked Mr. Meneses for an example of what kind of information makes a complaint more actionable. Mr. Meneses responded that an example of a useful complaint would include details such as what occurred, the timing, and anything unusual about the occurrence. He noted that general complaints like “the Airport is too loud” may help locate disturbances, but are harder to act on if no specific regulatory rule break is identifiable. Actionable reports require detail that operators can respond to directly.

**M#23-A3:** Mr. Meneses will forward an example of an actionable and detailed complaint to the committee members.

## **5. Business Arising**

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

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 PM.

## Appendix A: Meeting Agenda

### **Billy Bishop Toronto City Airport Noise Management Sub Committee Meeting 23**

Wednesday May 28th, 2025

6:30 pm to 8:00 pm

Zoom

<https://lura-ca.zoom.us/j/62521570434?pwd=tebgXaiSmjaUqP1j4lgkkUrRgai1S8.1>

### **AGENDA ITEMS**

- 6:30 Welcome
- 6:32 Agenda and Action Item Review
- 6:35 Ground Noise Draft Mitigation Questions or Suggested Mitigations
- 7:40 Contact Noise Management Office Form
- 7:50 Business Arising
- Next Steps and Next Meeting TBD
- 8:00 Adjourn

#### **Action Items**

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