Noise Mitigation Initiatives-Technical Briefing Feedback-May 30, 31, 2016

Idea 1: New approaches for night-time operations		**Idea 2: New departure procedures for night-time operation**		**Idea 3: Increase downwind arrival speeds**		**Idea 4: Use new technology to reduce the need for low altitude leveling by arriving aircraft**		**Idea 5: Weekend runway alternation**		**Idea 6: Review of preferential runway system**		
Idea 1. What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 1.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 2.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 2.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 3.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 3.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 4.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 4.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 5.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 5.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 6.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 6.** What concerns do you have…why?	Please share any additional feedback or suggestions regarding the community engagement process and next steps.
Nothing.	We are where we are because NAV Canada designed and implemented (Feb 2012) approaches. If it was so wrong and poorly implemented then, what assurances do I have now that this will change. NAV Canada and their ability to be accountable to no one other than the airline industry is why we are where we are. It can't just be NAV Canada. It has to be NAV Canada with oversight.	Nothing.	We are where we are because NAV Canada designed and implemented (Feb 2012) departures. If it was so wrong and poorly implemented then, what assurances do I have now that this will change. NAV Canada and their ability to be accountable to no one other than the airline industry is why we are where we are. It can't just be NAV Canada. It has to be NAV Canada with oversight.	One of the more logical ideas and believe this one was supported by Capt. Inch.	NAV Canada "studying" the noise benefits of increasing speed is to open ended. The study has already been done by Capt. Inch, why study again? Also, there is zero commitment to do anything by just studying other than delay things further than they already have been. I see zero commitment to this idea, and NAV Canada again needs significant oversight.	Not much, the use of current technology was a failure to the people on the ground because of poor implementation. So what assurances would I have that NAV Canada would now study and implement other technology well?	We are where we are because NAV Canada implemented current technology poorly (Feb 2012). If it was so wrong and poorly implemented then, what assurances do I have now that this will change. NAV Canada and their ability to be accountable to no one other than the airline industry is why we are where we are. It can't just be NAV Canada. It has to be NAV Canada with oversight.	Not much.	What assurances do I have that NAV Canada won't situate all traffic on a weekend over a now existing concentrated flight path that wasn't their prior to Feb 2012? Basically this option will just punish one or two concentrated flight paths or more to the point the victims below them. This is not a solution, it's a means to define a concentrated flight path (pre-existing or not). Basically putting a solid stake in the ground versus the mess it is now.	Not much.	Again this is not a solution to the problem. Basically this option will just punish one or two concentrated flight paths or more to the point the victims below them. This is not a solution, it's a means to define a concentrated flight path (pre-existing or not). Basically putting a solid stake in the ground versus the mess it is now.	Still not enough oversight and accountability with NAV Canada. I see little hope for any change at this point, and the game of politics is well under way. Basically NAV Canada which is ultimately working for the airlines will draw this out and just wear down community groups that don't have the means to fight the good fight. This is a well-orchestrated campaign that has and continues to deliver little to no corrective action. My kids will be grown up and moved out before any tangible change comes about. At that time, I will simply sell and move as far away from any airport as possible in Southern Ontario. Currently live 40 km from airport, but that wasn't far enough to escape the wrong doing of NAV Canada, Feb. 2012.

Noise Mitigation Initiatives-Technical Briefing Feedback-May 30, 31, 2016

Idea 1: New approaches for night-time operations		**Idea 2: New departure procedures for night-time operation**		**Idea 3: Increase downwind arrival speeds**		**Idea 4: Use new technology to reduce the need for low altitude leveling by arriving aircraft**		**Idea 5: Weekend runway alternation**		**Idea 6: Review of preferential runway system**		
Idea 1. What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 1.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 2.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 2.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 3.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 3.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 4.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 4.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 5.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 5.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 6.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 6.** What concerns do you have…why?	Please share any additional feedback or suggestions regarding the community engagement process and next steps.
Any relief is good but better to eliminate night flights entirely as has been done in many other locales.	The flights are too low, too concentrated over West Leaside, too frequent and air flaps and brakes are being deployed too often. The aircraft are also banking to steeply...adding to the noise. Air quality and visual obstruction of scenic qaulity are also problems.	Nothing...using only one runway will concentrate flights.	Eliminate night flights.	A good pilot would not deploy flaps.	Speed allowed should be even higher.	Act..don't just study. Better to eliminate parallel landings.	If the aircraft descended gradually from a higher elevation 6000' + there would be no need for thrust.	Democratic.	Implementation and monitoring.	Yes, share the noise.	An excuse for even more undesirable air traffic overall.	We need action...the health of our citizens and planet is suffering.
The concept is a good one and is very doable. Because Nav Canada has very similar RNAV approaches elsewhere in Canada, implementing the approaches should not take a lot of time. It is	New flight paths bring new noise concerns to new areas of the city. To Make these noise paths as quiet as possible is the real key.	Climbing higher before turning enroute is an idea that should be implemented as soon as possible.		When the design and characteristics of the present airspace design were being finalized airline staff asked for the higher speeds now being proposed. If I remember correctly, Nav Canada didn't agree.	None. The aircraft will make less noise.	RNP is the only technology in the next 10-15 years that will really help Toronto and its noise issues. The key to RNP is the certification that comes with the concept. It is the only technology that certifies the aircraft, air crew and approach design to do what it says it can do -	The RNP concept is a real winner. The real issue is the dragging of the feet by those writing the certification rules that go with Canadian airspace.	Provides some relief to some areas where they might be none today	It has been done before and can be done again. Does GTAA have the will?			There are at least 3 community noise groups that feel the present process has cheated them as no concept has been proposed to mitigate daytime arrival noise.

Noise Mitigation Initiatives-Technical Briefing Feedback-May 30, 31, 2016

Idea 1: New approaches for night-time operations		Idea 2: New departure procedures for night-time operation		Idea 3: Increase downwind arrival speeds		Idea 4: Use new technology to reduce the need for low altitude leveling by arriving aircraft		Idea 5: Weekend runway alternation		Idea 6: Review of preferential runway system		
Idea 1. What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 1.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 2.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 2.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 3.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 3.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 4.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 4.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 5.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 5.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 6.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 6.** What concerns do you have…why?	Please share any additional feedback or suggestions regarding the community engagement process and next steps.
important that GTAA and Nav Canada show they are willing to provide some noise relief over the city of Toronto. The biggest challenge is to design them as close to a low noise path as possible which might not have been done elsewhere				Implement the higher speeds ASAP.		low noise and emissions while being a solid environmental benefit.						
I am not too familiar with the RNAV approach during night time.	From the PPT, I don't like it much because one of the RNAV arriving lines is directly over my house in Nobleton.	no comments, but seems promising.	no comments.	sounds plausible on sheet.	does it really reduce noise?	ok	none	sounds good	none	like this idea.	as long as you don't introduce new arrival line over my house in Nobleton	My main concern is this RNAV approach during the night time, from the slides, it seems that one of the grey line is directly over my house in Nobleton (actually a little south of Nobleton downtown), I would like Pearson Airport to stick with the original night time landing path and hope not introducing new night time noise to an area which previously wasn't noise-polluted.

Noise Mitigation Initiatives-Technical Briefing Feedback-May 30, 31, 2016

Idea 1: New approaches for night-time operations		**Idea 2: New departure procedures for night-time operation**		**Idea 3: Increase downwind arrival speeds**		**Idea 4: Use new technology to reduce the need for low altitude leveling by arriving aircraft**		**Idea 5: Weekend runway alternation**		**Idea 6: Review of preferential runway system**		
Idea 1. What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 1.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 2.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 2.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 3.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 3.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 4.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 4.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 5.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 5.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 6.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 6.** What concerns do you have…why?	Please share any additional feedback or suggestions regarding the community engagement process and next steps.
Model seems well thought out	The model is predicated on a certain range or number of flights. Does increased volume over time undermine the model	Targeting the Applewood: ie increasing the altitude before it turns should be a priority	Should we survey pilots to get their perspective of this option?		Could this be applied to all downwind arrival flight paths day and night	Could the government provide initiatives and incentives to manufactures to achieve quieter planes through	New technologies?	Good idea: respite! Sharing the pain!	Could this idea be applied during the week on slow days or hours?	Changing preferential runways seems to be an equitable approval to sharing the pain or noise from aircraft?	Do high income areas have more “about” in the selection of “preferential” runways?	The presentation and presenters were well prepared. It is our hope that day time noise issues will be addressed as well.
Common sensical Serves many communities-not simply a response to a squeaky wheel Within current restrictions and safety parameters it offers some respite	Is this point moot when we are faced with emp technological advances? Are we moving the noise problem to new communities Can we get accurate noise levels recorded with the higher involved and is so, what delta will be considered an improvement to residents? What parameters/criteria will have to be met to deem this a successful shift? Farmland now but not for long!!! Are we chasing our		New communities Do we make changes when no one is complaining in certain area? Can’t be nimby		We need to know that there will be a discernible difference in noise, emission, $$	Pioneer Where the industry is leading	Concentration greater than current		Struggle with this one.. Weighting would have to be involved however, the criteria here could be subject to perception. CAN’T BE!	Long overdue review	Be careful what you wish for!	

Noise Mitigation Initiatives-Technical Briefing Feedback-May 30, 31, 2016

Idea 1: New approaches for night-time operations		**Idea 2: New departure procedures for night-time operation**		**Idea 3: Increase downwind arrival speeds**		**Idea 4: Use new technology to reduce the need for low altitude leveling by arriving aircraft**		**Idea 5: Weekend runway alternation**		**Idea 6: Review of preferential runway system**		
Idea 1. What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 1.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 2.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 2.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 3.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 3.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 4.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 4.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 5.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 5.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 6.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 6.** What concerns do you have…why?	Please share any additional feedback or suggestions regarding the community engagement process and next steps.
	tails?											
The approaches can be situated over less-populated areas	Concentration of flights over one respective line	Permits maintaining straight line further west, and over less populated area	A creep of 1.4 kilometers north neglects affects south Brampton solutions, west of highway 10 through the Peel-Halton border.	Any noise reduction should be considered	No concerns with this	Any noise reduction to be considered, not out brained. Planes are the problem at L0V 3N2		With an L6V 0H5 postal code, we have a disproportionate number of flights, so decision would much improve our quality of life.		We have been encouraging this since the disbanded study into airport expansion, 20 years ago. We appreciate the measurement and weighting procedures. All 10 configurations are very much supported. Option 1or 2 depends upon investigation, but which option would be a serious improvement.	That it's an equitable diversion may not be politically acceptable.	I still feel let down by the committee and by the municipality in Brampton a distraction by our MP would come to the attention of many more complaints. The requirement of a time the fly over and the familiar response of "authorized flight" does not encourage public participation. In L6V 3N2, there has been increasing diversions and turns at or before Mississauga Rd, west of Mississauga Rd. is much less populated, and 407-steels west of Mississauga Rd would be your preferred industrial/commercial paths
	Any type of aircraft noise at night disturbs sleep. Aircraft noise is substantial and will always have a great impact at night.		Aircraft noise at night disturbs sleep. Period.		"Studying this idea" does not mitigate the problem at this time. "May reduce noise".....we don't want	Yes, new technologies are almost always better.		Preferential runways on weekends need to be over industrial areas, not residential.		I don't like this idea at all.	"Sharing night time noise" is a terrible idea. You are impacting even MORE people. Removing night time noise is the	

Noise Mitigation Initiatives-Technical Briefing Feedback-May 30, 31, 2016

Idea 1: New approaches for night-time operations		**Idea 2: New departure procedures for night-time operation**		**Idea 3: Increase downwind arrival speeds**		**Idea 4: Use new technology to reduce the need for low altitude leveling by arriving aircraft**		**Idea 5: Weekend runway alternation**		**Idea 6: Review of preferential runway system**		
Idea 1. What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 1.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 2.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 2.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 3.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 3.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 4.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 4.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 5.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 5.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 6.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 6.** What concerns do you have…why?	Please share any additional feedback or suggestions regarding the community engagement process and next steps.
					"may", we need a more definite answer.						only solution.	
All is SMOKE AND MIRRORS	ALL IS SMOKE AND MIRRORS!	ALL IS SMOKE AND MIRRORS!	ALL IS SMOKE AND MIRRORS!	IF YOU DON'T KNOW ,YOU THINK WE WOULD KNOW	CAUSE ALL THIS IS SMOKE AND MIRRORS	GOOD	SMOKE AND MIRRORS	SMOKE AND MIRRORS	SMOKE AND MIRRORS	GOOD	CAUSE YOU WON'T DO ANYTHING,ANY WAYS	SMOKE AND MIRRORS!
Any improvement would be helpful.	There is no need to increase track miles flown... CDO descent from 6000 ft can occur while the aircraft is on downwind. In addition, aircraft can descend from 5000 ft on downwind from abeam the 7.5 mile minimum final turn. As can be seen by the graphics in the presentation, the tracks are inconsistent to the base turn point. Aircraft are rarely, if ever, told about the shortened segment before	Any improvement would be welcome.	Nav Canada seems to continue to rely only on altitude for turns, rather than geographical area. One aircraft may reach 3600 ft at a point where the turn would take it over rural areas, while a different aircraft at the same altitude may fly over populated areas. This is clearly seen in slide 44. While	Helps to reduce aerodynamic noise due to flap extension.	No concerns, but 220 kts, as is used at most major airports would be better. If jets were kept at higher altitudes, it would allow the occasional slower turboprops to be at lower altitudes if necessary. Reference to maximum procedure design speeds is a red herring, the reduction to	RNP approaches are cool.	Nav Canada has indicated that enroute arrival management is not possible, particularly from the south from Cleveland's airspace. RNP approaches demand this enroute management. For RNP to work, ALL aircraft using the runway must fly the RNP approach. For example, it would not be possible to mix straight-in	Changing runways reduces recurrence.	The only concern would be to ensure that the downwind is 5 miles from the runway in use. Using the downwind for runway 06 L/R when runway 05 is in use does not reduce recurrence for residents living under the downwind for runway 06.	Reducing recurrence is good.	For arrivals, the downwind is 5 miles from the runway in use. Using the downwind for runway 06 L/R when runway 05 is in use does not reduce recurrence for residents living under the downwind for runway 06. For departures, the routing should be geographically base, not altitude-only based.	Very disappointed that it has taken 10 months to get a few minor changes included in the proposals... really the only changes are the speed change to 210 and the proposal to use 5 mile downwinds when single runway operations are in use. The first could have been handled with a NOTAM. The second with vectors at night. Simply managing aircraft, instead of getting into long technical changes would go a long way to improving the situation. Not clearing aircraft below 5000 until past SELAP, MAROD (or equivalent), or having aircraft from the west straight-in to 05 intercept the glideslope at 5000 ft or

Noise Mitigation Initiatives-Technical Briefing Feedback-May 30, 31, 2016

Idea 1: New approaches for night-time operations		Idea 2: New departure procedures for night-time operation		Idea 3: Increase downwind arrival speeds		Idea 4: Use new technology to reduce the need for low altitude leveling by arriving aircraft		Idea 5: Weekend runway alternation		Idea 6: Review of preferential runway system		
Idea 1. What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 1.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 2.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 2.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 3.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 3.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 4.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 4.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 5.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 5.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 6.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 6.** What concerns do you have…why?	Please share any additional feedback or suggestions regarding the community engagement process and next steps.
	leaving cruise altitude, resulting in the use of speedbrakes to make efficient descents.Because some of this speedbrake descent will take place over populated areas, it increases noise. In addition, pilots do not like to use multiple speedbrake applications, for passenger comfort, and tend to overshoot the optimal descent profile when using speedbrakes, resulting in unnecessary flat segments. Providing pilots with proper track and altitude crossing information prior to leaving cruise altitude would result in the quietest approach profile. When single runway operations are used, the		there are some RNAV restrictions for non-GPS aircraft simultaneously departing on close parallel runways, there is no reason why RNAV departures could not be implemented in YYZ during single runway operations. Many airports around the world use a combination of altitude and location for turns. There seems to be significant concentration on technology for arrival proposals, but the only departure proposals seem to include altitude and single magnetic headings after departure. RNAV		190/200/210 kts could be issued with the base turn (as is often the case today), allowing current design to remain.		traffic from the east (YUL, YOW and overseas) to the same runway with traffic from the south carrying out an RNP approach without losing the efficiency that RNP approaches are intended to create. In addition, Nav Canada has already suggested that the mix of turboprop and jet aircraft precludes the possibility of increasing downwind speeds, yet the same turboprop aircraft are not capable of flying RNP approaches, so could not share the same runways. Finally, as has been shown in Phoenix,					higher, especially at night. Always providing enroute information of the use of diagonal tracks to base and turning aircraft over non-noise sensitive areas, east of Georgetown, over Vaughan rail yards, at 403 in Oakville. It is ALWAYS possible to use CDO on the north parallel, and often on the South, especially when the downwinds are of different lengths or in good weather. AND ALWAYS when single runway operations are in use. It simply requires that the controller manage the descent based on actual traffic and distance to fly.

Noise Mitigation Initiatives-Technical Briefing Feedback-May 30, 31, 2016

Idea 1: New approaches for night-time operations		Idea 2: New departure procedures for night-time operation		Idea 3: Increase downwind arrival speeds		Idea 4: Use new technology to reduce the need for low altitude leveling by arriving aircraft		Idea 5: Weekend runway alternation		Idea 6: Review of preferential runway system		
Idea 1. What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 1.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 2.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 2.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 3.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 3.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 4.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 4.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 5.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 5.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 6.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 6.** What concerns do you have…why?	Please share any additional feedback or suggestions regarding the community engagement process and next steps.
	downwind leg should be 5 miles offset from the approach in use, as per ICAO guidelines. Currently, traffic arriving on 05 uses the STAR for runway 06 L/R resulting in a 7.2nm downwind offset and flying over populated areas when a 5 mile downwind would be flown over rural areas. The smooth track profile information presented is misleading. It combines flights with excessive flat segments with flights that are cleared diagonally to the downwind leg on excessively steep descents requiring speedbrakes caused by the fact that these aircraft are told too late about the diagonal		departures could provide routing to almost completely avoid residential areas in some cases... for example, for northbound traffic off runway 23, a turn over the Credit Valley would provide significant reduction in noise for many areas as well as decrease track miles and fuel burn, rather than simply climbing to an arbitrary altitude. Getting to 3600, 5000 or 7000 ft does not magically jump aircraft to those altitudes... they still have to climb there, and if they are over residential areas, they still				Charlotte, Chicago and New York the recurrence that RNP approaches bring has SIGNIFICANT negative noise impacts on the communities over which they fly. The most successful RNP implementation has been in Denver where all approaches are flown completely over rural areas. The graphic for Brisbane is not indicative of the overall noise impact to the areas under the close-in portion of the RNP approach. It is simply not possible to take 5 square miles of red-level noise and turn it into 1 square mile of the same amount					

Noise Mitigation Initiatives-Technical Briefing Feedback-May 30, 31, 2016

Idea 1: New approaches for night-time operations		Idea 2: New departure procedures for night-time operation		Idea 3: Increase downwind arrival speeds		Idea 4: Use new technology to reduce the need for low altitude leveling by arriving aircraft		Idea 5: Weekend runway alternation		Idea 6: Review of preferential runway system		
Idea 1. What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 1.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 2.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 2.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 3.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 3.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 4.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 4.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 5.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 5.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 6.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 6.** What concerns do you have…why?	Please share any additional feedback or suggestions regarding the community engagement process and next steps.
			wake people up. Finally, single-track headings for aircraft going to different outbound directions increases recurrence for communities under those tracks.				of effective noise. While the levels might be close, the total effect on residents under the concentrated flight path, along with recurrence, would have a much higher impact than is depicted.					
	Keeping the a/c tracks over the identified industrial/rural areas on the departure routes for longer (i.e. to higher altitudes) would help significantly to noise.		It parallels the aircrew operating procedures to keep the aircraft clean for as long as possible.			I do not have a full understanding or appreciation of why there is the need for the 'level portion/segment' with the parallel approaches.						Are there any graphs or data to compile the multiple track profiles of the south downwind, both landing east and west? Additionally, it is hard to determine the number of flights that have a 2500' level off (close to a CDA) at around 7nm distance through to the flights that are at 18-20 nm from the airport. I do appreciate being included to attend these meetings. There were a few times during the evenings questions and answers that I felt I could have added my support to procedures that Nav Canada have in place. It is

Noise Mitigation Initiatives-Technical Briefing Feedback-May 30, 31, 2016

Idea 1: New approaches for night-time operations		Idea 2: New departure procedures for night-time operation		Idea 3: Increase downwind arrival speeds		Idea 4: Use new technology to reduce the need for low altitude leveling by arriving aircraft		Idea 5: Weekend runway alternation		Idea 6: Review of preferential runway system		
Idea 1. What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 1.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 2.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 2.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 3.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 3.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 4.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 4.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 5.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 5.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 6.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 6.** What concerns do you have…why?	Please share any additional feedback or suggestions regarding the community engagement process and next steps.
												difficult to determine if my input would be appropriate when there is an obvious atmosphere from some in the guest audience that is hostile to the presentation. I do believe that the time and effort being put into the Noise Mitigation Initiatives will lead to solutions that benefit the aircraft operations and the communities in the GTA.
This Idea does not go far enough. The preamble should be revised to read: "When traffic volumes are lighter there are options to improve descent profiles that could reduce noise impacts." Variability in north/south arrival volumes provides a virtual single	You are not addressing the entire problem. Action on descent profiles and tracks would provide benefits to residents.	This Idea does not address the real problem. Increasing the altitude at which turns are permitted does not provide the answer	The departure procedures should incorporate tracks and turns with the objective of avoiding residential areas whilst at the same time allowing continuous climb to altitude. Where overflight of densely populated areas is unavoidable a random dispersion should be	This is a good idea. The low speed currently specified should never have been implemented in the first place.	There is no need to study this idea. Such low speed is contrary to common international practise. A higher speed should be implemented immediately.	Ultimately this is a good idea, however there will be a long waiting time before procedures are fully implemented. Great care will have to be exercised to ensure that the best advantage is taken of these procedures.	The current objective should be continuous descent at the least below 6000ft. Controllers should be given tactical control of approaches and eliminate any unnecessary early descent. Pilots should be informed of their track miles to touchdown to enable them to plan their descent. With	This is not a good idea.	The first thing to do is to reduce the overall noise by implementing all the other ideas: controller managed descents; continuous descent; higher speeds; and avoidance of residential areas where possible. The same applies to departures: track based departures; and continuous climb. Having achieved all	This is not the best of ideas. It is the current restrictive and overly prescriptive procedures that are the problem	Once all the problems of: low speed; low altitude level flight; lack of continuous descent; no flexibility for controller managed descents; no track based departures; and lack of continuous climb have been addressed then is the time to again assess the use of preferential runways.	The six Ideas you put forward at the meetings in May 2016 are exactly the same as those introduced at the 2015 Roundtable Meetings. They reflect none of the proposals and suggestions that were put forward in 2015 by those who attended the Roundtables. Many of these proposals and suggestions were soundly based on international guidance and advice, and established international practise. This shows a total disregard for your own process and bodes ill for any better reaction to this 2016 round of consultation. There would appear to be too much concentration on

Noise Mitigation Initiatives-Technical Briefing Feedback-May 30, 31, 2016

Idea 1: New approaches for night-time operations		Idea 2: New departure procedures for night-time operation		Idea 3: Increase downwind arrival speeds		Idea 4: Use new technology to reduce the need for low altitude leveling by arriving aircraft		Idea 5: Weekend runway alternation		Idea 6: Review of preferential runway system		
Idea 1. What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 1.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 2.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 2.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 3.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 3.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 4.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 4.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 5.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 5.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 6.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 6.** What concerns do you have…why?	Please share any additional feedback or suggestions regarding the community engagement process and next steps.
runway operation. There is also the opportunity to modify tracks to prevent			employed to avoid multiple aircraft overflying the same location in succession. These procedures could be used at all times, not only at night during lower traffic volume periods when only one runway is in use.				closely spaced parallel runways, at busy times, the downwind legs should be used to provide separation. Early base turns on one side and later turns on the other. There should never be a need for extended flight at the minimum altitude.		these things is the time to look at the need for preferential runways.			study and consultation and not enough on action. Changes to the speed and altitudes specified in the STARs could be made immediately, with beneficial effect, by the issue of appropriate NOTAMs. Fortunately for the residents of the Greater Toronto Area NAV CANADA is now committed to contract an outside party to undertake a review of Toronto Airspace. Whilst this will inevitable promote a longer delay in the full achievement of results beneficial to residents it provides even more reason why action that could easily be taken now should indeed be taken.
Innovative approach to mitigating concentration of flight paths during the night-time.	Approach from the east on the northern side, could no correlate the flight path with the physical land use. Are we introducing over flights to an new area? Approach from the west on the	Employing runway headings keeping aircraft closer to the centre line.	None	Keeping heavier aircraft in a cleaner configuration to reduce noise.	Any negative effects for smaller aircraft?	Technology employed at other locations to maintain a higher altitude and a tighter approach path shows real promise	Are all aircraft at Pearson suitably equipped ? How to integrate the aircraft not equipped into the pattern?	May provide respite.	The southern runway complex currently carries the bulk of day time operations, the addition of weekend operations might not achieve the	Worth a review	Where is the highest concentration of residential properties ? Would altering the preferential runway expose more residents to night-time noise?	

Noise Mitigation Initiatives-Technical Briefing Feedback-May 30, 31, 2016

Idea 1: New approaches for night-time operations		Idea 2: New departure procedures for night-time operation		Idea 3: Increase downwind arrival speeds		Idea 4: Use new technology to reduce the need for low altitude leveling by arriving aircraft		Idea 5: Weekend runway alternation		Idea 6: Review of preferential runway system		
Idea 1. What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 1.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 2.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 2.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 3.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 3.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 4.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 4.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 5.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 5.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 6.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 6.** What concerns do you have…why?	Please share any additional feedback or suggestions regarding the community engagement process and next steps.
	southern side are we introducing noise to new areas?								balance intended.			
Night time operations should be the first priority	My concern is that day time operations will not be addressed. Quite simply, Pearson has over expanded and as a result more residents are impacted by aircraft noise. I moved to Etobicoke in 1983 and never experienced any problems in this area until 1998. I moved in 2002 to Oakville and never experienced problems until after say 2012-2013. Truly this shows the expanding noise area of aircraft operations.	Quite simply the 3,000 ft restriction before an aircraft may turn is too low. This is evident with a flight SCL at about 2300. Its engines strain under heavy loading producing a loud rumbling sound that lasts for a long period of time.	I believe that the 3,000 ft. turning restriction for RNAV should be increased to a much larger value (say 6,000) so date time issues are addressed. Since 2012-2014 NAV Canada and other ANS bodies have been allowed to fly anywhere.	Considering that flap operation at lower speeds is in use, the higher speed could assist in noise mitigation	There are no concerns in this procedure.	I first have difficulty in understanding why parallel operation requires level flights. As long as separation is maintained does it matter how it is achieved? This could be of benefit allowing continuous descent.	I do not believe NAV Canada is correct in requiring level flight profiles to achieve separation.	This is noise shifting and does not address the objective of noise mitigation	This procedure does not address noise abatement - just shifts the problem	This is noise shifting and does not address the objective of noise mitigation	This procedure does not address noise abatement - just shifts the problem	These meetings should be held at local centers like the original roundtables. The attendance was quite poor with NAV Canada and GTA staff outnumbering residents, due to location. There is a lack of transparency by NAV Canada which negates the value of the meeting and develops mistrust. For example, Regional Councilor Elgar asked NAV Canada why are there so many complaints from Oakville. In her reply, Ms. Bishop refers to the northeast section of Oakville being subject to more noise due to changes in separation requirements. She did not address the northwest quadrant which is impacted by new arrival routes(aircraft previously turned before 6th line) that extend to Bronte Road. What is the point of attending meetings when

Noise Mitigation Initiatives-Technical Briefing Feedback-May 30, 31, 2016

Idea 1: New approaches for night-time operations		**Idea 2: New departure procedures for night-time operation**		**Idea 3: Increase downwind arrival speeds**		**Idea 4: Use new technology to reduce the need for low altitude leveling by arriving aircraft**		**Idea 5: Weekend runway alternation**		**Idea 6: Review of preferential runway system**		
Idea 1. What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 1.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 2.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 2.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 3.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 3.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 4.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 4.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 5.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 5.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 6.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 6.** What concerns do you have…why?	Please share any additional feedback or suggestions regarding the community engagement process and next steps.
												there is no real honesty The only solution is a restructuring of NAV Canada to include a community perspective.
It's fine. depending on what and how it is decided		Increasing the target altitude is good if it is reached in the same distance as the present altitude	If you are just moving the target altitude downstream, and it will affect more neighborhoods. The real problem is airlines today are setting their departure thrust levels by the length of the runways at YYZ. In other wards, engine power is set lower because yyz has longer runways to achieve takeoff speed V2. What this means they do not climb as quickly in a shorter distance to mitigate noise. If they would	It's good. It's better for the airlines and noise on the ground. A cleaner trimmed aircraft will use less fuel and less noise.	Since Nav Canada started this crazy merry go round around YYZ flights are longer and use much more fuel	It's OK on paper, but Nav Canada will probably study it to death		It's a good idea as long as it is implemented fairly with no preference to some neighborhoods as is being done today. See below.	Alternating by weekend sounds good but it would be better in lots of several hours. No one will want planes flying over them all weekend or all day. In the summer winds are frequently under 10kts in other wards L/V. This allows aircraft to arrive from 8 directions spread evenly around YYZ, if preferential treatment is not given to certain neighborhoods this might mean 4 hours per day of noise. As you are very well aware	Sharing noise impacts from aircraft operations across more communities should be a consideration at all times, since you have parallel runways in every direction.	If you reinstate the 12:30 to 6:30 curfew that was in effect for more than 20 years, you wouldn't have this issue.	Right now I don't see AC or any other airline stepping to the plate to do their part to try and lessen the noise impact that they cause. They are perfectly fine waiting in left field. If airport fees were based of the noise footprint an aircraft produces and time of use, I think AC and every other airline would quickly come to the table with suggestions how they can achieve more acceptable noise levels for surrounding neighborhoods around YYZ. Either by flying them (thrust level, climb rate and flap usage) or purchasing new aircraft with a noise footprint in mind. For example,Westjet's B737 has some the quietest jets around including their B767. AC on the other hand has recently added some of the nosiest aircraft, specifically their 777-300s, which are much noisier than the 200s. Please see

Noise Mitigation Initiatives-Technical Briefing Feedback-May 30, 31, 2016

Idea 1: New approaches for night-time operations		Idea 2: New departure procedures for night-time operation		Idea 3: Increase downwind arrival speeds		Idea 4: Use new technology to reduce the need for low altitude leveling by arriving aircraft		Idea 5: Weekend runway alternation		Idea 6: Review of preferential runway system		
Idea 1. What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 1.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 2.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 2.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 3.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 3.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 4.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 4.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 5.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 5.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 6.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 6.** What concerns do you have…why?	Please share any additional feedback or suggestions regarding the community engagement process and next steps.
			be setting their thrust levels based on an 7,000 foot runway rather than 10,000 feet, they would reach V2 quicker and they would lift off sooner, using 50% of the runway rather than 75% and acheive 4,000 feet elevation one mile sooner affecting less residence. Also they would reach V3 sooner allowing them to power down (as they are suppose to in any case) creating less noise for everyone. The reason airlines such as AC are using lower thrust levels is because it uses less fuel and less wear on						preferential treatment has always been given to residence in southern and central Etobicoke, because that is the best organized and very affluent lobby group. To compensate, other areas with a less affluent demographic have always had to bare the brunt of the aircraft noise. Could it be that the higher levels of violence in north Etobicoke Jamestown is partly due to the physiological effect of constant aircraft noise over their neighborhoods?			my earlier paragraph about how airlines determine and set take-off thrust prior to departure. Any suggestions that involve taking from Peter to pay to Paul won't really fly if your just going to agitate other neighborhood residence.

Noise Mitigation Initiatives-Technical Briefing Feedback-May 30, 31, 2016

Idea 1: New approaches for night-time operations		Idea 2: New departure procedures for night-time operation		Idea 3: Increase downwind arrival speeds		Idea 4: Use new technology to reduce the need for low altitude leveling by arriving aircraft		Idea 5: Weekend runway alternation		Idea 6: Review of preferential runway system		
Idea 1. What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 1.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 2.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 2.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 3.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 3.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 4.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 4.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 5.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 5.** What concerns do you have…why?	**Idea 6.** What do you like about this idea?	**Idea 6.** What concerns do you have…why?	Please share any additional feedback or suggestions regarding the community engagement process and next steps.
			the engines. Ironically they think nothing of using higher thrust at airports that have much short runways and higher temperatures and humidities. IT's time you have the airlines tell you what they can do to mitigate noise levels if they want to fly-in, instead of you dancing around them. Its the tail wagging the dog situation									