City of Richmond **Minutes**

General Purposes Committee

Date: Monday, June 7, 2010

Place: Anderson Room
Richmond City Hall

Present: Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie, Chair
Councillor Linda Barnes
Councillor Derek Dang
Councillor Evelina Halsey-Brandt
Councillor Greg Halsey-Brandt
Councillor Sue Halsey-Brandt
Councillor Ken Johnston
Councillor Bill McNulty
Councillor Harold Steves

Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:39 p.m.

MINUTES

It was moved and seconded
That the minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee held on Monday, May 17, 2010, be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

DELEGATION

1. Belinda Boyd, Chair of the Richmond Caring Place Society, acknowledged her fellow board members and staff members sitting in the audience. She spoke of the Caring Place's history and highlighted that the City played a key role in its development in 1994.

   Ms. Boyd advised that fourteen agencies currently utilize the building, and the Caring Place Society Board hopes to expand the facility at the south end. She distributed additional letters of support and conceptual plans for the proposed additional building (copy on file, City Clerk's Office).

She spoke of the proposed building's business and capital campaign plans. Ms. Boyd then requested that the City support the Board's next phase.

In reply to queries from Committee, Ms. Boyd provided the following information:

- the City's support of 25% of the total $18 million (approximately $4.5 million) would hopefully result in a matching donation from a major donor;
- currently, tenant rents include building maintenance and ongoing capital costs but not building replacement costs;
- the proposed building would add 75,000 square feet and this space could be utilized well into the community's future needs;
- the additional proposed space would allow the facility to house new tenants and allow current tenants to expand; and
- it is key that the services provided by the tenants remain in the City Centre, approximate to other services and facilities, and public transit.

Discussion ensued and Committee suggested that (i) the Board consider a taller building that could accommodate seniors affordable housing on top of the proposed new facility; and (ii) private-public partnerships be considered. Also, Committee questioned whether social service agencies, such as those occupying the Caring Place, are viable entering the proposed project given all the funding cuts by the Province.

In response to comments made by Committee, Ms. Boyd advised that housing could potentially be integrated in the proposed project, however the Board was cognizant of zoning limitations when developing the concept for the new building.

As a result of the discussion, the following **referral** was introduced:

It was moved and seconded
That the Caring Place Expansion Project be referred to staff to investigate and bring back in Fall 2010.

The question on the **referral** motion was not called as Committee questioned how the proposed project fits in with other City priorities.

The question on the **referral** motion was then called and it was **CARRIED**.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

2. FINAL REPORT OF THE RICHMOND AIRPORT NOISE CITIZENS ADVISORY TASK FORCE – REPORT BACK ON REFERRAL

(File Ref. No.: 01-0100-20-RANC1-01/2010) (REDMS No. 2880934)

Victor Wei, Director, Transportation, provided background information and summarized staff's proposed recommendations.

In response to queries from Committee, Mr. Wei advised the following:

- the Vancouver Airport Authority's (VAA) proposed run-up centre is not a committed project and it is anticipated that it be included in their 2010 capital program;
- airplane noise is measured during landing, take off, and taxiing; whether or not an airplane is Chapter 3 or Chapter 4 depends on the accumulated sum of dbA at all three sources;
- the majority of VAA's night flights are cargo related operations;
- staff are confident that the VAA, NAV CANADA, and Transport Canada will continue to work with the City; and
- Toronto's Lester B. Pearson International Airport has an Aviation Enforcement Specialist who conducts approximately 400 investigations a year in relation to potential night time violations.

In response to a query from Committee, Howard Jampolsky, Chair of the Richmond Airport Noise Citizens Advisory Task Force, was of the opinion that approximately three years would be needed to completely phase out night-time movements of Chapter 3 aircraft. However, he noted that should this occur, many night carriers could potentially take their operations elsewhere.

Mr. Jampolsky commented on issues not addressed by the Task Force such as float planes and stated that he would like to see the Task Force's non-controversial recommendations be endorsed.

Doug Louth, east Richmond resident, distributed material regarding night operations (attached to and forming part of these minutes as Schedule 1).

Mr. Louth reviewed his material and was of the opinion that the staff report presented a status quo view. He drew Committee's attention to his recommendation on page 8 of his submission. He stated that change needs to occur at the highest level of government and thus, urged Committee to endorse his recommendation on page 9 of his submission.

The staff recommendation as presented was moved and seconded.

(1) That the final report of the Richmond Airport Noise Citizens Advisory Task Force, as presented in Attachment 1 of the attached report dated June 3, 2010, be endorsed with the following amendments:

(a) That Recommendation 10 of the final report of the Richmond Airport Noise Citizens Advisory Task Force (Attachment 1) be revised as described in Option 3 of Section 1.3.3 of the attached report such that the Vancouver Airport Authority (VAA) may continue to grant exemptions for night-time arrivals and departures in order to avoid providing a competitive advantage to other international airports on the west coast of North America, but subject to a defined transition period to allow for the eventual phasing out of night-time movements of Chapter 3 aircraft;

(b) That Recommendation 21 of the Task Force report be deferred at this time and the role of the City's representatives to the YVR Aeronautical Noise Management Committee (ANMC) be strengthened as described in Option 1 of Section 2 of the attached report such that:

(i) for the Advisory Committee on the Environment to establish the reporting to General Purposes Committee of the City's representatives to the YVR ANMC at least twice per year;

(ii) VAA be requested to modify the YVR ANMC meeting procedures and regularly report back to the YVR ANMC regarding how the deliberations of the Committee are considered by the VAA Board and/or senior VAA management as described in Sections 2.3.3 and 2.3.4 of Attachment 1;

(iii) the Task Force be retained through to Fall 2010 to allow for the opportunity to provide comment on discussions of the Task Force report with the relevant federal agencies as per Recommendation 2 below;

(2) That the final report of the Task Force, as amended per Recommendation 1 above, be endorsed for purposes of further consultation and forwarded to the relevant federal agencies including VAA, Transport Canada and NAV CANADA with a request to meet to discuss its implementation or the development of mutually acceptable alternative solutions that meet the intended objectives of each of the report recommendations;

(3) That Council reiterate its request to the VAA to incorporate the comments previously submitted by the City on the YVR 2009-2013 Noise Management Plan, along with the above Task Force recommendations, as amended, or alternatives to achieve their intended objectives, into its aeronautical noise management action plan to be developed later this year; and

(4) Per Recommendation 2, that the relevant federal agencies be requested to provide formal responses by September 30, 2010 as to how each of the Task Force recommendations, as amended, was or will be addressed and that staff be directed to report back in Fall 2010 on the status of the implementation of the recommendations of the Task Force.

The question on the motion was not called as discussion ensued regarding night time operations and Committee agreed to strike Part 1(a) from the motion.

Further Discussion took place on the future of the Richmond Airport Noise Citizens Advisory Task Force. Committee agreed to strike the words "through to Fall 2010" and add "that staff review, with the City's representatives, the effectiveness of the recommendations after one year" to Part 1(a)(iii).

Committee commented on costs associated with retaining the Task Force and Mr. Wei advised that he could work with the Finance division to locate funds as it is a small amount.

Committee spoke of the Aviation Enforcement Specialist at Toronto's Lester B. Pearson International Airport, and as a result agreed to add "That YVR be recommended to put a person in place to investigate and enforce noise complaints" as Part 1(b).

Committee agreed to add "with a copy to the City's representative to YVR Board and the BC Aviation Council" to the end of Part 2.

Discussion ensued regarding the federal government's role in regulating how airport agencies liaise with the public. Committee discussed Mr. Louth's suggested recommendation on this matter as indicated on page 9 of his submission (Schedule 1). As a result of this discussion, Committee agreed to add the following as Part 5 to the motion:

"That the Government of Canada be requested to prepare new legislation and/regulations governing NAV CANADA, Transport Canada, and YVR to require these agencies to be more open and transparent to the public. Public and annual meetings shall be regularly held by these organizations and convened during hours when the public could be expected to be able to attend (as in the evening). Questions from the public and other governments, and agencies and groups shall be answered in writing if requested, and that a copy of the correspondence to the Government of Canada be sent to the local MPs."

The motion, as amended reads as follows,

"(1) That the final report of the Richmond Airport Noise Citizens Advisory Task Force, as presented in Attachment 1 of the attached report dated June 3, 2010, be endorsed with the following amendments:

(5) That the Government of Canada be requested to prepare new legislation and/regulations governing NAV CANADA, Transport Canada, and YVR to require these agencies to be more open and transparent to the public. Public and annual meetings shall be regularly held by these organizations and convened during hours when the public could be expected to be able to attend (as in the evening). Questions from the public and other governments, and agencies and groups shall be answered in writing if requested, and that a copy of the correspondence to the Government of Canada be sent to the local MPs."

The question on Part 1(a) of the motion was then called and it was **CARRIED** with Cllrs. S. Halsey-Brandt, McNulty, and Steves opposed.

The question on the remainder of the motion was then called and it was **CARRIED**.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved and seconded
That the meeting adjourn (6: 36 p.m.).

CARRIED

Certified a true and correct copy of the Minutes of the meeting of the General Purposes Committee of the Council of the City of Richmond held on Monday, June 7, 2010.

Mayor Malcolm D. Brodie
Chair

Hanieh Floujeh
Acting Executive Assistant
City Clerk's Office

(a) That Recommendation 21 of the Task Force report be deferred at this time and the role of the City's representatives to the YVR Aeronautical Noise Management Committee (ANMC) be strengthened as described in Option 1 of Section 2 of the attached report such that:

(i) for the Advisory Committee on the Environment to establish the reporting to General Purposes Committee of the City's representatives to the YVR ANMC at least twice per year;

(ii) VAA be requested to modify the YVR ANMC meeting procedures and regularly report back to the YVR ANMC regarding how the deliberations of the Committee are considered by the VAA Board and/or senior VAA management as described in Sections 2.3.3 and 2.3.4 of Attachment 1;

(iii) the Task Force be retained to allow for the opportunity to provide comment on discussions of the Task Force report with the relevant federal agencies as per Recommendation 2 below and that staff review, with the City's representatives, the effectiveness of the recommendations after one year;

(b) That YVR be recommended to put a person in place to investigate and enforce noise complaints;

(2) That the final report of the Task Force, as amended per Recommendation 1 above, be endorsed for purposes of further consultation and forwarded to the relevant federal agencies including VAA, Transport Canada and NAV CANADA with a request to meet to discuss its implementation or the development of mutually acceptable alternative solutions that meet the intended objectives of each of the report recommendations, with a copy to the City's representative to YVR Board and the BC Aviation Council;

(3) That Council reiterate its request to the VAA to incorporate the comments previously submitted by the City on the YVR 2009-2013 Noise Management Plan, along with the above Task Force recommendations, as amended, or alternatives to achieve their intended objectives, into its aeronautical noise management action plan to be developed later this year;

(4) Per Recommendation 2, that the relevant federal agencies be requested to provide formal responses by September 30, 2010 as to how each of the Task Force recommendations, as amended, was or will be addressed and that staff be directed to report back in Fall 2010 on the status of the implementation of the recommendations of the Task Force; and

Schedule 1 to the Minutes of the General Purposes Committee meeting held on Monday, June 7, 2010.

H: 604-2701400

FROM THE DESK OF
DOUG LOUTH

C: 604 992-1278

June 4, 2010

Bill McNulty, Harold Steves, Linda Barnes, Derek Dang, Malcolm Brodie, Sue Halsey-Brandt, Ken Johnston, Greg Halsey-Brandt and Evelina Halsey-Brandt

Richmond Airport Noise Citizens Advisory Task force

I would like to provide committee members with a synopsis of the issues regarding night flights at YVR, which may help in your deliberation, when the staff reports back to the GPC on June 7, 2010. They are not in any order of priority.

1. In 2001, YVR Noise Management Annual Report - Page 6 - A noise surcharge and budget was initiated in 2000 and put on **delay** in 2002, I'm not sure what they mean on page 8 initiative # 17 & 20 **Noise Surcharges and Noise Budget** of their report concerning the noise surcharge and budget study. This may be brought forward by staff, but if they neglect to bring the issue before the GPC, council should ask staff if they are aware of the 2001 **YVR Noise Management Committee Report**. The committee planned for a study on a noise and budget surcharge to encourage airlines to use quieter aircraft, but somehow it got delayed in 2002. It looks like it disappeared into the stratosphere. Was it the committee or YVR executives that lit the fuse to send it into orbit, and why? See Boeing web site updates. http://www.boeing.com/commercial/noise/updates2009.html

2.More residents complained about sleep disruption after midnight to the Richmond Airport Noise Citizens Advisory Task Force Committee then any other issue, but the task force chose to ignore the citizens for a complete ban, because they didn't want to **lose credibility.** City of Richmond - **Urban System Report 2004** - claims that 69.5% of the residents living in East Richmond are concerned about sleep disruption caused by the airport. **YVR Noise Management Information** session held in East Richmond in September 2004 reported 84% of the residents who showed up to the open house complained about night time operation and sleep disturbance. **YVR Noise Management Committee** held a public meeting on their own turf in July 2006. It was a feisty meeting to say the least. YVR noise management employees were on the defensive on the way they run their night operation. At least 200 people, if not more turned out from the lower mainland. Most of the complaints brought forward by the residents were about **noise, sleep disruption and the inability of YVR to respond to our complaints.** To this date we have heard zilch from them on the number of attendees and breakdown of the comments. All the above reports and comments from the residents were ignored by the committee. Why?

3. New certified chapter 4 aircraft are much quieter according to a couple of members of the committee, but provide no prove to their noise level. The airline industry and its

association are reporting they are **only one-third quieter** then chapter 3. At 3:00am it doesn't matter how quiet they are, when you are sleeping and they depart over you house, especially in older established neighbourhoods. The windows rattle, the house shakes and in the summer time with the windows open, it is impossible not to be woken up. Some members of the committee believe and have convinced others there are no chapter 4 aircraft flying at this time. Not true. Even their consultant has told them differently. He was ignored. I'm sure staff knows why, but will they commit themselves, or will they just shrug it off by telling you they don't know. In my submission to the GPC in November, I provided information on chapter 3 and chapter 4 concerning noise and aircrafts such as (A380 and B 737-600 chapter 4) presently flying today.

4. **In YVR 2001 Noise Management Annual Report** - page 13 they write about modification from chapter 2 to chapter 3 aircraft. Simply put, it was more economically viable for the operators to convert their chapter 2 to chapter 3 rather then buy new chapter 3 aircraft. **Profit for them and sleep disturbance for the residents in Richmond.** In the report, YVR writes, "It doesn't necessarily make the aircraft from chapter 2 to chapter 3 quieter." According to the report, this is a major dilemma for airport operator, but YVR still allows them to fly after midnight. Again, **Profit is the motive for YVR.** ***So the question we must ask ourselves, if the airlines industries decides to re certify all chapter 3 aircraft in their fleet to chapter 4, this would mean not only the older re certify aircraft would be flying after midnight, but also the new generation aircraft. I was under the impression the task force was only recommending the new generation aircraft like Boeing 767 or Airbus 380 be allowed to fly after midnight.*** As I mentioned earlier it was still a major headache for YVR, because it didn't make them quieter after the airline industry converted chapter 2 to chapter 3 aircraft to save money. So, should we believe a few members of the committee who are not experts, or the airlines, YVR, and the airline association that chapter 4 aircraft are quieter, I don't think so. The committee has got the cart before the horse. Let the airlines and the manufacturing industries prove to us they are **much quieter** and we will certainly have a look into allowing them to fly after midnight. We are reasonable people, which is more then I can say about YVR and the industries. They never notify us of their intend to operate during our sleeping hours.

5. In 2002 YVR provided the manager of policy planning with the following data, who then prepared a report to city council in March 2003. In his report he confirms YVR had 257,850 arrivals and departures. From 10pm to 7am there was 31,970 flights per calendar year or 87 flights during those hours per day or 10 flights per hour. YVR is predicting 459,900 flights by 2015 and 50% will be overland. Approximately 61,225 flights will be between 10pm and 7am in a calendar year or 167 flights during those hours per day or 18 flights per hour. This will be a 93% increase in night movements from 2002. We need to be concerned about the open sky policy our government is negotiating with other countries. Air China has announced three more direct flights after midnight to Beijing starting in June 2010. If YVR approves this departure, what stops other airlines from doing the same thing. All in the name of profit. Absolutely no concerns for residents who live under the flight path.

6. Complaining to YVR is useless. Over the years residents have complained time after time and in the end we were all ignored. They didn't want to hear our complaints and instituted a system to exasperate the residents when they called in. In 2008 they tried to implement a procedure for residents to appear before the noise committee. This was just another stalling tactic, because they knew no one would even bother to put themselves through such a process. It was a complete joke. They don't take our complaints seriously.

7. Its important to remember that YVR executives work in their own little world and in sound proof environment during the day and go home to get a good night sleep away from the flight paths while we suffer from the nightly effect of departures and arrivals of aircraft after midnight. This should not be a bottom-line issue for YVR, but improving relations within the communities damaged by their thoughtless move to increase their profits.

8. My first presentation to council in 2000 I recommended the following **1.** Ban all flights between midnight and 7am. **2.** Because the federal government still owns the airports and leases out the operation to private organizations, we must involve all political parties in the process. **3.** Ask the airport to do the same as they did in Seattle between 1985 and 2000. See Seattle times article by John Zebrowski March 31, 2000. Sounding out homeowners on retrofitting. In 2005, Sea-Tac-Airport undertook a new program to insulate schools, condominiums and some homes. This new initiative is beyond the original program from 1985, ending in 2003 with more then 9000 homes insulated, which significantly lower interior noise levels.
9. www.portseattle.org/downloads/news/media/noiseprogramfactsheet.pdf

9. Over the last few years there have been many committees formed across Canada and even longer in the United States of America on this very issue. Cities like Montreal, Surrey, Delta and of course Richmond all have structure committees, while White Rock was mulling on whether they should join the lower mainland. In the United States many airports across the country began to sit down with its neighbour to resolve community issues well before we got our committees off the ground. Unless the cities across Canada affected by aircraft noise after midnight stick together and fight this battle in Ottawa, we will pick off, one by one. As ordinary citizens we don't have the money or the time to lobby our MP's like the airline industries, airport operators, or aeronautical operators do.

10. Many statements made by Grahame Clark chair of YVR and Larry Berg CEO about informing the community are just not true. Grahame Clark " We endeavour to inform and stay connected with our community" Larry Berg "Keeping the public informed and community consultation." They may be politically correct by making these statements and then sending out their appointees from the noise management committee to spread their message to the city and residents, but over the years our appointees were silent. If they want to stay connected and inform the communities, then they should deliver the message themselves, not only to the city, but town hall **public** meetings, not

open houses. When YVR executives approach city councils for their annual meeting, which is required under their lease agreement with Transport Canada, they like to pat themselves on the back and put a positive spin on all issues. Councillors need to ask stringent questions on night flights after midnight and then ask them to report back, instead of letting them off the hook. In addition, Council needs to get a firm date from them to report back to your unanswered questions or they will just consider your questions as frivolous. In one of YVR brochure **"Your Airport Your neighbour"** they write, **"this includes being a good neighbour - balance your needs - high quality of life, with little noise - commitment includes informing your communities of our plans and involving you in the process."** Sounds good, but its just words in a brochure and none of it has become reality in our neighbourhood.

11. We need to get our federal government to add this issue to the transport, infrastructure and communities committee, so we can present our case on airport noise and procure Nav Canada and airport operators across Canada for more accountability and transparency to the cities and the residents who live under the flight paths. Since our federal government decided to unload the operations of airports and the aeronautical navigation system to the private sector, we have lost control. This was done without any participation from the public or cities across this country. Why, well our government found a way to get money for its deficit budget and then they can lend a hand in playing pass the ping pong ball to Nav Canada and YVR. As I mentioned earlier, this is a bottom-line issue for any airport across Canada. Even Nav Canada told Transport Canada Committee the flight path changes at YVR save the airline industries $20 million. There was no consultation from YVR or Nav Canada before implementing those changes. They decided to implement these changes because the airline industry probably lobby hard on behalf of their members. Without changes in the legislation from our Federal Government we are beating our heads up against the wall. You know the old saying, you have to hit them in the pocket book to get their attention. **We need a lower mainland committee like the one set up in Seattle to achieve any goals, otherwise we will lose. It is vitally important that all the mayors in the communities affected by this issue, get together to support such a committee. We need leadership from the political arena and only the mayors from the lower mainland can provide the impetus to get this off the ground, like they did in Montreal. There are plenty of ordinary citizens ready to assist in what ever way, should the mayors decide to implement a strategy for aircraft noise.**

12. In March 2003, Transport Canada introduced the Canada Airport Act. The act gives the government of Canada the powers to remedy extraordinary disruptions. These night flights fit this category of extraordinary disruptions. **In the Federal Government own news release, it states "the government of Canada is responsible for protecting the public interest as it is relates to the airport."** Transport Canada now has an obligation to go to bat for its citizens and cities affected by aircraft noise after midnight. Under this Act the government has incorporated all air-

ports as (NPC) Non-profit Corporation. Even more reason for airports to be more accountable to the taxpayers of Canada, which will elude us if we don't succeed in changing the legislation in a way that gives the cities and taxpayers just as much rights as the airport operators and Nav Canada. Presently we have nothing.

13. Did YVR live up to their signed lease agreement with Transport Canada according to article 7 section 7:01 Airport master Plan page 126 (iii) the present and future environmental impact on areas within its vicinity, and page 127 (ix) propose solutions to noise impact problems especially within the older established communities? If not, then we need to take our government to task for allowing YVR to act without impunity.

14. A policy statement was made available when the airport lease agreement were signed. This news release was called, **Future framework for the management of airports in Canada.** I noticed two points in the news release. First, "A better position to create a climate of cooperation and partnership with the other parties involved at the airports. Second, "Consultative processes would be set up between LAA and adjacent communities, for the enhancement of economic development, coordinated regional planning, **management of environmental issues** and conformity with all local zoning and building by-laws. I believe it is nothing more then a smoke screen to cover up the government's hurry up approach to get these agreements into operation before the people realize what has hit them. YVR hasn't cooperated with the communities or involved us in their environmental management when it comes to noise, Therefore, these leases need to be reviewed by the federal government transport, infrastructure and communities committee because it truly doesn't reflect what the governments own press release states.

15. Don't forget that our government gave YVR a hefty rent reduction a few years ago. They didn't come forward to share in their benefit. As taxpayers, we own the airports and the federal government manages the lease agreement on behalf of us.

16. Marlene Jennings Liberal member from Notre-Dame-de-Grace - Lachine Quebec has introduced a private members bill M-320 on February 23, 2009. **That, in the opinion of the house, the government should issue an order, under the aeronautics act and through the relevant airport governing bodies across Canada, to ensure that night flights of aircraft weighing more than 45,000 kilograms, between 11:00pm and 7:00am into and out of Canadian airports that lie within proximity to populated areas, are suspended - except for flights operating for 91) medical emergencies, (2) delays beyond aircraft control, (3) adverse weather conditions, and (4) flights related to Canadian military operations - pending the outcomes of government-led public consultations on the economic, environmental and health impacts of night flights.** According to Mrs Jennings, this motion, if passed, would require all Canadian urban located airports to hold mandatory public consultations before implementing changes to their night flight paths and frequencies of departures and arrivals during the period from 11pm to 7am. Now, we all know how private members

bills make its way to the house. Not very successfully. In my opinion, with a minority government we at least stand a chance. We have the opportunity to present our case to the government transport, infrastructure and communities committee, should this bill make its way from the house to committee.

17. YVR placed a newspaper ad in the local newspapers. **"What is your vision for noise management at YVR"** I responded to their ad and till this date I have never heard back. Again, it was just another stalling tactic. At least we should have received a courteous reply, but considering its YVR, we will never hear back from this appointed corporate hierarchy. Older established neighbourhoods like the one I live in, need some protection from over **aggressive executives** who see profit over the quality of life of the residents.

18. Unless I'm wrong, I believe council was able to resolve the train whistling during the early morning hours because of complaints from the residents in the affected communities. Not sure how it was approached by council or staff, but it was definitely resolved. It sounds like they turn out to be good corporate citizens. I also believe the trains come under the direction of Transport Canada. The City must have applied pressure to end the practice of running trains at three in the morning. They must be making money, because they are still around.

19. In 1992, the Government of Canada decided to subcontract the operational part of the airports to private companies across Canada as a non profit society. We the taxpayers still own the land and the government of the day is still responsible for the lease agreements (LLAs) Local Airport Authorities made with all the airports. These private organizations have been give enormous powers by Transport Canada without any accountability or transparency to the citizens living under the airport flight paths. There has to be a way for taxpayers to voice their approval or disapproval of actions taken by airport boards affecting our communities. That is why I'm recommending a new number 19 be added to the task force report. This recommendation appears at the end of this synopsis.

20. In 2003, the Government of Canada introduced the Canada Airport Act. In the act, the government of Canada will also be granted emergency powers to remedy extraordinary disruptions. These nights flights fit this category of extraordinary disruptions. In their news release, under what the act will do. They state, " **the government of Canada is responsible for protecting the public interest as it relates to the airport."**

21. VAA has alway argued the most of the night flights are cargo operations, with minimal passenger airlines movements. I agree. In the past, I have argued that YVR will allow any airline a blanket approval for the whole year for night time movements, because of the open sky policy. I attended a meeting at YVR last month and they admitted if any airline asked for that kind of approval, they would get it. So, why do we expect airline corporations to be good corporate citizens, when the CEO make enor-

mous compensation and profit for their companies. In 2009 Federal Express CEO Fredrick W. Smith compensation package was $7,740.658 and UPS CEO Scott Davis was $5.6 million. Between the two corporations, do you think they really give a concern about our sleep or quality of life or is this a bottom-line for their companies and YVR? I think so.

22. In April 2005, I e-mailed a letter to Jean Lapierre, then Minister of Transport about making a rush decision for a rent reduction to YVR. Back then the YVR board was crying the blues for paying more rent then Toronto and wanted some kind of reduction. Today they pay only $40 million in rent, but is listed on the financial statement as $65 million. It is my understanding our Government gave them $60 million in rent reduction and are still asking for more. Of course, if we cry the blues because we can't sleep at night and want to ban night flights, that is an infringement on their operation, loss of business/employment and profit. Yep, it's OK for them to ask for financial relief, but its not OK for us to ask for quiet time between 12 midnight and 7:00am. They have two different standards on how to operate. One standard to advance their own cause no matter what kind of discomfort it causes people who get in their way, and the other to promote YVR as the good corporate citizen serving our community. We all know YVR and Nav Canada have the politically clout in Ottawa and lobbyist to get what they want to preserve the operational management of the airport. As our city representatives you can't compete on the same level and therefore you lack the opportunity to represent your tax payers on the same level as YVR. Without having accountability and transparency to the citizens of Canada from YVR and Nav. Canada, you are not in the same ball park.

I believe the task force report is weak in a couple of areas and would suggest making amendments at the next GPC, whenever the opportunity present its self.

Recommendation under night operation - Under (c) change 6:30am to 7:00pm and add chapter 4, drop the task force recommendation (d) and (e) now becomes (d). The main thrust of changing the task force report is to be consistent with the times from 6:30am to 7:00am and to ban all flights after midnight.

So the new number 9 should read - changes underlined:

9.That VIAA or other appropriate agencies implement the following curfew periods at YVR:

a.Non-noise certified jet aircraft shall not operate at any time.

b.All ICAO annex 16 chapter 2 aircraft shall not operate between 11:00pm and 7:00am.

c.All ICAO annex 16 chapter 3 & 4 aircraft shall not operate between midnight and 7:00am.

d.The New d - All other aircraft shall not operate between midnight and 7:00am.

Under governance and noise management - The task force obviously didn't take my recommendation seriously after asking me to put something together on transparency and accountability.

Rationale for this recommendation - It is very important to impress the Government of Canada to change legislation, because the agencies controlling our lives don't want to change or be good corporate citizens. This is the reason they can bounce us around like a ping pong ball and enjoy it. This is the next big political discussion if we are successful to get it changed in the task force report. I can't see no reason for not adding this to their report. It is just another bullet for us to use and for them to stop.

In addition, we must persuade YVR executives to change the time of their public meetings from the early afternoon to the evening, when more of the public stake-holders (citizens) are available to voice their opinion on the operation of the airport. They chose the afternoon, because most of the people work and can't attend. Only executives from other companies also known as stake-holders, attend this meeting to praise and pat YVR executives on the back. I attended the last annual meeting and put the question to the CEO Larry Berg. His comment was we will take it under advisement. Meaning, nothing is going to change. The government needs to use a big stick to get them to change. With a minority government we will never have a better opportunity to bring these kind of changes forward.

This would become the new recommendation # 19 of the report.

The Government of Canada shall prepare new legislation and/regulations governing Nav. Canada, Transport Canada and YVR to require these agencies to be more open and transparent to the public. Public and annual meetings shall be regularly held by these organizations and convened during hours when the public could be expected to be able to attend (such as in the evening). Questions from the public and other governments, and agencies and groups shall be answered in writing if requested.

Finally for the people who write to the editors of our local newspapers suggesting we want to shut the airport down, is ludicrous. This is the furthest from the truth. I along with the task force have never ever suggested shutting the airport down. These people who think along those lines have done absolutely no research before putting pen to paper. The other argument they like to make, it will put many people out of work. Not so. Other airports have ban night flights and over the years and I have never come across any airports mentioning they were going to have lay off employees because of banning night flights. They just rescheduled flights during the day time. Airlines and airports can make adjustments if they want.

You can be sure they would be the first one to complain if council was to approve a half way house or a rehab house in their neighbourhood. All we want is to continue what we use to have, which is better quality of life and improve sleeping conditions after midnight within our communities. YVR should be able to continue serving the public and maintain its economic benefits for the taxpayers of Canada.

Now here is were the rubber meets the road. Transport Canada allows for Non-applicable regulations concerning noise by-laws within municipalities because aviation is federally regulated. YVR executives also like to jump on the bandwagon and tell us they are open twenty-four hours and seven days per week. Many businesses are open 24 hours per day, and seven days per week, but it doesn't give them the right to disturb our sleep. Not one of these over paid executives from the YVR, Nav Canada or Transport Canada live under any flight paths.

I realize I have provided you with much information. Most, if not all the information provided for your perusal was located on the web, government documents, airline industries, airport operators and aeronautical operator. Please feel free to contact me, if you have any questions regarding the above. I would be more than happy to sit down with you for further in-depth explanations on the above points.

Let me use Neil Filipek's e-mail quote to the other members of the task force, **"Ban all flights after midnight, including chapter 4."**

"LET RICHMOND SLEEP"

FROM THE DESK OF

DOUG LOUTH

On April 24, 2010, I attended a seminar organized by the YVR noise management committee. The seminar lasted 2 hours 10-12 noon and was host by Mark Cheng along with two other employees. Along with me were two members from Richmond Noise Task force. Most of Mark's presentation was not news to us. The only other interesting parts of the seminar was a 45 minute tour of the airfield and how they can break down their own webtrak - Aircraft Noise & Operations Monitoring Systems (ANOMS) in great detail for their own perusal. We get the edited version.

They have scheduled two more seminars for this year, July 23 and October 24. My personal opinion, it is a first class presentation promoting YVR noise management program still based on their perception on how the airport operates with the usual limitation placed on them by the government. For any person who is not familiar with all the issues, it makes the seminar hunky-dory.

I think the information seminars on how the airport operates concerning noise is a good start. In my opinion, they use the tour of the airfield to lure us on to their premises instead of communities centres.

Here are the other problems as I see them: Only10 persons per seminar for the whole lower mainland - Not enough time at the end of their presentation for questions because most of the time is controlled by them - It was only advertised on their own web page and it was not easy to find.

Doug Louth (dmlouth@shaw.ca)