



**Etobicoke Waterfront Stormwater Management Facilities Study
Community Working Group**

Meeting #1

Thursday, March 12, 2009

The Assembly Hall, East Room
1 Colonel Smith Park Drive
6:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M.

SUMMARY NOTES

ATTENDANCE:

City of Toronto

- Kim Edgar – Assistant to Councillor Mark Grimes
- Josie Giordano – Public Consultation
- Man-Kit Koo – Toronto Water
- Tracy Manolakakis – Toronto Water
- Netami Stuart – Parks, Forestry & Recreation

Consultant

- Gustavo Jacome – Stantec Consulting

Toronto & Region Conservation Authority (TRCA)

- Connie Pinto

Community Working Group Members

- Jim Badame – Lakeshore Yacht Club
- Brian Bailey – CCFEW
- Leo Blindenbach – Humber Bay Shores Condominium Association
- Toby Fletcher – Lakeshore Joint BIA's Council
- Irene Jones – Etobicoke-Mimico Coalition
- Bob Poldon – Mimico Residents Association
- David Pritchard – Mimico by the Lake BIA
- Allan Valk – Friends of Sam Smith Park
- April Waddell – Ourlakeshore.com

1. Welcoming Remarks and Introductions

Josie Giordano from the **City of Toronto** opened the meeting and thanked everyone for participating. The attendees briefly introduced themselves. Their attention was then directed to the community working group handout, which explained the study and the various participants.

Josie Giordano indicated that staff worked together with Councilor Grimes' office to develop a list of stakeholders and had identified 14 groups. Josie also indicated that although these 14 groups were invited to participate in this working group, all residents, businesses and interest groups that fall within the boundaries of the study area will be given the opportunity to attend and participate in our larger public events. Attendees were asked to send a representative if they are unable to attend future meetings. And for subsequent meetings, minutes of the previous meeting will be distributed in advance.

2. Study Background

Man-Kit Koo of **Toronto Water** gave a brief background of the study and study area. The area was studied as part of the development of a City-wide Wet Weather Flow Master Plan (WWFMP), which was approved by City Council in 2003. The purpose of the Master Plan was to identify how the City was to manage the problems associated with wet weather flow¹ to improve the local environment, the water course and the waterfront. The Master Plan included a 25 year implementation timeline, and the Etobicoke waterfront is one of the areas identified in the plan for early implementation.

3. Storm Water Management Alternatives and Proposed Siting

Gustavo Jacome from **Stantec Consulting** provided a presentation outlining: the study area, stormwater management alternatives that are being examined and their proposed siting.

It was noted that the study is looking at the 30 storm sewers outfalls along the Etobicoke waterfront. The study was following the Municipal Class EA process which is mandated. The first step is to identify the problem and the second is to identify and evaluate alternative solutions to the problem, which is where they are now. In evaluating the alternatives, environmental and social implications are taken into account along with technical feasibility and economic cost. Public consultation is also required as part of the process.

A copy of the presentation was given out to all attendees and a copy may be made available to other interested parties over the web at www.toronto.ca/involved/projects. All attendees were encouraged to ask questions during the presentation.

There were some questions concerning the duration of the study and the reason the Etobicoke waterfront was identified as a priority. **Man-Kit Koo** explained that the WWFMP's general mandate is to improve water quality and to make more beaches swimmable etc. **Tracy Manolakakis** of **Toronto Water** explained that the first five years of the Wet Weather Flow Master Plan's implementation is focused on the waterfront. Areas to the east and west are also being addressed through separate studies, including the eastern beaches and the Scarborough waterfront.

Gustavo Jacome highlighted the catchment boundary and the location of storm sewer outfalls. All the outfalls are the same age, but they are different sizes. The largest is in Colonel Sam Smith Park, and it is approximately 2.4 m² in cross section and handles approximately 1/3 of the water in the study area. **Tracy Manolakakis** reiterated that the storm and sanitary sewers located within the study area are separated. Hence, the storm

¹ Wet Weather Flow consists of stormwater runoff that is generated when it rains or snows.

sewers don't mix with sanitary flows during high water events. Storm sewers handle the run-off from downspouts, streets, etc.

Gustavo Jacome explained that the stormwater problem is exactly that. As you pave more area, rain travels quickly and picks up pollution, salt, sediment, etc, and when it rains these get washed into the sewers and then into the lake. There is low water quality near the outlets especially after a rain fall event. Also, because of the high peaks and short time frames, watercourses get eroded over time. The objective of this plan is to control the stormwater along the waterfront from a quality perspective, and plan to capture and handle the first flush event - the first 25mm of rain - which contains most of the pollutants.

The plan is to consolidate the current 30 storm sewer outfalls that discharge into Lake Ontario, because there was not enough space to install a treatment facility at each outfall location. A hierarchy of solutions for dealing with wet weather flow is used, this includes: *source control, conveyance control, and end of pipe control.*

Jim Badame of the **Lakeshore Yacht Club** asked if settling ponds need dredging, to which **Man-Kit Koo** replied yes, every 5 to 10 years.

Toby Fletcher of **Lakeshore Joint BIA's Council** asked about the existing pond at the outfall at Colonel Samuel Smith Park, [and if it would be put to use]. **Gustavo Jacome** indicated that it is just a forebay to control floatables, oil and grease. There was general agreement by the members of the public that the pond is filthy and they would like it cleaned.

Irene Jones of **Etobicoke Mimico Coalition** asked if industrial sites had been considered. **Gustavo** replied that only city-owned sites were considered. **Irene Jones** suggested that the railway lands, the Mimico jail, and other places might be worth consideration.

Gustavo Jacome made clear that the focus of the study was on outflows at or near the lake, and not more northerly, because that is where most of the water ends up. **Irene Jones** made the point that the railway lands are contaminated and so it would be good to stop water from flowing over that ground. Unfortunately, the railway lands are federal jurisdiction, and would be challenging to include in the study.

Gustavo Jacome indicated that in assessing the various treatment options, they tried to minimize the footprint and maximize gravity flow. They have come up with three main alternatives: *entirely gravity flow, mechanically assisted with 2 central sites, and mechanically assisted with 1 central site.* Consolidation is preferable because treatment facilities cannot fit at the existing 30 sites, and because fewer sites are easier to maintain. The two main sites identified would be in Colonel Samuel Smith Park and in Humber Bay West Park.

Bob Poldon of **Mimico Residents Association** asked how big an interceptor would be required to consolidate the flows. **Gustavo Jacome** replied approximately two to four feet. There is currently no interceptor in place so they would need to disrupt the waterfront, but there is currently no treatment at all, and so installing treatment is the lesser of evils.

April Waddell of **Ourlakeshore.com** asked if a slide showing the locations of the existing outfalls could be provided in the future. **Tracy Manolakakis** replied yes.

Irene Jones asked if while they are installing the treatment facilities, would they be looking to enhance recreation as well? **Gustavo Jacome** replied yes, where the opportunity exists.

Irene Jones further asked if existing outfalls at road ends could be made into larger parkettes, or otherwise improved. **Gustavo Jacome** clarified that those outfalls would have to remain in place as the treatment facility will be designed to capture only the first flush, and there would still be some run-off flowing through the outfall during large events interceptor.

Bob Poldon asked about the proposed budget. **Man-Kit Koo** indicated that the capital cost was estimated in the WWFMP at \$40 million but will be further examined as part of the study.

Colonel Samuel Smith Park

Gustavo Jacome showed a series of slides with the various parks, showing the footprint of the various facility options, beginning with Colonel Samuel Smith Park. Some of the options are on land, and some in the water (water balance on land, pond in water).

Brian Bailey of **CCFEW** asked why the existing wetland at Colonel Samuel Smith Park, which was built by the TRCA, will not be used. This wetland was originally created to handle water which is now diverted to sewers. **Tracy Manolakakis** answered that this land is now considered habitat, and the TRCA has asked that it not be disturbed, but it is good to know that there might be some more options available in Colonel Samuel Smith Park.

Netami Stuart of Parks, Forestry & Recreation asked for some detailed specs concerning the size of the various options. **Connie Pinto** of the TRCA asked if the presentation will be available on the Web. **Josie Giordano** replied yes.

Allan Valk of **Friends of Sam Smith Park** asked if they could see a picture of what the above ground portion of the treatment facilities would look like. Some examples from Scarborough and Etobicoke were shown.

Bob Poldon asked about what maintenance these facilities would require, indicating that he often sees a crane at work near Strachan Avenue, presumably dealing with the treatment facility there. **Gustavo Jacome** noted that there are always some hiccups with new technologies, but they don't anticipate anything like the situation at Strachan Avenue. Storage tanks are widely used. Plus, the City now has more experience using and installing these facilities.

April Waddell asked for a summary sheet detailing the pros and cons of the various options. **Josie Giordano** indicated that something could be put together.

There was a general agreement that Colonel Samuel Smith Park is one of the area's nicest and most natural parks, so a natural treatment option that has a minimal impact on wildlife is preferable.

Cliff Lumsdon Park

Irene Jones commented that there is an old pumping station in that park, below the drinking water fountain. It used to be the water source for New Toronto. The historical society should be consulted if this old pumping station is to be effected. **Tracy**

Manolakakis said heritage features and archaeology are taken into consideration in any EA and will be examined.

Connie Pinto also indicated that any work done on land will restore the area to its previous state, but work in the water is a little more involved. Fish compensation and the creation of habitat will also be required. **Gustavo Jacome** said that the water balance facility could be designed to look nice and natural.

Prince of Wales Park

No comments were made.

Norris Crescent Park

Toby Fletcher of the **Lakeshore Joint BIA's Council** asked why a pond was not an option at this location.

Irene Jones replied that the park is already completed. It took 12 years.

Mimico Memorial Park

Bob Poldon requested that no tanks be placed at this site. The park is quite small and in a residential neighbourhood, and the installation of any tanks would be very disruptive. If, however, the park will be improved as a result of incorporating a facility, then residents might be keener to consider it. **Gustavo Jacome** said that an underground storage tank, such as the one being proposed for Mimico Memorial, would need to be cleaned approximately every five years, it would take six to 12 months to construct the facility, and no blasting would be required to install such a tank.

Irene Jones agreed that Mimico Memorial Park may be too small for the proposed tank, and if another alternative can be found that would be preferable. She suggested staff consider the base of Royal York Road as an alternative to Mimico Memorial Park. Attendees again asked about other possible sites, to which **Tracy Manolakakis** replied that they are starting with properties already owned by the city. That being said, some of these proposed sites can be revisited, and more prospective sites added down the road.

Irene Jones asked if tanks can be located under permeable paving, such as Humber College's parking lot in the east side of Colonel Samuel Smith Park. **Gustavo Jacome** replied that yes they could, but there needs to be a pipe in that location and with respect to the east side of the park, they have to steer clear of the major water supply pipelines from the R.L. Clark Water facility, and give it a 10-15 meter-wide berth.

Humber Bay West Park

Irene Jones said that the existing system in Humber Bay Park is not working properly. She also asked why not opt for a natural process in this park given its size and natural feel. Further, they should determine why the facility in the east side of the park is not functioning properly and ensure the same mistake is not made twice.

Bob Poldon asked about the relative expense of building a pipe to make use of the natural facility versus building a tank. **Gustavo Jacome** answered that the lake level is the constraint. They could divert the water to the natural area but they would need to use a pumping station. He said all the facilities will accumulate sediment, which will have to be removed approximately every five years. The sediment will likely be trucked to landfill, or diverted to the sanitary sewer.

Irene Jones asked if Municipal Park was looked at as an option. This park might be a good choice as it's not a destination park, and so using it would be less disruptive. In general, it would be best to keep the tanks away from areas where major objections will be raised. Mimico Memorial may not be feasible from a construction and pumping perspective. But a high rate treatment facility in a little park like Municipal Park may be the best option.

Bob Poldon expressed concern about the "big dig" for the interceptor. **Gustavo Jacome** said he was not sure whether they would trench or tunnel to install the interceptor. **Tracy Manolakakis** said that these types of works are typically kept within the municipal roadway allowance, but the exact location of the interceptor has not been looked at yet as we were still in the preliminary stages.

4. Next Steps, Wrap up, Thanks

Josie Giordano indicated that the staff will review all the comments put forth this evening, and incorporate the concerns raised before going to the upcoming Public Information Centre. The attendees will be notified as will the entire community via a mailing and advertisements in the local newspaper. A project website has also been created and the material will be available online.

Josie Giordano asked for some input as to how best to present tonight's information to the general public at the upcoming public meeting:

April Waddell said that she missed the purpose of the entire project at the outset. She didn't understand what the problem was, but now that she sees that there is currently nothing in place, she is on side. She said it would be good to make it clear why this project is necessary, and that it is an improvement measure. She suggests reorganizing the presentation, starting with the various options and then showing the potential locations. She said it would also help to have some sketches or pictures of the finished product. People want to know what things will look like once this is all completed.

Toby Fletcher said it would be useful to start with a diagram showing the existing 30 outfalls and catchments.

Bob Poldon said it would be helpful to know how bad the first flush (25mm) of rain is.

Brian Bailey said the purpose of the public meeting needs to be very clear: explain what the problem is and what the benefits are.

David Pritchard of the **Mimico by the Lake BIA** said the time frame for implementation would be helpful as well. He and his members keep hearing about disruptions from other projects, of which this is only one, and they want to know when all this work is to take place, and how disruptive it will be. Furthermore, it would be good if the city put some thought into how businesses will cope if their business is affected by the construction.

Tracy Manolakakis thanked everyone for their input. If anyone has further thoughts or comments, they can send them to **Josie Giordano**.

Meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.