

TORONTO STAFF REPORT

April 26, 2000

To: Joint Works Committee and Economic Development and Parks Committee

From: Barry H. Gutteridge, Commissioner, Works and Emergency Services

Subject: Staff Response to Written Submissions to the April 19, 2000 Joint Works Committee and Economic Development and Parks Committee Meeting (All Wards)

Purpose:

To provide our written comments to the deputants written submissions at the April 19, 2000 Works Committee meeting.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no financial implications arising from this report.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) Section 3 – Prohibition of Dilution of Draft 6 be revised to read “No person shall discharge directly or indirectly or deposit or cause or permit the discharge or deposit of sewage into a sanitary sewer, combined sewer, storm sewer, municipal or private sewer connection to any sanitary sewer, combined sewer or storm sewer in circumstances where water has been added to the discharge for the purposes of dilution to achieve compliance with Section 2 or 4 of the By-law.”;
- (2) Section 11 – Sewer Connections, subsection (17)2.(a) & (b) of Draft 6 be revised to delete the reference to combined sewer system;
- (3) Section 13 – Offences, subsection 13.(1) of Draft 6 be revised to read “Every person other than a corporation who contravenes any provision of Section 2, 3 or 4 of this By-law is guilty of an offence and on conviction is liable for every day or part thereof upon which such offences occurs or continues to a fine of not more than \$10,000 for a first offence and \$20,000 for any subsequent conviction.”; and subsection 13.(2) of Draft 6 be revised to read “Every corporation which contravenes any provision of Section 2, 3 or 4

of this By-law is guilty of an offence and on conviction is liable for every day or part thereof upon which such offence occurs or continues to a fine of not more than \$50,000 for a first offence and \$100,000 for any subsequent conviction.”;

- (4) Offices of Dentists, with NAICS 62121 with a Pollution Prevention Plan due date of December 31, 2001 be inserted between Industrial Category One-hour Photo-finishing and General Medical and Surgical Hospitals under Appendix 1 Subject Sectors;
- (5) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services provide staff assistance to undertake a minimum of three case studies of P2 Planning with separate industry sectors;
- (6) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, in co-operation with Economic Development, Culture and Tourism Department, undertake a direct outreach program to the major employers that will be affected in order to assure companies that the Department will work closely with the companies over the next two years to find workable solutions and to ensure that the companies benefit from the educational sessions that will be undertaken;
- (7) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, in co-operation with Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, develop a marketing/awareness campaign to recognize the accomplishments of companies as they develop and implement P2 Plans;
- (8) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services consult with Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, Ontario Centre for Environmental Technology Advancement, Industrial Research Assistance Program and senior levels of government and report back to Economic Development and Parks Committee with respect to the development of an incentive program to encourage companies to undertake P2 Plans in a timely manner and to offset preparation and implementation costs;
- (9) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services include the Economic Development Division staff in meetings with companies and business sectors regarding non-routine issues of compliance, P2 Plan preparation and implementation and that the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism report back to Economic Development and Parks Committee during the phase-in period with respect to the economic impact on companies and business issues related to the implementation of the By-law;
- (10) in the event that Council adopts the Board of Health’s Recommendation No. 4 requiring industries to prepare facility-specific pollution prevention plans rather than sectoral P2 plans for homogeneous industry sectors, the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to report back to the Works Committee on the additional staffing required to review the additional estimated four to five thousands individual pollution prevention plans; and
- (11) the appropriate City officials be granted the authority necessary to give effect thereto.

Background:

Due to the lack of adequate consultation time for Draft 6 of the proposed new Sewer Use By-law, which was distributed to stakeholders for comments and deputations prior to the April 19, 2000 Works Committee meeting, Council Layton put forward the following motion:

“That the joint meeting between Works and Economic Development and Parks Committee to discuss the Model Sewer Use Bylaw and any accompanying reports and documents be adjourned until no later than May 19 and that Draft 6 dated April 19, 2000 tabled today be the final and only draft of the Sewer Use Bylaw to be discussed at the May meeting and that prior to adjournment deputants who are here today who want to speak be given the opportunity to do so.”

Comments:

The following are responses to the written submissions and recommendations by the deputants who spoke at the April 19, 2000 joint Works Committee and Economic Development and Parks Committee:

Canadian Institute for Environmental Law and Policy

- *Standards for discharges of bismuth, vanadium, iron, chlorides, and sulphates should be restored to the By-law and discharge standards added for tungsten, zirconium, uranium, thallium, beryllium, tetraethyl lead, tetramethyl lead, triethyl lead, tributyl tin, triethyl tin, triphenyl tin.*

Bismuth, vanadium, iron, chlorides, and sulphates were in the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) 1988 Model Sewer Use By-law and in our current Sewer Use By-law. The MOE dropped these parameters from their current draft Model Sewer Use By-law because they are of no sewer concerns and we agree.

We have looked through the sampling results of the last two years and find the following:

On 280 samples in the sanitary trunk sewer study bismuth was at or less than 0.1 mg/L (our detection limit) in all samples but one.

On 282 samples in the sanitary trunk sewer study, vanadium was at or less than 0.1 mg/L (our detection limit) in all samples.

On 17 samples in the residential study and sanitary trunk study, thallium was equal to or less than 0.02 (our detection limit) and beryllium was equal to or less than 0.007 mg/L (our detection limit).

We have looked through the 38-plant study of 1987 undertaken by the MOE and it appears that no samples were taken for analysis of uranium, zirconium, and tungsten. These are not considered important pollutants in our municipal sewers. In fact, it appears that the problem with both tungsten and zirconium is the dust, smoke or vapour from them when they are being used as a metal in a manufacturing process such as machining. Tungsten is virtually insoluble in water and therefore is not a concern with regard to the liquid limit of this Sewer Use By-law.

Tetraethyl lead, tetramethyl lead and triethyl lead were used as gasoline additives and since they are no longer being used in motor fuels these organo lead compounds would not be found in our sewers. Tributyl tin, triethyl tin and triphenyl tin are used as anti-fouling agents for paints used on hulls of ocean ships to stop barnacles from attaching and growing. Again, these organo tin compounds would not be found in our sewers.

- *The City of Toronto should adopt the following definition of pollution prevention in its sewer use By-law: "Pollution prevention means any action which reduces or eliminates the generation of pollutants or wastes at the source and may include activities such as raw material substitution, product process modification, product reformulation, improvements in operations and maintenance, in-process recycling of production materials."*

In Draft 6 we have changed the definition of pollution prevention in order to be consistent with the definition adopted by the Federal Government.

- *The Sewer Use By-law should require that detailed pollution prevention plans be prepared every five years, and that pollution prevention plan summaries be submitted every year.*

We feel that with our present level of staffing we would be able review pollution prevention plan summaries only once every two years. Consequently, we have increased the implementation of the detailed pollution prevention plan to six years (multiple of two).

- *The pollution prevention plan (Appendix 3) and pollution prevention plan summary requirements (Appendix 4) should be amended to require reporting on total amounts of substances discharged into sewers each year.*

We are developing a draft P2 Guidance Manual as a guideline for industries to develop their P2 plans, which is reported to the Committee in a separate report on this agenda. We will amend the two appendices in the Guidance Manual to include providing information on the total amounts of substances discharged into sewers.

- *The City of Toronto should commit to making the contents of facility annual reports on their discharges to the city's sanitary, combined and storm sewers available to the*

public, and providing an annual summary report on the basis of their contents, including facility specific information.

The By-law states that all information submitted to the City that is contained in P2 plan summaries, reports, surveys, monitoring and inspection and sampling activities, will be available for disclosure to the public in accordance with the Municipal Freedom of Information and Privacy Act (MFIPPA). However, if the information is confidential or proprietary, it may be exempt from disclosure under MFIPPA. The person submitting the information must provide sufficient details as to the reason for its purported exemption from disclosure and it is up to our Corporate Access and Privacy Office and the Legal Department to determine if their request for exemption can be granted under MFIPPA.

Urban Development Institute

The following issues were raised by the Urban Development Institute (UDI) in a deputation to the April 19th, 2000 joint Works Committee and Economic Development and Parks Committee meeting, and at a May 2, 2000 meeting with staff regarding Draft 5 and Draft 6 of the New Sewer Use By-law:

- *Double sewer connections*

Prior to amalgamation, all of the former local municipalities, with the exception of Scarborough, required individual storm and sanitary connections for new residential services. The new Sewer Use By-law recommends individual sanitary and storm connections as the harmonized standard for new servicing throughout the new City.

Individual connections are found, in the long term, to be more desirable, both from an operational and maintenance standpoint. The double connection or "Y" connection may result in a blockage, which affects both homeowners connected to the double connection. Further, rodding activity which one homeowner may undertake to free a blocked drain may cause a blockage on the adjacent lot connected to the "Y". It should be noted however, that the higher level of service provided by the individual storm and sanitary connections will result in an increased servicing cost which has been estimated by UDI to be approximately \$700 per lot. It should be noted that your Committee, at its October 6th, 1999 meeting, requested that existing multiple drains be eliminated on projects where the Department is currently working in a location where blockages on multiple drains are likely to recur and to eliminate such drains when it is cost effective to do so.

With regard to a concern that the lot widths may not accommodate individual storm, sanitary and water service connections, we can advise that to date, this has not been a problem for the narrow lot widths that have been approved for freehold townhomes.

- *Limits for storm sewer discharge*

The Draft 5 and Draft 6 of the New Sewer Use By-law specifies the quality parameters for stormwater entering the storm sewer system, and in particular, requires that the total suspended solids in stormwater not to exceed 15 mg per litre. It is recognized that this concentration of suspended solids, although difficult to achieve, has been included in the former Toronto cities and Metro Sewer Use By-laws, as well as the Provincial Model Sewer Use By-law since 1988. Notwithstanding the endorsement of this number by earlier Councils and the Province, there is recognition on the part of the Ministry and a number of partnering municipalities of the need to investigate stormwater management methods in more detail with regard to quantity and quality criteria. In this regard, a Stormwater Assessment Monitoring and Performance Program (SWAMP) was organized in 1995 on grants from Environment Canada, Ministry of the Environment (MOE), Ministry of Transportation, Toronto Region Conservation Authority and a number of Municipal Engineers' Association member municipalities. The City of Toronto, along with the former cities of Etobicoke, Scarborough and the Town of Richmond Hill, Town of Markham, and Town of Aurora have each contributed both financially and through in kind assistance to evaluate stormwater management technologies under the SWAMP program. The former Cities of Toronto, Scarborough and Etobicoke have collectively contributed (\$245,000) since the formation of SWAMP. The range of investigations have included both large stormwater management systems relating to sedimentation tanks, wetlands and infiltration systems as well as smaller systems suitable for retrofit into parking lot areas referred to as oil and grit separators and pre-cast multi-chamber sediment tanks. A number of these investigations are currently ongoing, and consequently, removal rates and achievable suspended solid limits for stormwater are still under investigation. It is proposed therefore, that the stormwater parameters outlined in Draft 6, not be adjusted at this time, and that further evaluation be carried out regarding these limits over the two year phase-in period of the new By-law. The Ministry of the Environment has also indicated a willingness to provide technical assistance for this evaluation. The phase-in period will allow further evaluation of SWAMP program results as well as further consultation with the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation Authority, and industry sectors regarding the new By-law limits.

- *Storm sewer connections*

The current Draft 6 By-law prohibits the installation of new storm connections as a general requirement, however, the By-law grants permission to the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services to permit storm connections where there are no "practical alternative means of storm drainage". Consequently, as a general rule, builders will be required to disconnect downspouts and discharge roof drainage onto grassed areas around the buildings and to pump footing weepers to surface as a means of providing storm drainage. Exceptional circumstances will arise, particularly on narrow lots and lots where there may be a high groundwater table that will necessitate the installation of storm connections. The disconnection of downspouts on narrow lots may result in the storm runoff from one lot affecting adjacent properties, or icing of sidewalks and driveways in the spring and fall seasons. For larger lots however,

equal to 15.24 m (50 ft) and greater downspouts must be disconnected and drained to surface. This size of lot provides sufficient grassed areas and drainage opportunities to accommodate surface drainage systems.

Existing legislation clearly indicates that the City has the right to control the discharge of stormwater into the sewer system and consequently, has the authority to control where storm connections are permitted.

Riverside Stewardship Alliance

- *Downspout Disconnection Program*

The New Sewer Use By-law requires owners to disconnect downspouts if they are directly or indirectly discharging roof water to a sanitary sewer connection. The definition of directly and indirectly however, includes reference to combined sewer systems. It should be noted that at the present time, discharging roof water to a combined sewer system is allowed, however, through a voluntary downspout disconnection program, homeowners are encouraged to disconnect downspouts and discharge them to surface.

It is recommended therefore that Section 11. (17) 2. (a) & (b) be revised to delete the reference to combined sewer systems thus reflecting the voluntary implementation of the downspout disconnection program for combined sewer systems.

April 27, 2000 meeting with the Chemical Producers

A meeting was held with Reichhold Limited, Rohm & Haas Canada Inc., Halltech Inc. and Rhodia/Albright & Wilson Americas Limited, on April 27, 2000, to discuss the following issues:

- *Pollution Prevention - 6 year implementation plan*

The industries requested clarification on the phase-in period for the new By-law limits and the implementation period for the Pollution Prevention Plans. For the initial two years of the By-law, industries will be required to develop pollution prevention plans and identify specific storm and sanitary discharge limits which may be achievable using the pollution planning process. It is understood that industries will require a period of time to implement the Pollution Prevention Plan, which they have developed. This pollution prevention plan implementation period is identified in the By-law to take place over six years, with two year reporting to the City on the progress of achieving the progressive improvement in discharge limits set out in the plan. The City will monitor the industries progress in meeting the pollution prevention plan target using the enforcement mechanisms under the By-law to ensure that the planned implementation proceeds on schedule.

- *The By-law limits for nonylphenols and nonylphenol ethoxylates*

The industries that attended the April 27, 2000 meeting are supportive of the limits for nonylphenols and nonylphenol ethoxylates as set out in Draft 5 and Draft 6. The industries, which attended this meeting, expressed great concern if the limits were reverted back to the lower limits set in Draft 4. The lower limits would force them to shift production to other jurisdictions where there are less restrictions on the discharge of these two compounds.

Further, we can advise that Mr. James Riordan, Director, National Office of Pollution Prevention, Environment Canada, indicated in his deputation to the April 19, 2000 joint Works Committee and Economic Development and Parks Committee meeting that “the By-law limits we have set are reasonable and a good start toward virtual elimination of the persistent, bioaccumulative and toxic substances.”

The limits for nonylphenols and nonylphenol ethoxylates, together with di-n-butyl phthalate and bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate were adjusted to higher limits in Draft 5 and Draft 6 of the new By-law on the basis of new research results from Environment Canada and Ecotoxicity & Environment Safety’s “Application of quantitative structure activity relationships for assessing the aquatic toxicity of phthalate esters” by T. Parkerton and W. Konkel (1999). Environment Canada’s research indicates that the “estimated no effect value” for nonylphenol is 1 µg/L. So, by using the 20 times factor the new limit for nonylphenols should be 20 µg/L or 0.02 mg/L, and correspondingly the limit for nonylphenol ethoxylates (which is ten times less toxic) should be 200 µg/L or 0.2 mg/L. Parkerton and Konkel (1999) have developed a “predicted no effect concentration” for di-n-butyl phthalate in surface waters of 62 µg/L. So, 20 times 62 µg/L would be 1,240 µg/L or 1.2 mg/L. Environment Canada also has determined that the LC₅₀ (lethal concentration killing 50% of treated organism) for bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is 500 µg/L. So, 20 times 500 µg/L would be 10,000 µg/L or 10 mg/L. These research findings have also been forwarded to Environment Canada and the MOE for their review with respect to the Canada Water Quality Objectives (CWQO) and the Provincial Water Quality Objectives (PWQO). It is recommended that the limits remain as they are shown in Draft 6 for the two-year phase-in period for the new By-law limits and to continue consultation with Environment Canada and the MOE regarding the water quality objectives to be set by the Federal and Provincial agencies for these compounds. The City Medical Officer of Health concurs with this approach, however, the Board of Health has decided to retain the more stringent discharge limits in Draft 4.

Ontario Dental Association

The Ontario Dental Association (ODA) deputation paper lists 23 concerns with regard to the new Sewer Use By-law. However, all of the concerns essentially relate to two key issues in the new By-law.

- *The mercury discharge concentration limits and the requirement to install dental amalgam separators.*

Mercury amalgam has been widely used by dentists as a restorative material for a number of years and many dentists continue to use this material in today's dental offices. Mercury waste from dental offices relate to both the removal of dental amalgam which requires replacement and the waste amalgam that may be discharged during the procedure of installing a new dental filling.

Staff of Works and Emergency Services has reviewed the literature regarding mercury waste from dental offices and can advise that mercury is being discharged from dental practices in concentrations that are of concern. Mercury is a well-known toxic heavy metal, which has documented health concerns in Canada and other countries.

The literature suggests that dental amalgam contribute to the total mercury contribution to the sewer system. The estimated contribution from dental offices compared to the total mercury found in sewage waste will depend on what other industrial sources are present, the accuracy of sampling and analysis, other non-industrial uses of mercury. The ODA cites lower estimates of the contribution by dentists in the range of 8-14% of the total load. I should also note that City staff has been monitoring the waste amalgam from four City run dental clinics. The City staff's research results indicate that the contribution from dental offices may be as high as 80% of the total mercury found in sewage waste. Specifically, in the City of Toronto, studies have shown that there is no correlation between the degree of industrial activity and mercury loadings in sewers. We must conclude that the mercury is coming from non-industrial sources. The only known widespread use of mercury from non-industrial sources is dental practices and some hospitals. The use of mercury in hospitals is believed to be minor compared to dentists.

The proposed new Sewer Use By-law attempts to deal with the question of mercury wastes from dental practices by introducing new requirements that reflect the current state of waste treatment and recycling technology that is commercially available in Canada and commonly used in other parts of the world.

There are at least 20 different systems known as dental amalgam separators commercially available in the world. There are also ISO standards (ISO 11143) specifically for these devices. There are at least 3 manufacturers who are currently marketing ISO certified systems in Canada. These devices can be installed for under \$1,000 and take up very little room. In Europe one supplier alone has 30,000 units installed. The mercury is totally recycled from these units providing a cradle-to-grave solution for this pollutant. Several local dentists have already voluntarily installed these advanced amalgam separator systems.

The City of Montreal is moving in the same direction as Toronto and is expected to introduce similar bylaw requirements later this year. Interestingly, the Quebec

Dental Association now endorses the use of amalgam separators and is working cooperatively with regulators on this issue. Calgary has the same mercury discharge limit as our proposed limit since 1994. However, due to the lack of good sampling locations in dental offices, they have not been rigorously enforcing the mercury discharge limit.

- *The ODA is concerned that some dentists do not perform amalgam restorations and will still have to install a separator under the By-law.*

Separators will only be mandated where there is a possibility of amalgam discharges. The dental offices where removal and new mercury fillings are installed will be identified in the P2 planning.

- *The ODA is concerned that the separators may not achieve the By-law limits.*

With regard to By-law limit, it is the opinion of technical staff that amalgam separators should be capable of achieving less than one milligram per litre of mercury in the final discharge for the most inexpensive ISO certified devices. The technology is still developing and improvements are likely over the next few years. It is the intent to work with the ODA to develop a generic P2 plan for dentists. The dentists can then use this generic P2 plan to develop their own specific P2 plan. We are confident that with the separator plus the pollution prevention planning procedures for dentists they will be able to achieve the new By-law limit.

World Wildlife Fund

World Wildlife Fund has expressed concern that under Section 13 – Offences, only violations under Section 2 or 4 are subject to the higher maximum fines of \$10,000 for individuals and \$50,000 for corporations and that a violation under Section 3 for dilution to meet discharge limits is only subject to a maximum fine of \$5,000.

The Legal Department has advised that the authority to levy higher fines come from the Municipal Act for contravening a by-law that regulates or prohibits the discharge of any matter into a sewage system. Any other violations under the By-law which are not related to violations of discharge fall under Section 61 of the Provincial Offences Act, where the maximum fine is \$5,000.

In consultation with the Legal Department, this section has been rewritten as follows:

“No person shall discharge directly or indirectly or deposit or cause or permit the discharge or deposit of sewage into a sanitary sewer, combined sewer, storm sewer, municipal or private sewer connection to any sanitary sewer, combined sewer or storm sewer in circumstances where water or other material from any source has been added to the discharge for the purposes of dilution to achieve compliance with Section 2 or 4 of this By-law.”

With this revision, we could include this section in subsections 13.(1) and 13.(2) for the higher fines since it is a prohibition for discharge.

Economic Development, Culture and Tourism Department

The following are recommendations received from the staff in the Economic Development Division of the Economic Development, Culture and Tourism Department regarding Draft 6 of the new Sewer Use By-law:

- *That the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services demonstrate the economic benefits and paybacks to local companies by developing local examples. This should include sponsoring a minimum of three local case studies, cost sharing in the development of the case studies, and publicizing the results.*

Generally, it is the intent of the Works and Emergency Services staff to assist the industry sector in the preparation of P2 Plans by providing a Guidance Manual and workshops for the preparation of P2 Plans. The staff from the Economic Development Division has indicated that in their opinion, it would be desirable to undertake case studies as a means of demonstrating the advantages of carrying out P2 planning. Works and Emergency Services agree that this approach would be beneficial and would provide an actual case study example for other industries within the sector to use as an example for their specific industry processes. It is not intended however, that the City participate in a cost sharing program for the development of these case studies as the industry sectors will recognize a short pay-back for the investment of P2 planning through the result in savings identified.

It is recommended, therefore, that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services provide staff assistance to undertake a minimum of three case studies within separate industry sectors and to advise through an awareness campaign of the P2 results of the industries participating in the case studies.

Discussions are underway with Kodak Canada as a first volunteer to do a pilot P2 Plan using our Guidance Manual. We will work together with them to develop their P2 Plan and use them and any other volunteers as case studies subject to the industries concurrence, and publicize the results of the P2 planning.

- *That the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, in co-operation with Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, undertake a direct outreach program to the major employers that will be affected in order to assure companies that the Department will work closely with the companies over the next two years to find workable solutions and to ensure that the companies benefit for the educational sessions that will be undertaken.*

We agree with this recommendation. Staff from Works and Emergency Services will be working with staff from Environment Canada over the next two years to conduct

sector by sector industry training workshops on P2 planning. There will be Information Support Hotline and Web site to assist companies in registering for the workshops, to download the P2 guidance manual and to provide Internet access to P2 options. As noted in previous reports, funding in the amount of \$55,000 has been allocated in the 2000 Operating budget to undertake these training workshops.

- *That the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, in co-operation with Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, develop a marketing/awareness campaign to recognize the accomplishments of companies as they develop and implement P2 Plans.*

We are in support of this marketing/awareness campaign to give recognition to those companies that have achieved success in reducing or eliminating their wastes through implementation of P2 planning.

We can also advise that one of the initiatives under the Environmental Task Force recommendations also relates to developing an awareness campaign for the new Sewer Use By-law. In this regard, additional funding has been allocated in the amount of \$75,000 for developing further awareness of the new Sewer Use By-law regulations for the commercial and residential sectors.

- *That the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services consult with Economic Development, Culture and Tourism (EDCT), Ontario Centre for Environmental Technology Advancement (OCETA), Industrial Research Assistance Program (IRAP) and senior levels of government and report back to Economic Development and Parks Committee (EDPC) with respect to the development of an incentive program to encourage companies to undertake P2 Plans in a timely manner and to offset preparation and implementation costs.*

Staff will work with EDCT, OCETA, IRAP, and senior levels of government to assist companies in the development of their P2 plans. Municipal financial assistance has not been recommended as it is intended that the P2 planning will provide a favourable cost benefit result.

- *That the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services include the Economic Development Division staff in meetings with companies and business sectors regarding non-routine issues of compliance, P2 Plan preparation and implementation and that the Commissioner report back to EDPC during the phase-in period with respect to the economic impact on companies and business issues related to the implementation of the By-law.*

We agree with this recommendation.

Surrounding Region Municipalities

We have received letters of support from Region of Peel and Region of Durham.

Region of Peel indicated that: "We are seriously looking at the proposed City of Toronto Sewer Use By-law as the guide for the development of our own by-law. It is our plan to have a new by-law in place by the spring of 2001."

Region of Durham wrote: "We will be taking into account during our review, the changes which are being made by the City of Toronto, in order to develop as much consistency as possible."

We have also met with the Region of York staff and they have indicated that they are contemplating reviewing their Sewer Use By-law. However, we have not received confirmation letter to that effect.

Copies of the letters from the Region of Peel and the Region of Durham are attached.

Medical Officer of Health

We support all the recommendations contained in the Medical Officer of Health's report to the Board of Health meeting on May 1, 2000, which has been forwarded to this joint Committee for consideration, except Recommendation No. 4 concerning the requirement of industries to prepare facility-specific P2 plans rather than sectoral P2 plans for homogeneous industry sectors.

In our April 10, 2000 report to the joint Works Committee and Economic Development and Parks Committee on April 19, 2000, we were planning to accept generic plans for certain sectors where their types of business are homogeneous, e.g. photo-finishing, printing, dental offices, car washes, vehicle servicing and oil change facilities, etc. A generic plan for the whole sector makes sense in that it will save us having to deal with each individual business, which might be a one to two persons operation with no resources and expertise to develop the P2 plan. A generic P2 plan will be developed with the Association who represent the industry sector, and each individual business will be required to sign the P2 plan and commit to achieving the results. We estimate that there are about four to five thousands of these homogeneous businesses in the City. If we have to review these four to five thousand individual plans, additional staff would have to be required.

It is, therefore, recommended that in the event that Council adopts this recommendation that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency will have to report back to the Committee on the additional staffing requirement to handle the additional four to five thousand individual P2 plans.

Conclusions :

Staff have responded to issues and concerns raised by deputants at the April 19, 2000 joint Works Committee and Economic Development and Parks Committee meeting, and where possible have incorporated their comments into recommending the revision of the Draft 6 Sewer Use By-law.

Contact:

Vic Lim, M.A.Sc., P.Eng.
Manager, Industrial Waste and Storm Water Quality
Quality Control and System Planning
Telephone: (416) 392-2966
Fax: (416) 397-0908

Wayne Green, P.Eng.
Director of Quality Control and
System Planning
Telephone: (416) 392-8242
Fax: (416) 392-2974

Michael A. Price, P.Eng., FICE
General Manager
Water and Wastewater Services

Barry H. Gutteridge
Commissioner
Works and Emergency Services

File No. 1047.22

List of Attachments:

1. Letter from Region of Peel
2. Letter from Region of Durham