



## Ashbridges Bay Treatment Plant Neighbourhood Liaison Committee

Meeting #70  
Thursday, April 27, 2006  
7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.  
1774 Queen Street East – Mennonite New Life Centre

### **ATTENDANCE:**

Karen Buck	Citizens for a Safe Environment, Co-chair
Connie Demb	Beach Resident
Dave Hanna	Citizen
John Hopkins	ICMC
Jim Neff	Citizens for a Safe Environment
Doug Phillips	BMCN 416
Michael Rosenberg	Environment and Economy Coalition
Hy Schwartz	Sierra Club
William Sheehan	Citizen
Karey Shinn	Safe Sewage, Co-chair
Layton Stewart	Beach Triangle Residents Association
Aliss Terpstra	International Institute of Concern for Public Health

### REGRETS

David Done	Safe Sewage
------------	-------------

### STAFF

Mark Rupke	Senior Engineer, Toronto Water
David Evans	Public Consultation Unit, Facilitator

### MINUTES

Kaight Rehner

## 1.0 Welcome and Introductions

**Karen Buck** called the meeting to order at 7:08 p.m. and everyone present introduced themselves.

The agenda was reviewed and the following amendments were made:

- **Aliss Terpstra** and **Connie Demb** each asked to add an item under new business.

## 2.0 Review of Works Committee Decision and Agenda

The Works Committee Agenda was discussed during the pre-meeting.

**Action Item #1: Karey Shinn, Karen Buck and Connie Demb to identify for David Evans reports that they would like to have for the next meeting. David Evans will include these on the agenda for discussion.**

The submissions from the NLC to the March 7 Works Committee were distributed.

**Karen Buck** said that she, Karey Shinn, Aliss Terpstra, Michael Rosenberg and Shannon Porter presented a letter written by Aliss Terpstra to the Board of Health at the Board's March 19 meeting. The outcome was that Dr. David McEwen would report back on the feasibility of even considering their suggestion of doing a pilot to remove fluoride from the water in order to reduce metals in biosolids. The NLC will have to look on the City's website for the Board of Health agenda to see if he is reporting back at the next meeting.

**Aliss Terpstra** said that, from the International Institute of Concern for Public Health's (IICPH) perspective, David McEwen's response was unacceptable, as it was based on a Centre for Disease Control Oral Health Division policy statement rather than on science. She said that Dr. McEwen's position is that because the Oral Health Division says fluoride is safe, no further environmental or health studies are necessary. She added that they were lucky the Board of Health did not decide to kill the idea right away, as this gives them a chance to bolster their proposal with expert opinions.

**Karen Buck** said that Aliss Terpstra is going to do further research into how hydro fluorosis acid added to the drinking water may affect pipe corrosion, and the subsequent addition of heavy metals to the biosolids. She invited anyone interested to help with researching how to remove metals from biosolids. **Aliss Terpstra** said she would have an intern during the summer to help with the research.

### **Discussion:**

- **John Hopkins** asked if he could get a copy of the fluoride information. **Karen Buck** said that the NLC received this information in a presentation in December. **David Evans** said he would make sure John Hopkins gets a copy of December's minutes.
- **William Sheehan** suggested asking Maureen Reilly if she has any additional information. **Aliss Terpstra** said that the Sludge Watch does not look at whether fluorosilicates makes things worse. She noted that there is a report that compares Canadian Biosolids to European ones, but it does not look at the fact that Europe does not use fluorosilicates.
- In response to a question from **John Hopkins**, **Aliss Terpstra** said that sodium fluoride is less reactive than fluorosilicates. It is also less likely to increase the uptake of cadmium and lead, but it is six to eight times more expensive. In response to a question from Hy Schwartz, **Mark Rupke** said that he believes the cost of fluorosilicates to the city is less than \$400,000.

- **Connie Demb** noted that sodium fluoride is effective for topical use through toothpaste, but she has read that it has not been shown to be beneficial through addition to drinking water.
- **Connie Demb** asked how much notice Dr. McEwen was given about this proposal. **Aliss Terpstra** said the IICPH has been posing these questions for 18 months. **Aliss Terpstra** said the letter also had to go through Works first. **Karen Buck** corrected her, saying that Toronto Water wrote her a letter indicating that those concerned about flouride should deal directly with the Board of Health.
- **Michael Rosenberg** said they should send David McEwen a list of questions to deal with in his report as well as reports he should look at. **Aliss Terpstra** said this was done. **Karen Buck** suggested that the NLC could look at the list of references that was sent to Dr. David McEwen or do research to support looking at the possibility - presented by the NLC – of a pilot to improve the quality of biosolids. She also suggested that the NLC should come up with some additional questions.

### 3.0 Water Quality Presentation

**Mark Rupke** gave a presentation on the water quality monitoring around Ashbridges Bay. He presented data collected last year from two water quality sondes, as well as from the sewer system. His presentation included maps showing where samples were taken, as well as results from the samples.

#### Discussion:

- **Connie Demb** asked whether conductivity had to do with the amount of metals in the water. **Mark Rupke** replied that had more to do with salinity ions in the water.
- In response to a map of the sewer systems that feed into the bay, **William Sheehan** asked which sewers were combined. **Mark Rupke** replied that there is only a small area in which there is absolutely no combined sewers, however, many of the sewers in the other areas are either not combined or only combined a small amount. **William Sheehan** requested a map detailing exactly where the sewers are combined. **Mark Rupke** said that would be contained within the technical details of the Wet Weather Flow Master Plan.
- In response to a question from **William Sheehan**, **Mark Rupke** said that water from the plant bypasses about 1500 metres out into the lake, which is well away from the probes.
- **Michael Rosenberg** said he felt there was a significant difference between the position of the calibration points and the data lines. **Mark Rupke** said that instrument drift is very common, which is why they need to recalibrate.
- **William Sheehan** asked about their margin of error. **Mark Rupke** replied that the margin of error depends on the parameters. He said that the margin of error for dissolved oxygen, for example, was acceptable at about .5.
- In response to a question from **William Sheehan**, **Mark Rupke** said that they have been doing this sampling for two years.

- **Connie Demb** asked why the bypass was more than the amount of the storm on the 31<sup>st</sup> of August. **Mark Rupke** said it depends on the intensity of the rainfall. There is no fixed reference as to which should be greater.
- **Mark Rupke** explained that the August 19 storm did not have much effect on the plant, as the rain was mostly up north. He added that the data on rainfall is collected from Pearson. **Jim Neff** asked if they could use data from the Island Airport. **Mark Rupke** said he just needed to determine which days it was raining, and he took data that was readily available.
- **Aliss Terpstra** said she was surprised that the alkalinity in the lake goes up to nine. She asked whether the pH of the water is correlated to ammonia. **Mark Rupke** replied that there is not enough ammonia in the lake to cause changes in pH, but that the pH of the lake influences whether the form of the ammonia is ammonium or unionized ammonia.
- **William Sheehan** asked if Mark Rupke would characterize the probes as unreliable. **Mark Rupke** said, yes, the specific ion probes are difficult to keep in calibration, but they are the best probes available. **William Sheehan** asked why they don't calibrate the probes more often. **Mark Rupke** said it was an issue of manpower. **David Evans** said, given the number of people available to calibrate the probes, it cannot be done more often. **Mark Rupke** said that, for their needs, they do not require the probes to be calibrated more often, as most of the information can be gathered from other instruments.
- **Doug Phillips** asked if he was familiar with automatic calibration probes. **Mark Rupke** said the probes they have are the best available, there is no automatic calibration for specific ion probes in water quality sondes.
- **John Hopkins** asked whether the quality of the rainfall would affect the turbidity. **Mark Rupke** said that, as the lake is more affected than the bay, he would conclude that it had more to do with the amount of waves picking up sand and grit.
- **Mark Rupke** showed a list of organic chemicals and metals that they tested for in the sewer system during dry weather. Most chemicals were below the detection limit. **Karen Buck** asked if any of the chemical regulations were below detection levels. **Mark Rupke** said that some might be, but added that they are dealing in miniscule quantities. In order to get better readings, they would have to go to a research laboratory at a university.
- **Doug Phillips** asked if they had a list of the acceptable limits for all of the chemicals. **Mark Rupke** said he did not have that in this presentation. For example, the limit for ammonia depends on the pH of the water. For BOD, the plants effluent has to be less than 25. He added that none of the numbers were anything to be concerned about; they are all very low.
- **Karey Shinn** asked if they tested chloramines. **Mark Rupke** said, no, they follow the Great Lakes Agreement, which provides standardized sets of what to look for in surface waters.
- **Connie Demb** asked about the large amount of E. coli. **Mark Rupke** said that they would expect to find that in a sewer. **Connie Demb** asked whether the number for total suspended solids was high. **Mark Rupke** said that tap water would be about 25, so 58 would not be as clean as tap water, but it is characteristic of surface water.

- **Michael Rosenberg** asked why some of the blue lines were missing from the charts. **Mark Rupke** replied that he was not sure, but he suspects that the probe did not record for some reason. **Doug Phillips** asked whether they had fixed problems with the instruments to ensure that they record in the future. **Mark Rupke** said that instrument issues are pretty inevitable.
- **Doug Phillips** asked who did the sampling. **Mark Rupke** said it was the group within the former Works Department that does beach and river water sampling.
- **William Sheehan** asked how much the probes cost. **Mark Rupke** said that the individual sensors are probably between \$500-1000. The probe itself is about \$60,000.
- In response to a question from **Aliss Terpstra**, **Mark Rupke** said that the results show that the dry weather conditions of the sewers are pretty clean and without cross-contamination.
- In response to a question from **Jim Neff**, **Mark Rupke** said that 2005 was a wetter year than 2004, but it was not a particularly wet year.
- **Doug Phillips** asked if the probes could be moved closer to the sewer outfalls in the future. **Mark Rupke** replied that it is more useful for them to keep the probes in the same place, in order to compare data from previous years. He added that they worked with the Wet Weather Flow group to determine where to place the probes in order to gather meaningful data.

#### 4.0 Flow Forecast and Budget Presentation

**Mark Rupke** gave a presentation on flow projections for Ashbridges Bay and the other Toronto Treatment plants.

##### Discussion:

- In response to a slide detailing flow to the treatment plants over the last thirty years, **Mark Rupke** noted that the spike in flow in 1986 was likely due to a metering error, and the drop in 1994 was due to improved metering at Ashbridges Bay. He explained that the numbers have leveled off, and there is a slight downward trend, as increases in population are balanced out by water efficient technologies and changes to the building code that require low-flow fixtures. **Connie Demb** asked why there was a rise in flow in 2005. **Mark Rupke** said that was likely due to noise in the treatment plant.
- **Dave Hanna** said that there was a report about the west beaches at the last council meeting and he wondered whether any of the recommendations, such as rebuilding break walls and pumping in water and blocking exits, were relevant to the population projections outlined in Mark Rupke's presentation.
- **Mark Rupke** said that some of them are incorporated into the medium scenario. He said that measures for cleaning up the beaches are not part of this because they have more to do with keeping the river water out of the beach.
- **Michael Rosenberg** noted that the population is handled differently in the three different projection scenarios, and the water conservation goals change between medium and high. He said that it is not possible to tell which variable is affecting the change and asked if they could see a fourth projection based on maximum

population growth and the 15% water efficiency plan. **Mark Rupke** said he couldn't redo the projections because they were done by the consultants. He noted that between now and 2015; there is no difference between the normal and high population projections. **Michael Rosenberg** said he feels it would be more useful to have more than three scenarios. **Mark Rupke** explained that the low and high sceneries are extremes that are only intended to bracket what is possible, while the medium is a reasonable estimate of what they can expect. He added that none of the scenarios have a dramatic impact on the facilities. **Michael Rosenberg** requested the data in order to create a fourth projection based on maximum population growth and the 15% water efficiency plan.

- In response to a question from **Karey Shinn**, **Mark Rupke** said that the numbers represent the average flow, rather than peaks, as that is what the facilities are rated on. **Karey Shinn** noted that it is the peaks that cause problems. **Mark Rupke** explained that those do not change with population growth, but rather have more to do with the sewer system. He noted that as sections of the sewer system are repaired, the peaks will decrease.
- **Connie Demb** asked how a new development in a previously undeveloped area, such as the greenwood racetrack, would affect the flow and contribute to an increase in the number of peaks. **Mark Rupke** said that new sewers would not contribute to peaks, as they would not be leaky or combined and therefore would not be affected by the heavy rain that causes the peaks.
- **Karen Buck** asked if there was a full report that the group could have access to. **Mark Rupke** said the report was done in 2003. In response to a question from **Jim Neff**, **Mark Rupke** said that the population projections have not changed since 2003.
- **Karen Buck** asked which consultant collected the data. **Mark Rupke** said there was a different consultant for each plant.
- **Connie Demb** asked what point they would have to reach before decisions would have to be made. **Mark Rupke** said that was subjective, but noted that they would want to allow ten years lead-time. He said if there were 3-4 years of increasing flow they would want to take a closer look at it.
- **Jim Neff** asked how much effect the peaks have on the overall averages. **Mark Rupke** said they would only affect a yearly average by about 1- 2 per cent.
- **Jim Neff** asked when they have to bypass after a storm. **Mark Rupke** replied that they bypass within a couple hours of it starting to rain.
- **William Sheehan** asked why it was difficult to accurately measure sewage. **Mark Rupke** said that this is because sewage is chunky.

**Mark Rupke** gave a brief presentation on the budgets for treatment plants across the city.

#### **Discussion:**

- **Karey Shinn** asked why the amount of polymer has gone down. **Mark Rupke** said it is likely due to better operation. They have brought some extra centrifuges on line and are now able to optimize equipment better.
- In response to a question from **Jim Neff**, **Mark Rupke** said that the cost for rebuilding the pelletizer does not really affect the budget as it is covered by

insurance. **William Sheehan** asked how much it is costing to rebuild the pelletizer. **Mark Rupke** said it would be better to ask Nancy Fleming at the ICMC meeting.

- **Doug Phillips** asked how many employees were working at the plants. **Mark Rupke** said he did not know numbers off the top of his head. **Doug Phillips** said that he believes they have gotten rid of four fifths of the staff over the last number of years. **Mark Rupke** said he did not think that was correct. **Karen Buck** said that in order to track any sort of change, they would have to have data on employee numbers over a number of years. She asked Mark Rupke whether that data is available publicly. **Mark Rupke** said he could find out.

Please Note: *Mark Rupke's presentations are available in hard copy upon request. Contact David Evans (416-392-3358 or devans2@toronto.ca)*

## 5.0 Mini-updates

### 5.1 Progress on ABTP Environmental Assessment

**Mark Rupke** reported that the Ministry of the Environment has decided that they do not need any additional information from the City, and are moving the EA through the approvals process.

**Karen Buck** said that Ashbridges Bay Treatment Plant NLC, the ICMC and signatories to the mediation agreement are concerned that there are still compliance issues with the mediation agreement.

### 5.2 Progress on Odour Control Implementation

**Mark Rupke** said that they are moving out of the engineering study phase into the pre-design phase. Pre-design work is underway in a number of areas including the pumping stations, the ventilation and odour control systems, and the preliminary treatment systems. They are hoping to have the consultant team present an update to the NLC in September.

### 5.3 Progress on Landscaping Site Plan and Implementation

**Mark Rupke** noted that some NLC members attended the interviews to select a landscaping architect. The selection team took the feedback from those in attendance, and has revised their scoring based on the interviews. They have short listed proponents and opened price envelopes. They are currently evaluating the prices, and will soon enter negotiations with the preferred proponent.

#### Discussion:

- **Karen Buck** asked how many proponents they are considering. **Mark Rupke** said he does not think he cannot release that information due to confidentiality. He would say that they opened more than one envelope. **Karen Buck** noted that two proponents were interviewed.

- **Michael Rosenberg** asked what criteria would be used to determine that someone was still in the running even though they did not get an interview. **Mark Rupke** replied that it would be based on the preliminary technical scoring as well whether they felt there was something to be gained by interviewing them.
- **Dave Hanna** asked whether they might consider a firm they were familiar with without giving that firm an interview if they did not feel an interview was necessary. **Mark Rupke** said this is hypothetically possible. **Dave Hanna** said he did not understand that at the interviews. **Michael Rosenberg** said he believed anyone in the running for a job like this should be interviewed. **Mark Rupke** said he agrees hypothetically, but he is unable to tell them how many people have been short-listed due to rules about confidentiality. He noted that, in general, people who were short-listed would be interviewed.
- **David Evans** asked, hypothetically, if the two firms that were interviewed were not acceptable, and they opened a third envelope, would that third firm get an interview. **Mark Rupke** said they likely would.
- **Dave Hanna** said that in the previous minutes it said people would sign a conflict of interest statement, when it was in fact a confidentiality agreement. **Mark Rupke** said the form specifies both. **Michael Rosenberg** said there should be two separate forms because in some cases only one or the other should be used.

#### 5.4 Progress on Draft Biosolids and Residuals Master Plan

**Mark Rupke** said that Nancy Fleming is working on the Terms of Reference for the peer review, as well as the expression of interest to industry for alternative means of biosolids management.

### 6.0 Other Business

**Connie Demb** said that David Done wanted to know the status of the characterization of biosolids by Ecotechnics on behalf of Falconbridge for a pilot project involving the use biosolids. **Mark Rupke** said that Nancy Fleming would know the status, but his understanding is that it is not happening.

**Connie Demb** said she was concerned that there was a hiatus between the last NLC meeting and this one due to the date of Works Committee. She said that she believes it is important for the NLC to meet monthly to prepare things that they would like to present to Works Committee.

***Connie Demb** motioned to have a monthly meeting. All were in Favour. Motion passed.*

**Mark Rupke** said he understands the desire to have monthly meetings, however the meetings are very costly to the City, and therefore they should only hold meetings when they have something specific to meet about.

### 7.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting has been set for **Thursday, June 1, 2006 at 7:00 PM**. The pre-meeting to discuss Works Committee agenda items will begin at 6:00 PM.

Action items and the adoption of the minutes from meeting #69 (March 2, 2006) will be discussed at the next meeting.

**Karey Shinn** requested that the NLC have a tour of the odour control pilot units in September. **Mark Rupke** said he would try to bring pictures to the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 9:21 p.m.