



## Ashbridges Bay Treatment Plant Neighbourhood Liaison Committee

Meeting #72

Wednesday, July 5, 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
Karey Shinn	Safe Sewage, Co-chair
Connie Demb	Beach Resident
David Done	Safe Sewage
John Hopkins	ICMC
David Hanna	Resident
Jim Neff	Resident
Michael Rosenberg	Economics of Technology Working Group
William Sheehan	Citizen
Aliss Terpstra	International Institute of Concern for Public Health
Jean Y. Urbain	Earth Tech
Alan Woods	Resident
Merril Woods	Resident
2 observers	

### REGRETS

Boris Mather	Tommy Thompson Park Advisory Committee
--------------	--

### STAFF

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

### MINUTES

Kaight Rehner

## **1.0 Welcome and Introductions**

### **1.1 Introductions**

**Karey Shinn** called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and everyone present introduced themselves.

## 1.2 Review and Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was reviewed and the following items were added:

- A motion regarding the creation of a biosolids beneficial use committee.
- A discussion of the Request for Expression of Interest for biosolids beneficial use management options at the ABTP.
- An update on the pelletizer.

The agenda was approved as amended.

## 1.3 Facilitator's Report re: minutes/agenda on website

**David Evans** informed the NLC that the sign-in lists will now be used solely for changes in contact information. He reported that he has had fairly good response to the cover letter re: internet access to agenda and minutes. Responses are continuing to come in.

## 2.0 Review of Works Committee

**Karey Shinn** explained that the Works Committee met today, and members of the NLC held a pre-meeting to discuss Works Committee items pertaining to the ABTP. They discussed items #13 and #18.

### *#13- Collaborative Research Funding for Development of Sludge Characterization Techniques for Optimizing Anaerobic Digestion*

The item is a request for \$85,000 to co-operate with the District of Columbia on an anaerobic biosolids characterization study.

The NLC wanted to know the following:

How does this characterization relate to the work being done by Falconbridge?

What does the ABTP expect to get out of this characterization?

Is this a chemical study or a computer model?

Will this characterization lead to a reduction in odour?

**Mark Rupke** said he could speak to these questions, as it is his project. He explained that this characterization is not directly related to the work being done by Falconbridge. This study is being undertaken to develop a fundamental theoretical understanding of anaerobic processes and sludge characteristics, particularly, which characteristics affect how well a particular sludge digests. The work is being done to be able to assess technologies that claim to make sludge break down faster. It is a lab-based study with practical implications. They are using both lab testing and computer modeling.

They are requesting money for phase two of this project. In phase one, they used laboratory techniques to understand the digestion process, as well as computer models of aerobic digestion. In phase two, they are taking the techniques and models and starting to pre-treat the sludge to measure any changes.

**Mark Rupke** said they will be looking at odours in a later phase of the project.

**Discussion:**

- In response to a question from **Jim Neff**, **Mark Rupke** said they are working with the District of Columbia because they have similar interests and have worked with them before. This study was actually started by D.C. and Toronto has piggybacked onto their project. He noted that currently Toronto and D.C. are the only cities working on the project, though they are also trying to get New York involved.
- **John Hopkins** asked whether this project would involve Hamilton sewage. **Mark Rupke** replied that while Hamilton is not involved, they are testing sludge from different plants around the area, including Burlington.
- **Connie Demb** asked whether there was any indication that they might be able to use technology to reduce the amount of biosolids. **Mark Rupke** replied that some pre-treatments claim to be able to do this, but at this point there is nothing to support that claim. They are currently exploring this.
- **Connie Demb** asked how long this study would take in relation to the already existing odour control project. She is concerned that they will install technology to control odour before first developing technology to pre-treat biosolids to reduce odour. **Mark Rupke** explained that the biosolids odour control is a very small part of the overall odour control at the plant, and the odour control project is not focusing on the biosolids.
- **Jim Neff** asked whether they would have to break sludges into smaller matter for UV treatment. **Mark Rupke** said that UV is only used to treat effluent, not sludges.

*#18- Downspout Disconnection Program*

**Karey Shinn** noted that they requested this information before. The report from Lou Di Geronimo mentions a downspout disconnection study. They would like a copy of this study. She noted that the study was asked for at the June 14 City Council meeting and then requested by Works Committee.

**Action item #1: David Evans to provide the NLC with the report on downspout disconnection.**

**Karey Shinn** said that they also briefly discussed the contract for purchasing more Ferrous Chloride. She asked **Mark Rupke** whether anything else could be used instead of Ferrous Chloride. **Mark Rupke** replied that anything else would be more expensive.

### 3.0 Review of Action Items

Action Item #6 Meeting #69: Karey Shinn and Karen Buck to write a letter requesting to be kept informed of any impacts the August 19, 2005 storm had on the ABTP or the feeder sewers.

- **Mark Rupke** said that the storm had no effect on the plant.

Action Item #1 Meeting #70: Karey Shinn and Karen Buck 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.

- **David Evans** said he emailed a City contact, who responded by saying “If you are looking for WBT sampling data – I have none. If you would like beach monitoring data, I can get that for you. Pls let me know...I know that the UV system at WBT is still not operational.”
- **Karey Shinn** said they would like a copy of the beach monitoring data going back ten years if possible.
- **John Hopkins** said that Saturday’s Toronto Star said that the UV was operational.

**Action item #2: David Evans to request beach monitoring data going back ten years.**

**Action item #3: Karen Buck to pursue data on the Western Beaches Tunnel from the Wet Weather Flow group.**

Action Item #1 Meeting #71: *Connie Demb to write a letter to Works Committee expressing concern about Republic landfill’s decision to stop accepting Toronto sludge.*

- **Connie Demb** said that this item should have stated that she would draft a letter for Karen Buck’s signature to be submitted to Jim Neff for review.
- Completed. Letter attached to the draft minutes.

Action Item #2 Meeting #71: *David Evans to provide the ABTP NLC with the minutes from the Highland Creek Treatment Plant Neighbourhood Liaison Committee’s September 2005 meeting.*

- **David Evans** said that he will be able to get these minutes from Nancy Martins when she returns to work in August.
- **David Evans** asked William Sheehan to see if he has a copy of these minutes.
- In progress.

Connie Demb said that the following action item was left off of the minutes of meeting #70:

Action Item #2 Meeting #70: *David Done to ask Nancy Fleming for information about the status of the characterization of biosolids by Ecotechnics on behalf of Falconbridge for a pilot project involving the use biosolids.*

- In progress.
- **Connie Demb** noted that this was included in their letter to Works Committee. She would like to know what happened to the letter, as it was not on the Works Committee agenda.
- **Michael Rosenberg** suggested contacting the chair of Works Committee to find out why it was not included on the agenda. **Karey Shinn** said they could contact Deputy Mayor Bussin. **John Hopkins** asked whether Deputy Mayor Bussin was the best person to contact about this, as she is no longer on the Works Committee. **Karey Shinn** said that she often attends the meetings and is very involved in this issue.
- **Connie Demb** said that this letter was with regards to the issue of the loss of the landfill site in Michigan, which was being discussed. **William Sheehan** said that this item was discussed in camera.

**Action Item #4 Karey Shinn and Karen Buck to contact Deputy Mayor Sandra Bussin to determine what happened to the letter of support for the beneficial use program and get the letter included on the Works Committee agenda if it has not already been discussed.**

Jim Neff said that the following action item was left off of the minutes of meeting #71:

Action Item #3 Meeting #71: *Chris Krueger assisted by Karen Buck to contact Deputy Mayor Sandra Bussin's office regarding the status of soil testing and contamination at the skateboard park.*

- **David Evans** said that this is a Parks and Rec. project. **Mark Rupke** confirmed this.
- In progress.

## **4.0 Mini-Updates**

### **4.1 Progress on ABTP Environmental Assessment**

**Mark Rupke** reported that there has been no progress on the EA approval from the Ministry of the Environment. The Ministry is working towards bringing it to cabinet for approval. They anticipate that it will be moved forward in the fall. He noted that Kevin Plautz is moving to the Ministry of Transportation, and therefore there will be someone new dealing with their file.

### **4.2 Progress on Odour Control Implementation**

**Mark Rupke** said that they are currently nearing the end of the pre-design process for several major components including the D building, process upgrades, and the M&T building odour controls. In the next couple of weeks, they will be conducting a value-

engineering workshop to ensure that the City is getting the maximum value for their money. He explained that the project is a plant-wide initiative to try to reduce odours from the entire plant and involves many components.

The D building houses the preliminary processes like grit removal and screening. In that building, they are automating the grit removal system so that it will stay enclosed and release less odorous air. They are upgrading the screens to avoid flooding. They are changing the diffusion system from a coarse bubble aeration system to a fine bubble system. This will use a lot less air so that there is less air to treat for odour. They are currently testing different types of diffusers to make sure they don't fail.

**Mark Rupke** showed slides of the odour control project on his laptop. He explained that they are nearing the end of the testing phase for the pilot biofilters in the parking lot and said that they have been getting some reasonable results from the units.

### **Discussion:**

- **John Hopkins** asked whether they add oxygen to the stream. **Mark Rupke** said that they just add air. They would need different tanks to add oxygen.
- **Connie Demb** asked whether the odour control had the potential to affect the odour of the biosolids. **Mark Rupke** said this is unlikely. He does not know of anything that they can do within the treatment plant to significantly reduce odour from the biosolids.
- **Connie Demb** asked whether the odour from the biosolids is consistent with other cities. **Mark Rupke** said that everyone else who used high solid centrifuges experiences the same odour. Most large cities, including New York, Los Angeles, and Ottawa use this process.
- In response to a question from **Jim Neff**, **Mark Rupke** said that pelletizing greatly reduces the odour of the final product.
- **Someone** asked how they are testing the biofilters if they are not pelletizing. **Mark Rupke** said the pelletizer has its own odour control system. It uses all of its odorous air within the formula that heats the pelletizer.
- **Connie Demb** asked if the plant's boiler was heated by methane from biosolids or natural gas. **Mark Rupke** said it was originally heated by natural gas. They have since looked at burning methane, but he is not sure whether this has been implemented. **Connie Demb** asked how much methane is currently being flared off. **Mark Rupke** said that, unfortunately, most of it is currently being flared due to problems with the hot water boiler system. He stressed that they do not like flaring methane. He explained that they usually have an excess of methane in the summer, but in the winter they have to bring in more fuel to heat the plant.
- **Michael Rosenberg** asked whether the excess fuel could be used to run the pelletizer. **Mark Rupke** said he is not sure; they have done an economic assessment looking at how much fuel they would need for each of the processes at the plant, and whether or not cogeneration would be practical. He has not seen the details of this report, but he will ask Nancy Fleming if it's available.
- **William Sheehan** asked how long they have been burning off methane. **Mark Rupke** replied that they have been burning it on and off forever, but they have

had to burn it due to boiler problems since April/May. He's not sure when it will be fixed as they are currently in litigation with the manufacturer of the boiler. Some flaring will likely continue for the rest of the summer.

- **David Done** asked why the odour levels of the cake have been higher lately due to the shearing in the centrifuges and pumping the cake to the loading facility. **Mark Rupke** said that it has to do with a disruption in the biology of the cake. There is something disrupting one type of bacteria that usually eats a lot of the odour, and therefore it is building up. **Connie Demb** asked whether storing the cake during periods when it is more odorous would reduce the odour. **Mark Rupke** said that some facilities are able to do this, but the ABTP has nowhere to store it.
- **Aliss Terpstra** asked whether all big cities have high solids centrifuges. **Mark Rupke** said high solids centrifuges create a cake with much less water. Without it, it would take twice as many trucks to ship it.
- **Michael Rosenberg** asked whether they could reduce the amount of organic material through a longer digestion process. **Mark Rupke** said doubling the digestion time would only decrease the amount of material by a couple percent.

**Action Item #5: Mark Rupke to ask Nancy Fleming for economic assessment looking at the possibility of using methane from biosolids to run various processes within the plant.**

#### **4.3 Progress on Landscaping Site Plan and Implementation**

**Mark Rupke** said that the award report recommending a landscape architect will be going forward any day now. **David Evans** requested the results as soon as they are available to be distributed to NLC members. **Mark Rupke** explained that once they have made the recommendation to Bid Committee they will be able to start the project. He noted that some things are already underway including the Leslie Street greening and the skateboard park.

##### **Discussion:**

- **Karen Buck** asked whether they would be taking the report to council. **Mark Rupke** said it will go to Bid Committee rather than council.
- **Karey Shinn** asked about public input into the landscaping. **Mark Rupke** said that the landscape architect will be required to consult with the NLC. **Karey Shinn** said she is concerned that the proponents seemed to think that the landscaping plan was a crude outline to be altered. She does not want to see the plan become altered to the point that it is not longer recognizable. **Mark Rupke** said that there will be consultation early in the process. The RFP is pretty clear that the existing plan is what they will be moving forward on.

#### **4.4 Water Quality Monitoring**

**Mark Rupke** explained that the monitors have been deployed for the year. The monitoring will be similar to previous years and he will present the results when they are available.

#### 4.5 Pelletizer Update

**Mark Rupke** said that reconstruction of the pelletizer is underway, and the pelletizer should be restarted next spring.

##### Discussion:

- **William Sheehan** asked how much it is costing to rebuild the pelletizer and what effect it would have on the City's insurance premium. **Mark Rupke** said he did not have the answer to either question, but noted that it cost \$23 million to build the first time.
- **Michael Rosenberg** said that they were told the pelletizer would be done by the end of the year. **Mark Rupke** said they are experiencing delays.
- **Michael Rosenberg** asked whether Republic would be willing to take pellets if they end up having to landfill the pellets. **Mark Rupke** said they would have to ask Nancy Fleming.
- **Connie Demb** asked whether they were currently doing any quality testing of the pellets. **Mark Rupke** said that construction is underway, but they are not at that stage yet.
- **Karen Buck** asked if they were aware of the pelletizer that is being built in the Chicago area. **Mark Rupke** said that Nancy Fleming would know about it. **Jean Y. Urbain** said it is in a very small community outside of Chicago.

**Action Item #6: Mark Rupke to ask Nancy Fleming whether Republic Landfill in Michigan would be willing to take pellets.**

**Action Item #7: Mark Rupke to ask Nancy Fleming the reason for the delay in the rebuilding of the pelletizer.**

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

**Mark Rupke** said there is nothing to update as it is still out for public comment.

##### Discussion:

- **David Done** requested an update on whether Greenlane landfill will be taking sewer sludge from the ABTP. **Mark Rupke** said they are exploring all of their options and the REOI is still on the street until July 12.
- **Connie Demb** brought the NLC's attention to the REOI for the Provision of Specialized Services for Alternative Biosolids Beneficial Use Management Options at the ABTP. On page 3, item 2.1 the document says that the current plan for beneficial use is to have 50% of the biosolids applied to agricultural land and 50% converted into pellets. She asked how this deals with the other potential beneficial use applications. **David Evans** said that is the current plan,

but 1.0 appears to say that they want to expand that to include anything that is lawful, technically feasible, environmentally sound and reliable.

- **Connie Demb** noted that on page 4 the document describes loading. They were told that pumping may have an impact on odour. **Mark Rupke** replied that pumping takes some time, and allows odours to develop. He explained that odours peak at 4-7 days. **Connie Demb** asked whether using a conveyor belt would help control odours. **Mark Rupke** said that it would, but they do not have the room for it. **Connie Demb** asked whether using rail instead of trucks might ease this problem. **Mark Rupke** said it would not. **Jean Y. Urbain** said this would cause more odour problems. **Jim Neff** suggested that it could be barged.
- In response to a question from **Connie Demb**, **David Evans** said he believes section 4 (b) ii, and iii, reinforces the idea that the City is open to a variety of solutions. **Connie Demb** asked whether the City would move forward with an RFP if an acceptable solution was found through the REOI. **Mark Rupke** said yes.
- **Connie Demb** asked whether the City would be open to other cost structures in order to avoid another crisis situation. **Mark Rupke** said that they need to find a solution, however they have an obligation to do it in an economical manner.
- In regards to section 4 (b) v., which asks for contingency planning, **Connie Demb** asked what contingencies will be accepted. **David Evans** replied that the document states on page 3 that anything would be considered as long as it's lawful, technically feasible, environmentally sound and reliable.
- **William Sheehan** said that the definition of beneficial use has been changing. According to the wording on page 3 of the REOI, beneficial use may be anything that is lawful, technically feasible, environmentally sound and reliable.
- **Michael Rosenberg** said it is unclear whether the City is asking for any beneficial use that is lawful, technically feasible, environmentally sound and reliable or anything that meets those requirements. He asked whether someone would be able to propose landfill, even though it is not a beneficial use. **Mark Rupke** said that he believes the document is not restrictive and people are free to submit anything, however it is up to the City to decide which options it chooses to pursue. **Michael Rosenberg** questioned why this document was called the beneficial use program if they are willing to consider anything. He thinks the REOI was intended to only include beneficial use.
- **Michael Rosenberg** asked why the REOI is only asking for 25,000 tonnes and why they would not consider a proposal for a use for the pellets. **Mark Rupke** said 25,000 tonnes sets a scale, and explained that they could have four or five solutions for up to 25,000.
- **Karen Buck** said asked why there is no redundancy included when there is a 1/3 redundancy current two contracts for pellets. **Mark Rupke** replied that the REOI asks respondents to identify whether they can take more than 25,000 tonnes.
- **Dave Hanna** asked why the landscaping project did not get an REOI. **Mark Rupke** replied that, in this case, they are seeking a variety of solutions, whereas in the case of landscaping, they were looking for specifics. An REOI is exploratory.

- **Connie Demb** asked how this REOI came about and whether it was approved by Council. **Mark Rupke** replied that it was approved by purchasing. **Karey Shinn** said that it originated at Works Committee when Lou Di Geronimo was put on the spot because he did not have an alternative to shipping biosolids to Michigan. It was a direct response to the crisis.

## 5.0 Other Business

*David Done Motioned that:*

***The Ashbridges Bay Treatment Plant Neighbourhood Liaison Committee strongly supports the establishment of the Biosolids Beneficial Use Committee chaired by Deputy Mayor Sandra Bussin, with Terms of Reference guided by the 1999 Mediator's Report to expedite the implementation of the 100% biosolids beneficial use program for the Ashbridges Bay Treatment Plant.***

### **Discussion:**

- **David Done** said he believes it is important for the community to be involved in this process since it was politically internally controversial at City Hall.
- **William Sheehan** said he feels this motion may be premature. He thinks that they should first define beneficial use, as the City seems to have moved beyond the Mediator's Report with their definition. He would also like more information about the committee before voicing support for it. **David Done** replied that the motion puts the committee within the context of the definition of beneficial use in the Mediator's Report.
- **Connie Demb** suggested that the first order of business for the committee should be to review the process for the Expression of Interest. **David Done** suggested that they should clarify beneficial use excludes energy from waste (EFW) technologies. **Connie Demb** said it's defined in the Mediator's Report. **Jim Neff** suggested that the definition be pulled from the Mediator's Report and quoted.

*Seven were in favour. One was opposed. Motion was passed.*

The motion will be sent to Works Committee, with copies sent to Lou Di Geronimo and Mayor David Miller.

## 6.0 Review and Approval of Minutes from NLC Meetings #70 and #71

The minutes from meetings #70 and #71 were amended. The minutes from meeting #70 were approved. The minutes from #71 were approved in principal. NLC members have until the end of the month to submit additional changes to David Evans.

The final version of the minutes will be available on the website.

## **7.0 Next Meeting**

The next meeting has been set for **Thursday, August 17, 2006 at 7:00 PM.**

Meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.