



**Ashbridges Bay Treatment Plant (ABTP) Neighbourhood  
Liaison Committee  
Meeting #79**

Mennonite New Life Centre, 1774 Queen St. East  
Tuesday, May 8, 2007  
7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

**Attendance:**

Karen Buck	Citizens for a Safe Environment, Co-chair
Constance Demb	Beach Resident
John Hopkins	ICMC
Jim Neff	Citizens for a Safe Environment
Hy Schwartz	Resident
Karey Shinn	NLC Co-chair
Stephen Whyte	Resident of South Riverdale and ICMC member

Mark Rupke	Senior Engineer, Toronto Water
Shiri Pasternak	Facilitator, City of Toronto

Jean Yves Urbain    Earth Tech

**REGRETS:**

David Done            Safe Sewage

**MINUTES:**

Anne-Marie Anderson

## **1.0 Welcome and Introductions**

**Karey Shinn** called the meeting to order at 7:11 p.m. and everyone introduced themselves. **Mark Rupke's** reports on the annual budget and flow forecast were added to the agenda under Updates. **Hy Schwartz's** presentation on water meters was added to the agenda under Other Business.

## **2.0 Review of Action Items**

Meeting #77, Action Item #1:

- Completed. **Shiri Pasternak** reported that David Evans already created a mailing list for NLC. It is the most updated list and sends the agenda to everyone on the NLC. The email list that Shiri sends out with the Minutes is also the most updated list. For legal reasons, she cannot bring in the master list for review.

- **Karey Shinn** asked about people that have fallen off the list (i.e. Millie) and **Shiri Pasternak** replied that nobody can release contact information without a person's exclusive permission. However, **Karey Shinn** noted that she simply wanted to ensure that Millie was on the list in the first place.

Action Item #1:

**Karen Buck** to call Sandra Bussin and request contact information for Millie.

- In response to a question from **Jim Neff**, **Shiri Pasternak** responded that the people that attended the last ABTP meeting are on the list. If anyone is not on the list, it is because they did not respond to mailings from David Evans. **Karen Buck** asked if David Evans gave Shiri the master list and **Shiri Pasternak** replied that David had sent a letter to all members, asking if they would like to receive agendas every month or just be notified of special events. As a result, there is a long list of people who want to be informed of public meetings and then a short list for people who want both agendas and minutes for each upcoming meeting.
- **Connie Demb** asked Shiri Pasternak how many people are on each list. **Shiri Pasternak** replied that the bigger list has approximately 100 people and the shorter list has 30-40 people, including city staff. **Jim Neff** asked if those numbers include the people who attended the last meeting and **Shiri Pasternak** said, yes.

Action Item #2:

**Shiri Pasternak** to report back to ABTP on actual numbers of members in the short list and long list, broken down by city, staff, members of the public and consultants.

Meeting #77, Action Item #2:

- Ongoing.
- **Mark Rupke** indicated that he had the fire marshall report but had to ask the Assistant Deputy Fire Marshall of the province for consent before distributing it. A clause on the front page notes that this report was provided in confidence and cannot be copied without the Fire Marshall's consent.

Meeting #77, Action Item #3:

- Ongoing.
- **Karen Buck** asked why tokens are not distributed at each meeting and **Shiri Pasternak** noted that it would be a logistical nightmare.
- **Jim Neff** asked what is the current ongoing process of distribution and **Shiri Pasternak** replied that the City introduced a new process of giving everyone reimbursements at the end of each year. Originally, people had to fill out expense claims and she feels that this worked well because it meant that members took responsibility for letting her know how many claims they had. **Shiri Pasternak** suggested that members with outstanding token claims inform her of these and she will bring the tokens to the next meeting. Henceforth, tokens to be distributed yearly through expense claim forms.

- **Jim Neff** asked if these expense forms must be filed by a certain date and **Shiri Pasternak** said she was not sure, but that it makes the most sense to deal with finances at the end of each year.

Meeting #77, Action Item #4

- Completed. **Mark Rupke** is prepared to give a presentation on Wastewater and Biosolids Quality Trends this evening (see Section 3.0).

Meeting #77, Action Item #5

- Completed. **Mark Rupke** brought a copy of the Biosolid Master Plan Peer Review Request for Proposal (RFP) to the last meeting. The RFP has already closed.
- **Karey Shinn** asked what was the next step and **Mark Rupke** said they are going through a selection process and will be hiring a facilitation team to coordinate the peer review. **Karey Shinn** asked how many applications there were and **Mark Rupke** said there were three.
- In response to a question from **Stephen Whyte**, **Mark Rupke** confirmed that the comment period on the peer review was over but the master plan itself is still open.

Meeting #77, Action Item #6

- Ongoing.
- **Karey Shinn** said Michael Rosenberg was to write this letter to Joanna Kidd.

Action Item #3:

**Shiri Pasternak** to email Joanna Kidd's contact information to Karey Shinn.

Meeting #77, Action Item #7

- Completed.

Meeting #77, Action Item #8

- Completed.

Meeting #78, Action Item #9

- Completed. **Shiri Pasternak** reported that the City will not compensate taxi cab fare.

### 3.0 Wastewater and Biosolids Quality Trends presentation

**Mark Rupke** noted that he has updated the biosolids trends. The biosolids quality reflects wastewater quality coming into the plant. Changes in influent show up as changes in biosolids. He presented graphs for the 11 regulated metals in biosolids, starting in January 1978 to the end of 2006. The graphs reflect changes in biosolids quality after the new sewer use by-law; most levels are very flat and well below the MOE criteria limit. Metals included: cadmium, arsenic, cobalt, chromium, copper (the City is closest to the limit for copper), mercury, molybdenum, nickel, lead, selenium and zinc. **Karen Buck** asked when the implementation of the by-law occurred and **Karey**

**Shinn** said it was January 2000. **Mark Rupke** added that the bylaw was updated in 2000, and that a sewer use bylaw had been in place for several years before that.

The following is a summary of ABTP questions and discussion:

- **John Hopkins** asked if people who do not comply are fined and **Mark Rupke** said yes, inspectors encourage companies through the P2 planning process to be good environmental stewards, but they do also fine violators.
- **Jim Neff** asked what each dot indicated and **Mark Rupke** said that each dot is one sample. **Mark Rupke** confirmed for **Karen Buck** and **Jim Neff** that the unit of measure is parts per million.
- In response to a question from **Connie Demb**, **Mark Rupke** said that the fertilizer act is federal legislation.
- **Karen Buck** asked what the high sample spots in mercury were and **Mark Rupke** said they could be random variations in sampling and analysis. It is not likely they are mercury being dumped into the system because they are single isolated points. Real changes would appear as trends over several samples. **Karen Buck** asked what puts mercury into the system and **Mark Rupke** replied that it comes largely from eating fish and from fillings in teeth.
- **Connie Demb** asked if the clustering of dots represents all the samples and **Mark Rupke** said yes, they are taken every two weeks.
- **Mark Rupke** said that generally, most of the metals have downward trends, with a plateau at the end, with the exception of selenium. Most selenium is presumed to be coming from dandruff shampoo products.
- **Jim Neff** asked if zinc is toxic in the water at the level recorded and **Mark Rupke** said no, although, like anything, it would be potentially toxic at some level.
- In response to a question from **Connie Demb**, **Mark Rupke** replied that it is easiest to measure biosolids (with respect to levels in sewage before it is separated) where it is most concentrated. Most change is due to changes in influent. **Connie Demb** asked about the effect of effluent water after treatment. **Mark Rupke** said that removal will be some percentage of what came in. Most have a high percentage. Many of the metals are non-detectable in the effluent.
- **Jim Neff** asked if the copper is in the plumbing. **Mark Rupke** said yes. **Jim Neff** asked if the metals in solder show up as well. **Mark Rupke** said that compared to the amount of copper, little solder comes into contact with water. **Jim Neff** asked why would there be more copper and **Mark Rupke** explained that tap water slowly eats away at the copper pipes.
- **Jim Neff** asked if electrolysis has an impact. **Mark Rupke** replied that it is just due to the aggressive nature of water. **Connie Demb** asked about the impact of fluoride and **Mark Rupke** said it likely has little or no impact.
- **Karen Buck** asked for testing protocols to be included when the presentation is posted on-line. She did not want the protocol in particular, but rather, details such as how often testing is done, how many grab samples are plotted, etc.

Action Item #4:

- a) **Staff** to bring some printed copies of the Wastewater and Biosolids Quality Trends presentation to next meeting.
- b) The presentation to be made available on-line, along with testing protocols.

#### 4.0 Mini-Updates, Mark Rupke

##### *Pelletizer*

The pelletizer is in commissioning. They are heating things up and getting all the individual parts working. Performance testing should be done this summer. **Karen Buck** asked if they have an amended Certificate of Approval (C of A) and **Mark Rupke** said it did not need to be amended on the sewage side. **Jean Yves Urbain** noted there was no update to the C of A on the air side either. In response to a question from **Karen Buck**, **Mark Rupke** noted that these were the only two C of A's. **Karen Buck** asked if the original C of A's are still intact and **Mark Rupke** said yes. **Hy Schwartz** asked if the City has succeeded in getting customers to buy any of the pellets produced. **Mark Rupke** answered that the City is still negotiating with Veolia but he does not believe they will have trouble finding customers. There are several markets available. **Jim Neff** asked when there will be a product and **Mark Rupke** said in the summer.

##### Action Item #5:

**Mark Rupke** to determine if Veolia has any customers.

**Karen Buck** asked what kinds of regulations are put on Veolia in terms of where they can market pellets. Are they allowed to market to an incinerator? A kiln? Or to some other industry that will use it as fuel? **Mark Rupke** replied that any restrictions would be part of the agreement being negotiated with Veolia, and he was not aware of the details.

##### Action Item #6:

**Mark Rupke** to report on details about restrictions put on Veolia in terms of where they can market pellets.

**Karen Buck** stated that we still have a Mediation Agreement that says that the biosolids will go into a 100% beneficial use program; these other contingencies are not a choice set out under the Mediation Agreement. **Connie Demb** noted that NLC passed a motion to this effect in the fall that was made as a communication to the City. **Karen Buck** asked if this motion was forwarded to staff and politicians. **Mark Rupke** noted that it was communicated to the City and recorded in the Minutes.

##### Action Item #7:

To find the original Motion, put it on the agenda and redirect it to City Legal re: Contract Wording.

**John Hopkins** asked who is in charge of selling products and **Mark Rupke** said this would be dependent on the agreement with Veolia.

## **EA**

There was nothing new from the Ministry to report. The City is waiting for the Minister to sign the EA. **Stephen Whyte** added that a letter from Paul Heeney, project coordinator at the EAAB branch, indicated that it is still at the planner's desk, but will go to the Minister soon. The project officer of the approvals branch is Gavin Battarino.

## **Odour Control Project**

This is continuing along. They are moving into air management strategy and trying to determine where the biofilters will be, how many filters, etc. They are moving into a value engineering of pre-design in May.

**Karen Buck** explained that many people are being affected by odours from the plant. What is the current odour reporting protocol? **Mark Rupke** said that if someone smells something, they should phone the treatment plant. The number is (416) 392-5150. **Karen Buck** asked what happens after that and **Mark Rupke** explained that once a call comes in, it goes to a control room where operators create an odour report sheet identifying time, date, issues, nature of odour, wind direction. They check the plant for problems and investigate anything unusual, particularly if they receive a number of complaints in a short period of time. Usually, it is the result of calm winds. **Karen Buck** asked if there was any verification of the odour at the time that the call goes in and **Mark Rupke** answered that staff sometimes go out into the community, but not always. **Karen Buck** noted that as a result, the City can't be sure if it is odour coming from the plant or something else and **Mark Rupke** agreed. **Karen Buck** asked how many complaints would concern them enough to start investigating. **Mark Rupke** said that 2 or 3 complaints in a week would raise concern. For example, in 2006 they did not have any complaints. **Karen Buck** disagreed, saying that she knew of two people that called in. **Mark Rupke** said that the plant did not receive these complaints.

**Connie Demb** reported that a Letter to the Editor has appeared in the Star, complaining about odours while driving on the Lakeshore. **Mark Rupke** said he had heard about this letter but had not read it. **Connie Demb** asked if the City is putting out press releases to all major media about the odour control project, to inform them of the timetable and let them know it will be coming under control. **Mark Rupke** said they have done mail drops and advertising but no press releases. They have been using this committee as their primary contact with the local community. **Stephen Whyte** suggested working with the Communications department and **Mark Rupke** said this was something to consider.

**Jim Neff** suggested that the telephone number for reporting odour complaints should be made more prominent in the Minutes. **Mark Rupke** agreed.

### Action Item #8

**Staff** to display odour complaints telephone reporting number prominently on first page of Minutes.

**Stephen Whyte** said that given the fact that we have projects for the odour control program, when you get into design, which part of the project will go up for detail design

first? Which will be ready for final design? **Jean Yves Urbain** replied that they have started the M, T and D buildings. This will go out for bidding in the fall (to January) and construction will start in the spring. **Stephen Whyte** asked how they will get a C of A and **Jean Yves Urbain** replied that they are not allowed to request bids without a permit. **Stephen Whyte** asked if it takes a long time before you get it from the Ministry. **Mark Rupke** said they have been preparing for a C of A for quite a while. **Jean Yves Urbain** noted that they cannot wait for the detail design because this would take too long. His personal deadline is in June. The M & T buildings should be ready in the Fall to December and then construction will start in spring of 2008. The biofilter will follow a year later, but they have to determine the master plan air management first and then do detail design to get a permit. **Stephen Whyte** asked if there was a problem finding the location of the final large building. By the time that they finish the detail design, will they know the location? **Jean Yves Urbain** said yes, in the Fall.

**Karen Buck** asked if buildings M, T and D are those identified as having the greatest impact. **Jean Yves Urbain** said that the greatest impact area is in aeration and P building (part of the project not covered by Earth Tech's contract); it includes some uncovered primary tanks and will take about 6 years. The aeration will also take several years as the City cannot take more than 2 tanks a year out of service from construction provide more than 2 tanks a year for construction.

**Jim Neff** said that regarding public relations, people are complaining about odours from the sewage plant but the problem is most likely the commercial asphalt roofing plant. Since the sewage plant is getting a bad reputation because of the roofing plant, do we have any way to communicate this? **Karey Shinn** suggested a press release noting that we are undertaking an odour control mitigation project. **Mark Rupke** said that the City did advertise. **Shiri Pasternak** suggested that members write letters to the editor. **Stephen Whyte** noted that they should write something up to alleviate resident concerns.

**Mark Rupke** noted that typically, such press releases do not get picked up but **Stephen Whyte** noted that the water plants issue got picked up. **Connie Demb** said that the letter to the Editor that she previously mentioned asked how the City can be promoting waterfront development when it stinks. An official should respond to this letter and explain that this is a timing issue and an implementation plan is actually available. We should communicate that the City is addressing the waterfront issue. This will improve the waterfront.

**Karen Buck** asked Shiri if she notifies all the political people in the neighbourhood when a mailing goes out. **Shiri Pasternak** said she does inform people like Sandra Bussin. **Karen Buck** asked about provincial and federal members. **Shiri Pasternak** replied that someone from the MPP is on the email list. **Connie Demb** listed several councillors who should be informed: Bussin, Fletcher, Davis.

Action Item #9:

**Shiri Pasternak** to ensure that all appropriate political figures are on the mailing list.

**Shiri Pasternak** to contact Local MPP offices (Peter Tabuns, Michael Prue) as well as Jack Layton to ask them if, on behalf of NLC, they would like to be on our mailing list.

In response to a question from **Karen Buck**, **Shiri Pasternak** said that Maria Minna (MP) is already on the list.

**Karen Buck** asked if, when you apply for a C of A, does it automatically go on the EBR? **Mark Rupke** said no. **Jean Yves Urbain** said that under section 9, they are exempt. **Jean Yves Urbain** confirmed **Karen Buck's** statement that industries only have a 30 day listing.

### ***Landscaping***

The City is arranging their initial meeting with the consultants, Envision Group and Earth Tech, in June. **Karey Shinn** asked if Suzanne Barrett was the representative from Envision Group. **Mark Rupke** was not sure. Bob Dobbins is the rep from Earth Tech.

### Action Item #10:

**Mark Rupke** to report on who is the representative from Envision Group.

**Karey Shinn** asked if we will have a presentation from the representatives in the fall and **Mark Rupke** replied that this was likely. **Karen Buck** asked if this was a consultation project. **Mark Rupke** said there is allowance for consultation, but less than during the conceptual design stage.

### ***Biosolids***

This is moving along well; they are continuing to manage the biosolids application program. With the warm weather, they are now getting to land and are typically getting 6-8 trucks/day to fields. The balance of trucks are still going to landfills. The City is finalizing the selection process and will be holding the peer review of the draft biosolids and residuals master plan over the summer into the fall. Once complete, the City will revise the biosolids master plan.

**Connie Demb** said that although Mark Rupke noted that the balance is going to landfill, the biosolids committee had presented again by Nancy Fleming in February that noted there were a number of other places biosolids were going to i.e. Quebec, for composting. Why are trucks going to landfill? **Mark Rupke** said that some composting is still going on but, land application and landfill are the primary destinations. The program is considerably diversified so that there are many locations, although many are landfills. **Connie Demb** asked how many trucks were moving each day. **Mark Rupke** said that there were 22-23 on average during the week and there is less haulage on the weekends (but still some). With respect to the 6-8 trucks going to land application, he is not sure if that is part of or extra to the total of 22-23. **Connie Demb** asked for more details and **Mark Rupke** noted he is already planning an update to the ICMC.

### Action Item #11:

**Mark Rupke** to provide a full breakout of truck hauling details.

**Hy Schwartz** said that landfills are not customers because owners of landfill are not paying us money for stuff going there.

**Stephen Whyte** asked if anything is being done on the Coatsworth Cut CSO project (with respect to biosolids) and **Mark Rupke** explained that there is pre-design work under way as well as work on preparing the draft report. **Stephen Whyte** asked if Toronto Water will invite consultants to speak to us regarding the draft report. Will there be any further public consultation? **Shiri Pasternak** noted that one more consultation has been planned for Tuesday, June 12. In response to a question from **Karey Shinn**, **Shiri Pasternak** said that the consultation will be advertised in community newspapers and flyers will be sent out to stakeholder groups, ICMC, NLC. **Stephen Whyte** asked if there will be a flyer drop and **Shiri Pasternak** said probably not; project managers feel that stakeholders and resident associations would disseminate information more effectively.

**Connie Demb** asked if the consultation will be an actual meeting unlike the previous outdoor open houses and **Shiri Pasternak** noted that it would be held upstairs at the Mennonite Centre. There will be an open house with a half hour presentation followed by Q & A.

**Jim Neff** noted, regarding the biosolids use program, that New York State has a different method of measuring and rating materials than the Quebec plant. Their standards are different so they measure contaminants differently. He got this information from Sludge Watch but it is not sufficient to understand the impact. In response to a question from **Karey Shinn**, **Mark Rupke** said it was likely biosolids that were not able to be composted in Quebec were sent to landfill in New York State.

**Karen Buck** asked if Mark meant that things cannot be composted because of capacity issues and **Mark Rupke** said yes. **Karen Buck** asked if they are going to **Conporec** and **Mark Rupke** said he did not know. **Karen Buck** asked what is the likelihood that New York will reject biosolids like Michigan State has and **Mark Rupke** said that the Michigan landfill gave up its ability to accept biosolids from Toronto, and from the U.S. as well, as a result of a permitting process. **Karen Buck** asked if the New York location is an industrial landfill and **Mark Rupke** said he did not know the particulars.

## 5.0 Updates

### 2007 Budget Presentation

**Mark Rupke** gave a presentation on the "2007 Budget". In his presentation, he covered the following topics:

- Toronto Water Program Issues

- Inventory of Assets: Replacement Value of \$26.6 billion
  - Water
  - Wastewater
- 2007-2016 Capital Forecasts
- 2007-2011 Capital Plan Wastewater Infrastructure
- 2007 Capital Cash Flow \$410 Million

The following is a summary of ABTP questions and discussion:

- **Connie Demb** asked if the capital forecasts included just residential or also commercial, industrial metering. **Mark Rupke** said it was industrial and commercial as well. Flat rate metering is limited to just residential customers.
- **Karey Shinn** asked if there is a crossover between the costs attributed to the Wet Weather Plan as opposed to the costs attributed to the Sanitary System. **Mark Rupke** said there was likely some crossover. Wet weather would presumably be items specifically related to implementing the Wet Weather Flow (WWF) Master Plan. Most of this spending will be for things like disconnect programs, EAs, as well as major end of pipe systems and conveyance systems.
- **Connie Demb** commented on the trunk sewers and **Mark Rupke** said that they are not building any right now but spending will begin soon for Coxwell.
- **Karey Shinn** asked if Coxwell was a sanitary sewer and **Mark Rupke** said yes.
- **Connie Demb** asked how far north it runs and **Mark Rupke** said it runs almost as far north as the Toronto Treatment Plant. **Karey Shinn** added that it was in the Millwood area, west of the Don Valley.
- **Karen Buck** asked who is feeding into this. Are both the Don Trunk Sewers dedicated to sanitary sewage? **Mark Rupke** said there is a combined system that feeds into the North Toronto treatment plant but there is no overflow from those once they join. They come straight down from the plant and feed from everything north of that. A large block of city up to Steeles feeds into what is now a single sewer.
- **Connie Demb** asked if twinning the Coxwell would have an impact on the ABTP and **Mark Rupke** said there was no significant impact. It is just a second pipe in case something happens to the first pipe. **Mark Rupke** confirmed that it was not related to development projections.
- **Karen Buck** asked if they were intending to create the twinning to carry a lot more and **Mark Rupke** said that during the EA, they will look at how to optimize the twinning of the Coxwell with the proposed WWF plans. However, if the WWF is calling for the capture of CSOs that need to be converted, they will look at synergies to incorporate this.
- **Karey Shinn** asked when the NLC could find out more about this EA and **Mark Rupke** said they are currently finalizing the RFP.

<p><u>Action Item #12:</u></p>
--------------------------------

<p><b>Staff</b> to provide copies of RFP once released.</p>
---

## 2007 Operating Budget Presentation

**Mark Rupke** gave a presentation on the “2007 Operating Budget”. In his presentation, he covered the following topics:

- 2007 Operating Budget Challenges.
- 2007 Operating Budget Pressures
- 2007 Projected Operating Revenue - \$648.221 million
- 2006-2007 Base Budget Comparison
- Fiscal Overview
- Key Assumptions in Rate Setting
- Water Consumption and Forecast
- Water and Wastewater Reserve Balances
- 2007 Recommended Rate Increase
- Impact of 9% on Consumers in 2007
- How does Toronto compare?
- 2006 Residential Consumers in Canada and US

The following is a summary of ABTP questions and discussion:

- **Connie Demb** said she thought Green Lane was supposed to be cheaper and **Mark Rupke** said it is, but we do not own it yet.
- **Karen Buck** asked if the Waste Water group was considering offline and decentralized waste water treatment in the new subdivisions, considering the high operating budget and capital pressure. For example, near the Ted Reeves arena there is a subdivision that has space to do something different. Rather than continuing to hook up to the centralized system, is Waste Water talking about new strategies for residents and developers to put in systems that decentralize and relieve the city of cost pressures? **Mark Rupke** said he has not heard this being considered for wastewater, but certainly on the wet weather side they are working at things like downspout disconnects and, there is the water efficiency plan. In terms of decentralized waste water treatment, the economics are hard to manage when there is already a sewage network in place. For example, a showpiece Green home was built 5-6 years ago as a prototype as a green residence. The cost of waste water treatment for this home was ten times what you would pay for waste water treatment in our facilities.
- **Connie Demb** asked if this cost was amortized and **Mark Rupke** said yes.
- **Karey Shinn** asked if some buildings are using rain water and grey water and **Mark Rupke** agreed that grey water reuse is a possibility.
- **Karen Buck** said that the whole idea is to take pressure of money off the City and put it on individuals. **Mark Rupke** agreed that may help the budget, but said that from a macroeconomic perspective, the cheapest rate is when everyone connects to the centralized system.
- **Jim Neff** said that the race track development had to put in a pond for storm water management. Is that not universal for new developments? **Mark Rupke** said yes, it was for storm water management. The move is towards treating storm water before it moves to the lake.

- **Stephen Whyte** said that we know the water rates will go up 9% but does Mark think that our water rates are too low to finance a potential increase in expenditures? He looked at the forecasts on-line and they said that Toronto Water will not finance any debt. However, the documents did not explain how the City will sustain a large capital program. **Mark Rupke** replied that the capital forecast up to 2014 is based on those 9%/year increases and that provides funding for all programs scheduled.
- **Stephen Whyte** asked if rates will have to go up substantially and **Mark Rupke** explained that everything the City is currently planning is in that program already; that is what the 9% is funding.
- **Connie Demb** remarked that this will compound and double revenue every 7-8 years.

### Waste Water Flow Projections Presentation

**Mark Rupke** gave a presentation on “*Waste Water Flow Projections*”. In his presentation, he covered the following topics:

- Overview
- Historical Flow Data
- Per Capita Wastewater
- Population Projections
- Flow Projection Scenarios
- Flowrate Projections ABTP (all scenarios)
- ABTP Flow Forecast Factors
- Solids Handling

Action Item #13:

**Staff** to put Waste Water Flow Projections presentation on website.

Action Item #14:

**Staff** to bring copies of Solids Handling sheet to next meeting.

The following is a summary of ABTP questions and discussion:

- **Stephen Whyte** asked if you can have a flow scenario with high population growth and maximum water efficiency savings and maximum CSO capture. **Mark Rupke** said there is almost no difference until 2014 with respect to population growth. In 2024 there will only be an extra 40 megalitres a day. Therefore, maximum population growth does not contribute a significant amount to the plant.
- In response to a question from **Connie Demb**, **Mark Rupke** explained that ‘HRT’ refers to hydraulics residence time.

## 6.0 Other Business

### *Water Metering*

**Hy Schwartz** reported that 125 years ago when people had wells in the City of Toronto, eventually these wells filled up and a system of piping was creating downtown. He is a member of Willowdale and North York where they have meters. However, other Torontonians are still being charged for water in houses that were built when people had more residents. The flat rate was thus established and there are currently over 40,000 invoices going out to the public for a rate established many years ago. The invoices are not related to the actual amount of water used in the houses. We have been told that meters are too expensive but they are very easy to install. There is a tremendous amount of water being used. However, the fire department does not have water meters for their pumping. Also, the City of Toronto use water to wash streets and they use the fire hydrants, so there is no real fairness in the system. **Hy Schwartz** asked when the City will notify people that if they want a meter the City will give it to them. This will prevent pipe bursting because then you will be able to monitor where pipe leakages are happening. We should sent out letters or create a street program.

**Jim Neff** noted that he thought people can already request meters. He asked what the current City policy was on this.

Action Item #15:

**Hy Schwartz** to draft motion regarding water metering and bring to the next meeting.

Action Item #16:

**Staff** to report on City metering policy.

## **7.0 Review and Approval of Minutes from NLC Meeting #77/78**

**Jim Neff** asked to be added to the attendance list for both meetings. **Karey Shinn** added that the meeting list did not reflect everyone who attended. The qualifying note at the bottom of the attendance list should read: "In total, 30 members of the public were in attendance.

**Connie Demb** said she gave regrets for both meetings and asked to have her name added to the list under 'Regrets' for both the February meeting and the April meeting.

Revisions to Minutes #77: February 8, 2007, include:

- **Jim Neff** was actually in attendance (remove from list of Regrets)
- Page 3, Biosolids report: "Someone is going..." should read "Some is going..."
- Page 4, Top line: The word "statisticians" should be corrected.
- Page 4, Action Item #6 and #7 should be reversed (Item #6 is really Item #7)
- Page 5, Revisions to the Minutes: "Page 3 – claimed that ...." does not make sense. **Mark Rupke** said he thought it was about the budget presentation, but will have to follow up on this and revise the wording.

Revisions to Minutes #78 were deferred until the next meeting. Any corrections or clarifications should be sent to Shiri Pasternak.

## **8.0 Next Meeting Date**

The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for either June 14 or June 19.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.