



## Ashbridges Bay Treatment Plant (ABTP) Neighbourhood Liaison Committee

Meeting #81

Mennonite New Life Centre, 1774 Queen St. East  
Tuesday, July 31, 2007  
7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

### Attendance:

Karen Buck	Citizens for a Safe Environment, Co-chair
Edward Chin	Resident
Constance Demb	Beach Resident, ICMC Member
Dave Done	Beaches Resident, Safe Sewage Committee
David Hanna	Resident
John Hopkins	ICMC
Jim Neff	Citizens for a Safe Environment
Michael Rosenberg	Economics and Technology Work Group, ICMC
Hy Schwartz	Resident
Karey Shinn	NLC Co-Chair
Aliss Terpstra	International Institute of Concern for Public Health
Steven Whyte	ICMC, Resident of South Riverdale
Mark Rupke	Senior Engineer, Toronto Water
Shiri Pasternak	Facilitator, City of Toronto
Jean-Yves Urbain	EarthTech

### Regrets:

Saul Cohen	Resident
Sheila Cohen	Resident

### Minutes:

Joshua Zucker

## 1.0 Welcome and Introductions

**Karey Shinn** called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. **Shiri Pasternak** announced that this would be the last NLC meeting she would be facilitating. **Karey Shinn** asked **Shiri Pasternak** if she knew who the new facilitator would be. **Shiri Pasternak** said no.

**Constance Demb** noted that the Odour Study should now be referred to as the Odour Control Project as the study is complete. **Dave Done** asked that the new Retention Facility in the Beach be included under Other Business. The revised agenda was approved.

## 2.0 Action Items

### Meeting #79, Action Item #1

- **Karen Buck** was unsuccessful.

### Meeting #79, Action Item #4

- Completed. **Mark Rupke** reported that he completed the cover slide. **Shiri Pasternak** said she will put it up on-line and some copies will be brought to the next meeting.

### Meeting #79, Action Item #5

- Completed. **Mark Rupke** said he can't speak to any specific customers that Veolia has, but the company is moving towards signing an agreement with the City which includes a strong financial penalty if they aren't able to market the pellets. Therefore it is likely that they have customers, or the ability to develop a customer base.

### Meeting #79, Action Item #6

- Completed. **Mark Rupke** stated that within the Marketing Agreement there is language governing the burning of pellets requiring Veolia to first obtain the City's permission. He added that the marketing plan Veolia has laid out calls for agricultural uses as the core of their marketing plan.

**Constance Demb** said that directing agricultural production toward producing fuel is a controversial area. **Mark Rupke** asked for clarification and **Constance Demb** replied that agricultural production that involves food substituted for fuel is a major environmental and social concern and can result in very high food prices. **Karey Shinn** asked **Mark Rupke** to find out whether Veolia is seeking to sell pellets to be used for bio-diesel crops and, if so, that they not be used on land currently engaged in food production.

### Action Item #1

**Mark Rupke** to look into further details of Veolia's contract and marketing plan.

**Karen Buck** said she was concerned that the contract between the City and Veolia allows the City to change its mind about the marketing and burning of pellets in contravention of the Mediation Agreement (MA). Has the MA been included as one of the documents that Veolia has to adhere to? **Mark Rupke** responded that he didn't know.

**John Hopkins** asked if it is one of the “Big Three” oil companies producing and selling the bio-fuel. **Mark Rupke** responded that at this point bio-fuel is identified only as a potential market, so no specific company is known. **David Hanna** said we have to distinguish between a crop that would produce a fuel such as ethanol and burning waste to create fuel, which would be unacceptable.

**Michael Rosenberg** asked if any amendments were made to the marketing agreement at City Council after approval at the Works Committee that would affect the contract. **Mark Rupke** responded that he hasn’t seen anything.

**Jim Neff** noted that Schedule 9 is the material the contractor needs to be compliant with the marketing agreement and it did not include the MA, which is a contravention of the agreement. He asked **Mark Rupke** if the MA could be added to the Schedule 9 list. **Mark Rupke** said he cannot add it himself, but he will bring it forward.

Action Item #2

**Mark Rupke** to report on efforts to add the Mediation Agreement to the Schedule 9 list.

**Constance Demb** noted that a financial penalty would be imposed on Veolia if they were to dispose of the pellets in a landfill, which is seen as a “benign use.” She asked why a penalty would be imposed in this case. She also asked why a priority had been put on identifying a high-end market for pellets when the City would not share in these profits.

**David Hanna** asked **Mark Rupke** if the Greenlane facility has a Certificate of Approval (CoA) for the deposit of cake or pellets. **Mark Rupke** said they have some CoA for bio-solids cake but it is limited to small amounts.

**Michael Rosenberg** said the contract states pellets can’t be used in a thermal process without City approval. He asked **Mark Rupke** if he could guarantee that the City would not give that approval, or, if approval is given, that the community is informed months in advance. **Mark Rupke** said he is in no position to give such a guarantee, but will pass on that this is a desire of the community if there is consensus on that point. **Karey Shinn** asked **Michael Rosenberg** to draft a motion to this effect for the next meeting.

**Karey Shinn** said that the Marketing Agreement between Veolia and the City should be discussed further at the next meeting as a separate agenda item, noting it would be useful for more people to read it.

Meeting #79, Action Item #7

- Completed. The Motion in question is in the minutes of ABTP NLC Meeting #74.

**Constance Demb** restated the Motion and the Action Items attached to it. **Dave Done** could not remember if he took the Motion to Sandra Bussin.

Action Item #3

**Dave Done** to take the Motion to Sandra Bussin.

**Karey Shinn** asked if the Motion was copied to Lou Di Geronimo and the Board of Health. **Mark Rupke** said he didn't believe so, however appropriate city staff were made aware of the Motion and a form of it was included in the agreement. **Dave Done** said the Biosolids Use Committee is now defunct, so it is not apt to pass along the Motion at this stage.

**Constance Demb** noted that the important thing is the NLC's resolutions be adopted and established. **Karen Buck** added that she is very concerned that Toronto Water has decided the City can change its mind about NLC resolutions. She said this is continually undermining the MA. **Mark Rupke** said the motion produced by the NLC is what caused City Staff to put this restriction in the agreement. He said the City doesn't have to give its approval and this does not undermine the MA. He added that given this is a 10-year contract with a possible 10-year renewal, it must retain flexibility to be able to respond to changing market conditions. **Karen Buck** asked if this means we have to consider a thermal process and **Mark Rupke** replied, yes, that would be one element of flexibility.

**Hy Schwartz** said he feels the City is doing everything under the table in order to destroy the ICMC, adding that 'flexibility' is a dangerous word.

Meeting #80, Action Item #1

- Ongoing. The letter has gone to Lou Di Geronimo but it is unknown whether it has gone to other councillors.

Meeting #80, Action Item #2

- Completed. The Motion regarding the beneficial use program was made on September 14, 2006.

Meeting #80, Action Item #3

- Completed.

**Constance Demb** asked, in reference to the Fire Marshall Report, whether the approximately \$2 million enhancements to the pelletizer have dealt with the problems leading to the fire, specifically to the missing seal on the pump. **Mark Rupke** responded that, yes, the City and the insurance company have made changes to guard against fires like this happening again. The enhancements include the screening system, some fire suppression systems and possibly a locker facility, all of which are listed in the background file. He added these were not things required under the original design build.

**Karey Shinn** asked if the new pelletizer is built to higher fire standards and **Mark Rupke** replied, yes. **Constance Demb** asked, referring to the Fire Marshall Report, how was the fire in the basement and roof at the same time? **Mark Rupke** responded there

were no intervening floors. **Karen Buck** asked what specifically these fire suppression systems are. **Mark Rupke** said he doesn't know the specific details but will find out.

Action Item #4

**Mark Rupke** to report on details of the new fire suppression systems.

**Michael Rosenberg** asked if there was another Fire Marshall's report with a deeper analysis. **Mark Rupke** said there is only one report. **Constance Demb** noted that we still don't know what ignited the oil. **Karen Buck** noted that in speaking with the Back River Plant in Maryland, she was informed that they do not operate any of their Seghers Dryers with an oil temperature above the flashpoint in order to prevent fires. Additionally, they use a non-wicking insulation within the building to prevent the possibility of fire spreading. **Mark Rupke** said the City's Dryers are built to Seghers' standards.

Meeting #80, Action Item #4

- Completed. **Mark Rupke** reported that City staff colleagues are aware of the commissioning of the Chicago pelletizer and that we are ahead of Chicago in the construction and commissioning process. He added that Chicago staff are coming here to learn from our facility.

**Karen Buck** noted that in Maryland the commissioning of the dryers took 18 months. When did we start construction of our pelletizer? **Mark Rupke** said the RFP was released in September-October 1998 and construction began in 1999. **Jean-Yves Urbain** noted that the truck loading was complete in 2000. **Karen Buck** asked when Chicago began construction and **Mark Rupke** replied that he didn't know but they were evaluating bids when Toronto was. **Karey Shinn** said that when Chicago begins their pellet program, we would like to know.

Action Item #5

**Mark Rupke** to find out when Chicago begins commissioning their pelletizer.

Meeting #80, Action Item #5

- Ongoing.

**Karey Shinn** said the NLC hoped **Michael Rosenberg** would be able to sit on a public committee concerning the Coatsworth Cut but none was set up. **Michael Rosenberg** noted there are still no public representatives on the City's steering committee for the Coatsworth Cut Environmental Assessment. However, the Waterfront Corporation's committee for Lake Ontario Park does exist. **Karey Shinn** said they will notify either **Michael Rosenberg** or her when their meeting is taking place. **David Hanna** asked when the Lake Ontario Parks Meetings take place and **Karey Shinn** said she would let him know.

### 3.0 Mini-Updates

### *Pelletizer*

**Mark Rupke** reported that commissioning of the pelletizer is continuing, with secondary tested expected soon .

**Constance Demb** said a key concern before the fire was getting the right sized pellets and **Mark Rupke** said one of the enhancements was a screening system put in to physically size the pellets, where anything too small goes back into the system for re-processing. **Constance Demb** asked how long commissioning should take. **Mark Rupke** said it is ongoing, over the spring and summer they have been doing hot testing and trying equipment and secondary testing should begin sometime in August. **Constance Demb** asked **Mark Rupke** what amount of biosolids is going into pelletizer now and he said it is running to capacity, which between the two, should be about 25,000 tons/year. There are a series of testing periods to prove it has the ability to run at a steady state.

**Dave Done** asked if the pellets have passed all provincial legislation requirements and **Mark Rupke** replied that he believes so. **Dave Done** asked if Veolia had to get U.S. government regulatory clearance to move material into the U.S. and **Mark Rupke** that information was in the report and available to public and it would be talked about at the following meeting.

**Jim Neff** asked if there is currently a pellet output and what it is. **Mark Rupke** responded that, yes, there are pellets being produced now but he did not know the output nor what is happening with them at the moment.

<u>Action Item #6</u>
-----------------------

<b>Mark Rupke</b> to find out from Veolia what the current pellet output is.
--

**Karen Buck** asked if it takes both Seghers Dryers to process the 25,000 tons/year. **Mark Rupke** said in the design there is time allotment for one to be down for maintenance while the other runs. However one would need to run continuously while the other runs about 4-5 days/week. **Karen Buck** noted that in Maryland there are 3 pelletizers, where two run continuously and the third is redundant, alternating in this pattern.

### *EA*

**Mark Rupke** said he hasn't heard anything specific from the Ministry of Environment and they are still waiting for approval of the EA. **Steven Whyte** reported that he spoke with Gavin Batterino 2 weeks ago and was told the EA was at that time with the Ministry of Environment legal branch. They were getting the legal wording exactly right for the conditional approval to ensure it's not challenged in court. This depends on whether the Minister sends it to ERT. People can send comments to Gavin Batterino recommending more stringent conditions of approval. **Steven Whyte** added that it was his understanding that the City cannot withdraw or change its EA at this time. Once the legal review is done it will travel up to the Minister of Environment for a decision. He was told that the Minister is prepared to make a decision before the election. Gavin Batterino also

said they are not awaiting further information from the City and they are prepared to move the EA through the process. **Karen Buck** said she spoke to Gavin Batterino today to ask if there had been more correspondence between the City and the Ministry and the answer was no. She was also informed that all Ministry letters sent to the signatories were CC'd to **Mark Rupke**.

### *Landscaping*

**Mark Rupke** reported that the division and Envision have had initial design meetings. Envision are in their data gathering stage and are looking at the site. That work will continue through the fall and once they are up to speed they will move into the initial design work such as looking at soil quality issues. He added they are already starting to integrate this work with other projects, such as the odour control facilities. **Karey Shinn** asked when this will be brought to the NLC and **Mark Rupke** responded that in September they would do a meet-and-greet between the consultants and the NLC. **Jean-Yves Urbain** said the proposed meeting has been postponed to October. There will be an announcement for public participation concerning the use and design of the park, including public meetings.

**Karey Shinn** asked about the skateboarding park and **Mark Rupke** replied they are still waiting for the land to stabilize. They have pre-loaded the site with soil and recently added a lift of fill to get the soil to consolidate and stabilize.

**Karen Buck** said she is concerned about whether Toronto Water requires landscapers to create swales or ditches to prevent run-off of storm water in roads and sewers, such as on Leslie St. How could we make sure those implementations are there? What is Toronto Water doing to address this? **Mark Rupke** responded that this is not something within the purview of the Ashbridges Bay Water Treatment Plant, but is part of the City's development review process. He added that within the water flow master plan maintaining ditches and swales is encouraged, but he couldn't speak to any mandatory requirements.

**David Hanna** asked if there was anything directly under the skate park. **Mark Rupke** replied there is no infrastructure underneath. **David Hanna** noted that innovative projects exist involving roads where native species aid in the water filtration process. He added that TD Bank offers money for these sorts of environmental projects and **Karey Shinn** suggested he bring information for the group.

**Karey Shinn** asked that when the landscapers come to meet with the NLC, could they speak about storm water drainage so input on this subject could be given? **Mark Rupke** said that for the Ashbridges Bay site storm water management is a large landscaping component and the landscapers will be able to speak to the issue. He added that the concept plan includes zero-discharge areas and much of the storm water issue will be addressed through the design process.

**Edward Chin** asked what a swale was and **Karey Shinn** replied it is like a ditch that allows water to go into the ground instead of into the sewer system.

**Karen Buck** asked where she could find the actual storm water requirements for a lot being developed and **Mark Rupke** said the Development Standards in the Planning Department.

### *Odour Study*

**Mark Rupke** reported the detailed design is continuing. D building's design is near 50% completed and the M and T buildings are under design. Tender should be completed late this year and construction is planned to begin in early 2008.

**Constance Demb** asked whether the transfer of funds from the digester improvements for the pelletizer project is affecting the Odour Control Project. **Mark Rupke** replied that they have nothing to do with the Odour Control Project.

### *Biosolids*

**Mark Rupke** reported they are continuing to get as much biosolids on land as possible, some is going to the pelletizer and the balance is going to landfill.

**Karen Buck** asked if Toronto Water is working with the Division of Solid Waste Management, so that rather than being landfilled, biosolids cake could be treated in some way as to be used for landfill cover. If not, is it possible to look into this? **Mark Rupke** replied that they're not planning on those uses. It is not impossible to use biosolids as landfill cover, however it would require a great deal of processing and would very likely present an odour problem.

**Edward Chin** asked if pellets are different than cake. **Mark Rupke** replied that biosolids start as a thick liquid and then is de-watered through centrifugal processing where it becomes cake. The cake is what is taken to agricultural land or can be further dried to produce a fertilizer pellet.

**Constance Demb** mentioned a massive odour emergency that occurred before the pelletizer contract went to City Council. Upon calling in a complaint she was told there weren't enough trucks to carry the biosolids away, only 6/day. Are the biosolids really under control? **Mark Rupke** said that it is an on-going challenge to manage the daily haulage, however the truck shortage was brief and is now remedied. One contractor did go bankrupt but currently there are currently 20+ trucks/day in operation. **Hy Schwartz** noted that he was in favour of using trains for haulage.

**Dave Done** asked about the progress of the peer review methodology for biosolids residuals and **Mark Rupke** replied that a facilitation team, Ehl Harrison Consulting (along with MacViro consultants), had been selected. A letter to interested stakeholders in the peer review process should be out soon and they are looking to set up a peer review panel by mid-to-late September. The intention is to begin the peer review in October and have it finish by the end of the year. **Dave Done** asked **Mark Rupke** if there would be a re-thinking of the biosolids residuals master plan when the peer review was completed. **Mark Rupke** responded that he would not pre-judge the master plan; however, following

the peer review they would go back to the master plan and apply whatever changes needed to be made, followed by more public review on the revised plan.

**Michael Rosenberg** asked when the London landfill would be able to receive biosolids. **Mark Rupke** said he did not know but would find out.

Action Item #7

**Mark Rupke** to find out when the London landfill will be able to receive biosolids.

**Michael Rosenberg** asked whether a theoretical economist would be part of the peer review panel and suggested this would be a good idea. **Mark Rupke** replied that he has told the panel they should include a theoretical economist and noted that their focus is on decision making methodology and not biosolids technical expertise. **Karey Shinn** asked whether the peer review team would be meeting with the NLC or ICMC and **Mark Rupke** replied that the process does not include meetings between the panel and the NLC or ICMC, however both groups (as well as other concerned parties) would receive a letter requesting their input, and will have an opportunity to address the panel.

**Jim Neff** asked **Mark Rupke** if he knew who was managing the London landfill. He did not know but said he would find out.

Action Item #8

**Mark Rupke** to find out who is managing the London landfill.

## 4.0 Other Business

### *Hy's Motion*

**Karey Shinn** asked **Hy Schwartz** if he would like his motion forwarded to the Mayor's Office and he replied, yes. **Karey Shinn** said she would forward it.

### *Recent odours*

**Karen Buck** asked for the Ashbridges Bay odour protocol that is followed for odour complaints in writing and brought to next meeting.

Action Item #9

**Mark Rupke** to bring the Ashbridges Bay Odour Complaint Form to the next meeting.

**Karey Shinn** noted the odour complaint number is on the minutes. It is (416) 392-5150.

**Jim Neff** asked whether there is any on-site storage for biosolids given there were days when only six trucks were operating. **Mark Rupke** replied that the treatment process itself has some storage capacity; however, there were only a few days when they were down to six trucks. He added that solids levels in the plant are back down to acceptable levels and that while the facility does smell, this is no different than in the past. **Jim Neff**

asked when specifically the number of trucks in operation was down. **Mark Rupke** said he believed it was in April.

**Jim Neff** asked if, given some of the locations where a strong odour has been present, is there a possibility of an underground line rupturing that's producing these odours? **Mark Rupke** replied that this was unlikely since ruptures tend to produce sinkholes and flooding, although sewer venting is a possible cause given that sewers are designed to breathe. He added that this is a separate issue from the treatment plant itself and is the responsibility of Toronto Water handled through District Operations.

**Aliss Terpstra** asked if increased odours could be caused by slightly higher temperatures and **Mark Rupke** replied that while odour does increase with rising temperatures, a difference of 1 or 2 degrees would probably not be noticeable given that waste water varies between 10-30 degrees over the span of a year. **Jim Neff** noted that the lack of rain and low flow could lead to stagnation in the sewer system and add to the odours, **Mark Rupke** agreed.

There was some debate as to the exact time period of increased odour during the spring and summer. **Constance Demb** said she phoned in to complain about odours in mid-to-late June. She also said that it was likely that the intensity and location of odours were changing based on wind patterns. **Shiri Pasternak** noted she received a number of phone calls complaining of odours during the second week of July. **Karen Buck** asked approximately how many calls were received and **Shiri Pasternak** answered, 5, although she believed each call likely represented 10-20 people.

## **5.0 Review and approval of minutes from NLC Meeting #79, #80**

**Karey Shinn** said **Shiri Pasternak** suggested people send minute corrections to her.

**Michael Rosenberg** said he could not comment on the minutes from Meeting #79 as he did not have a copy with him. Review of Meeting #79 minutes was deferred.

**Constance Demb** noted a correction to the minutes for Meeting #80, page 6. The word 'stalk' and 'stalks' should be changed to 'stack' and 'stacks', respectively. This error was repeated over several pages.

**Karen Buck** said there should be a report-back on the Motions from Meeting #80 and **Karey Shinn** said these were, in effect, action items that were not reported in the minutes. **Karen Buck** said she had a number of corrections to the minutes for Meeting #80 and **Karey Shinn** asked her to send or fax them to the City. Review of Meeting #80 minutes was deferred.

**Shiri Pasternak** suggested the following meeting begin early to review the minutes to Meetings #79 and #80. She noted the minutes cannot be posted on-line because they have not been fixed. **Karen Buck** and **Karey Shinn** suggested the next meeting begin at 6:30 p.m. to deal with minutes and this was approved.

## 6.0 Next meeting date, agenda topics and adjourn

The next meeting of the NLC is set for Tuesday, September 4<sup>th</sup>, 2007 at 7:00 p.m. Minutes from previous meetings will be reviewed between 6:30 p.m. and 7:00 p.m.

**Karey Shinn** said the item not yet addressed was the Coatsworth Cut. **Dave Done** said the issue was the completion of the outfall project as it impacts the creation of wetlands at the seawall gates. **Mark Rupke** said the Coatsworth Cut wetland could potentially proceed without the outfall being built first but there were a number of interactions between the two. He said that the ICMC tried to pass a Motion (which failed) that there was no interaction between the creation of the wetland and the outfall project and explained this was untrue. He said there are physical constraints on the site which would likely increase the cost of the wetland if it's built before the outfall. **Karey Shinn** noted that Mario Parenti, the wetland consultant, disagreed. **Dave Done** asked **Mark Rupke** why the location of the wetland was chosen and he replied that it was to accommodate recreational use.

**John Hopkins** said he missed the Coatsworth Cut Open House and asked if there were any reports available. **Shiri Pasternak** said she put all the Open House displays and publicly distributed materials on-line and would mail a set to **John Hopkins**. **Michael Rosenberg** requested a mailing as well and noted that at the Open House there was a lot of information not included in the presentation material. He asked if there was any way of getting more background information, specifically technical information, beyond what was available in the reports. **Shiri Pasternak** suggested he get in touch with the project managers as they are accountable to the public. **Karey Shinn** asked if was not possible to read the supporting documents at a City building. **Shiri Pasternak** replied that she would find out where these documents were kept.

### Action Item #10

**Shiri Pasternak** to inform **Michael Rosenberg** of the location of more technical background documents relating to the Coatsworth Cut.

**Karey Shinn** noted that **Karen Buck** asked for a Motion to be brought forward but had left the meeting. **Jim Neff** offered to put forward the Motion on behalf of **Karen Buck**.

### *Motion #1 by Karen Buck*

Moved by: **Jim Neff** on behalf of **Karen Buck**

Seconded by: **Stephen Whyte**

**THAT: The Mediation Agreement be included in the Schedule 9 of the Veolia pellet operating, maintenance and pellet marketing agreement.**

**The Motion was passed.**

**Karey Shinn** said that Retention Tanks should be added as an item on the agenda for the following meeting.

The meeting was adjourned by **Karey Shinn** at 9:14 p.m.