



**Ashbridges Bay Treatment Plant (ABTP)
Neighbourhood Liaison Committee (Meeting #90)**

&

**ABTP Implementation and Compliance Monitoring Committee (ICMC)
(Meeting #69)**

Metro Hall
Wednesday, September 24, 2008
6:30 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

Attendance:

Michael Rosenberg	Economics of Technology Working Group
Karen Buck	Citizens for a Safe Environment, NLC Co-Chair
Lois James	Scarborough Resident
Jim Neff	Citizens for a Safe Environment
Karey Shinn	NLC Co-Chair, Safe Sewage Committee
Dalton Shipway	Friends of the Lower Donlands, Task-Force to Bring Back the Don
Steven Whyte	ICMC, Resident of South Riverdale
William Sheehan	Citizen
Bob Kortright	Toronto Field Naturalists
David Done	Beaches Resident, Safe Sewage Committee
Mary Ann Atell	Safe Sewage Committee, Riverdale resident
Alice Terpstra	International Institute of Concern for Public Health, Citizens for a Safe Environment

City of Toronto:

Shabbir Datto	ABTP Engineer, Toronto Water
Nancy Fleming	Senior Engineer, Toronto Water
Scott Wilton	ABTP Engineer, Toronto Water
Robert Davis	Supervisor, Public Consultation Unit
Mike Logan	Public Consultation Unit

Consultants:

Jean-Yves Urbain	EarthTech
------------------	-----------

Regrets:

Steven Connell

1. Welcome and Introductions

Karey Shinn brought the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

Mike Logan, from the Public Consultation Unit, introduced himself. He will be the new facilitator for the ABTP NLC and ICMC meetings. His contact information is as follows: mlogan@toronto.ca; (416) 392-2962. **Robert Davis** facilitated the current meeting as Mike is still new to the Unit.

Scott Wilton was introduced as a new Engineer with Toronto Water, who will be based at ABTP.

NLC Portion of the Meeting

2. Review and Approval of ABTPNLC Minutes

- **Meeting #89, July 8, 2008**

The review and approval of the ABTP NLC minutes was deferred to the next meeting. **Robert Davis** circulated paper copies of the July 8, 2008 minutes as the incorrect minutes were sent via email prior to the meeting.

3. Review of NLC Action Items & Motions

Only Action Items and Motions from Meeting #89/68 (July 8, 2008) were reviewed, as the Action Items/Motions list had not been updated. All other items were deferred until the next meeting.

Meeting #89/68: Action Item #1

Shabbir Datoo to find out more information about flashing lights on the stacks and whether or not there were any recent changes to them.

Shabbir Datoo indicated that there had been some complaints made recently about the flashing lights. This was following a recent stack lighting upgrade project, which involved all of the lights being replaced. During the testing of the new lights, a problem with the new intensity controller was identified. This has since been fixed and no further complaints have been received as of this meeting.

Disposition: Completed

Meeting #89/68: Action Item #2

Dalton Shipway to share John D. Minor's contact information with Karey Shinn. Karey Shinn to contact John D. Minor and ask him to share written information regarding the Carlaw and Lakeshore site.

Karey Shinn did not receive a response from John D. Minor when she tried to contact him. She suggested that **Dalton Shipway** be in touch with him as he may be more successful.

Disposition: Completed

Action Item #1: **Dalton Shipway** to contact John D. Minor and ask him to share written information regarding the Carlaw and Lakeshore site. (**Karey Shinn** attempted to contact Mr. Minor and was unsuccessful.)

Meeting #89/68: Action Item #3

Shabbir Datoo to get further clarification on alkaline stabilization process and the resulting reaction.

Shabbir Datoo said that alkaline stabilization is not something he is intimately familiar with. He said that Sections 9-12 of the Biosolids and Residuals Master Plan contained additional information on this process and provided the following web link to this document:

http://www.toronto.ca/wes/techservices/involved/wws/biosolids/pdf/brmp/brmp_9-12.pdf

Disposition: Completed

Meeting #89/68: Action Item #4

Michael Rosenberg to draft a letter to Waterfront Toronto regarding the lack of immediate action regarding footpaths and specifying that the Toronto Water plan has not been cancelled.

Michael Rosenberg spoke with someone from Waterfront Toronto, but he has not yet prepared a written letter. He wants to find out if the landscaping plan can be put into some sort of status, rather than an item that has no status at all. **Shabbir Datto** asked if Michael was looking for a timeline for the landscaping plan. **Michael Rosenberg** replied that he would like a timeline or confirmation that this will happen eventually.

Karey Shinn passed around the Waterfront Toronto Lake Ontario workbook (Public forum #3; July 10, 2008).

Disposition: Ongoing

Meeting #89/68: Action Item #5

Shabbir Datto to find out if the design-build contact with Veolia specified completion dates and financial penalties for not meeting timelines or completion.

Shabbir Datto indicated that he was not able to get a response in time for this meeting.

Disposition: Ongoing

Karen Buck asked how Veolia was marketing the biosolids. **Shabbir Datto** indicated that Veolia had addressed this in the presentation they gave and in their marketing plan. Toronto Water has not received an updated marketing plan because it had not been a full year yet, and the pelletizer was still in the commissioning phase.

Karen Buck indicated that the information presented in the previous Veolia presentation was hypothetical and was not what was happening in reality. **Jim Neff** asked whether Veolia was incinerating the pellets. **Karen Buck** said that at the time of their presentation it was not their intention to put it in a thermal process. **Karen Buck** asked if pellets were being produced yet. **Shabbir Datto** said that pellets are being produced.

William Sheehan said that he was assured (in meeting #87/66, Action Item 4) that he would be given an online link to the Veolia marketing plan. **Shabbir Datto** clarified that the link to the meeting when the Veolia plan was presented was provided in the minutes of meeting #88/67 (page 5). He further clarified that the link is for a presentation that Veolia gave to the NLC (as per Action Item 4), and that two copies of Veolia's Marketing Plan had been provided to the NLC co-chairs. Veolia's presentation can be found directly at:

http://www.toronto.ca/water/wastewater_treatment/treatment_plants/ashbridges/nlc/2008-02-12_veolia.pdf.

Additional action items deferred to next meeting.

4. Mini-updates

- Pelletizer

Shabbir Datto said that the pelletizer has re-started, primarily with a single dryer in operation. Secondary testing should begin within the next month, which consists of a 66 day performance test. **Karen Buck** asked if 66 days is the full cycle length. **Shabbir Datto** said that the Contract stipulates that a 66 day performance test will be done, within which the equipment must run continuously, but allowing for some downtime. Once that is complete, the Marketing Agreement will come into effect. **Karen Buck** asked if the performance test was to be deemed satisfactory to the City or to Veolia. **Shabbir Datto** replied that it was to be satisfactory to the City.

William Sheehan asked when Veolia would reveal who their market is (i.e., in terms of percentages, number of tonnes distributed to different areas, etc). **Shabbir Datto** said that Veolia is required to provide this information within their annual reports. **Karen Buck** said that the City is required to report annually to the Ministry of the Environment. She asked if the City still has a contract with the land application group Terratec. **Shabbir Datto** replied yes, and that land application will be re-starting soon if not already, following the extended period of rain (during which land application is not possible). **Karen Buck** asked if most of the biosolids are going to the

Green Lane landfill. **Shabbir Dattoo** replied that some of it is going to Green Lane, but not most.

William Sheehan said in the past, Mike Price indicated that there was no market for biosolids. He wondered if they are guaranteeing any markets. **Shabbir Dattoo** said that the answer to this would likely be in the Marketing Agreement. **William Sheehan** asked if there were any applicable production standards. **Shabbir Dattoo** said yes, there is a certain tonnage amount Veolia has to produce on an annual basis. **William Sheehan** asked whether there was an escape clause in Veolia's contract. **Shabbir Dattoo** replied that he did not know. **William Sheehan** asked how long the contract is for marketing. **Shabbir Dattoo** replied that he thinks it is for ten years. **Karen Buck** added that it may also include the option to renew for another ten years. **Michael Rosenberg** asked if they do landfill, do they have to do their own landfill contract or do they use the City's landfill contracts. **Shabbir Dattoo** said he did not know. **William Sheehan** asked if Veolia landfilled everything could the City end the contract before ten years and give it to someone else. **Shabbir Dattoo** said it was difficult to know without looking at the contract. **Karey Shinn** said she will try to get a copy of the agreement and share it with **William Sheehan**.

Action Item #2: Karey Shinn to try to get a copy of the Veolia agreement to share with William Sheehan.
--

William Sheehan asked if we are ever going to see the contract that allowed for rebuilding the pelletizer. **Shabbir Dattoo** said he did not know.

William Sheehan asked when the draft Biosolids and Residuals Master Plan will become finalized. **Nancy Fleming** said there will have to be another phase of public consultation. So it would not be finalized until at least another year.

- **Odour Control Project**

Shabbir Dattoo said there is not much to update on the Odour Control Project. They are still awaiting approval from the Ministry of the Environment.

William Sheehan asked about the design cost. **Shabbir Dattoo** said the design work is ongoing and that no construction contracts have been awarded. The consulting engineers are getting paid for their design work. He did not remember the value of each of the phases but can provide this information at a later date. Costing information was presented to the ABTP NLC in the past.

William Sheehan asked for the following motion: When City staff come to the meetings to talk about projects that they know how much each project's costs were to date. **Robert Davis** said that it is not realistic for **Shabbir Dattoo** to be aware of this detailed information for every meeting. The motion did not go forward. **Michael Rosenberg** said that he would not expect every report to be available at every meeting. In the past, however, there has been a regular rotation of reports, which has stopped. There is not enough time to discuss items like this.

Jean-Yves Urbain said that the current budget for the Odour Control Project is \$150 million. That is not how much has been spent so far, but that is how much will likely be spent over the next 10 years.

Karen Buck said that the Plant has been very odourous lately. She asked if there have been complaints made to the complaint line – (416) 392-5150. **Alice Terpstra** asked if it would be possible for the plant to have a computerized sampling system in place at various locations. She said that it is not reliable to depend on citizens to report odours as after a while no one complains and nothing can be done. **Jean-Yves Urbain** said that a company named Zorix did one year of sampling in the past, the results of which were presented at this committee. He said that the GCMS scan will list chemicals, but it cannot tell which one is the troublemaker. The nose is still the best detector.

- **Landscaping Plan**

Shabbir Datto said that Toronto Water has asked Envision to proceed with a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment. This 6-8 week process will involve site interviews and historical searches to get information on the Site and sites around it.

Dalton Shipway served on a committee to deal with the strip of land along Lakeshore Boulevard from the Don River over to Leslie. This led to the realization of how polluted the lakefront soil is. They learnt about provincial regulation 153-04, primarily through John D. Minor. This regulation was introduced under former Ontario Premier Mike Harris. At that time, the focus was on economic development and not the environment. This committee should be one step ahead of Envision and request more information on site specific risk assessment. He believes staff should come back to the Committee and to council with a report that provides information that City Council needs to make an informed decision. It shall include biological factors of the environment that include soil, water, flora and fauna and any issues that must be addressed so that a net improvement can be attained and that information from the City site registry (Public Health) must apply to a complete application. Such information must have full public disclosure. He is trying to influence the City's official plan so that the environmental assessment takes these environment considerations into account. The letter Dalton Shipway prepared is located at the end of the minutes.

Karen Buck said there has been a new process put in place by the new film board. It is amazing that after fifteen years of TEDCO being in place and with all of the contaminated land in the port and industrial area, that there is not a specific protocol in place that indicates how we measure and remediate this. **Dalton Shipway** said that the Carlaw/Lakeshore site at Toronto Hydro and the Fulfort site are good examples of remediation. He wondered how TEDCO went about doing this. **Karen Buck** commented that there was a lack of City initiative in this area. **Jim Neff** said that there have been several successful remediation projects in the Portlands, however the toxic metals still remain.

- **EA**

Shabbir Datto said Nancy Fleming will be presenting the draft Scope of Work for the disinfection RFP. She is also in the process of hiring a public consultation company to assist with facilitating and developing the public consultation plan.

- **Biosolids**

Shabbir Datto said the City is still in the process of developing a new list of management options.

Dalton Shipway asked how the peer review of the Biosolids & Residual Master Plan went. **Nancy Fleming** replied that the peer review report went to Council a few months ago. The findings of the peer review will be incorporated into the masterplan.

Michael Rosenberg asked if the contract extension has been signed to extend the previous contract for the additional one year review process. **Nancy Fleming** replied that it is just an amendment to the original purchase order (i.e., it is under the same contract).

William Sheehan presented a request to Michael Rosenberg that the next time he goes to an economist meeting that they should come up with model to grade the success and failure of City's projects.

Michael Rosenberg asked if the same consultants do the next phase if it is going to proceed without an advisory committee. **Nancy Fleming** said future public meetings will be held during key milestones in the project.. There will be 2 sets of public meetings at each phase. **Michael Rosenberg** asked if the consultants will come to ICMC or NLC meetings. **Nancy Fleming** said that Shabbir Datto will provide an update at the NLC meetings.

Karey Shinn asked if the waste-heat boilers are functioning. The report from 2006 indicated that they were not

working and that they were flaring methane. **Shabbir Datto** said that as far as he is aware, they are working and have at least been working since he started in 2007, with the exception of one boiler which was repaired recently. The only time the Plant flares is when we cannot use all of the gas (which typically happens in the summer). **Karey Shinn** requested information on the reduction in natural gas usage so she could figure out the cost savings.

Action Item #3: **Shabbir Datto** to provide information on natural gas usage so that **Karey Shinn** can calculate cost savings.

Next NLC meeting: Thursday November 6, 2008.

Mike Logan can be emailed (mlogan@toronto.ca) with meeting location suggestions.

ICMC Portion of the Meeting

5. Review and Approval of ICMC Minutes

- **Meeting #68**

Deferred to next meeting.

6. ICMC Steering Committee- implementation of the ABTP EA Approved undertaking

- **Updated on the implementation of the EA approved undertaking**

Nancy Fleming said that the RFP for facilitation/public consultation in relation to the implementation of the EA approved undertaking has been released and the successful proponent should be on board in next few weeks.

- **Presentation and review of the draft disinfection study RFP**

Nancy Fleming shared copies of the draft Scope of Work for the ABTP Effluent Disinfection Study for members to review and to share feedback on. It has not been released yet so had to be re-collected before the meeting end.

Jim Neff said that it was not reasonable to have to re-collect the Scope of Work at the meeting. He did not think it should be done at this meeting. He commented that in the future it will be said that the NLC has reviewed and approved it. **Robert Davis** said that this is the best that can be done. Bylaws would be broken if it was released and the City would be subject to legal repercussions if it was released. **Karen Buck** said that this was untrue. For the residual waste working group members signed a document that indicated that they would read it in confidence and that comment back by a certain date. **Robert Davis** said this was not a secure method. **Karen Buck** said that she thought it was unfair to think that immediate feedback can be provide on a document the committee is supposed to advise on. She thought that Nancy should have arranged for a meeting prior to this one to discuss this, with opinions given at a later meeting. The process for this needs to be discussed seriously.

Members were given 20 minutes to review the Scope of Work. All members were finished reviewing the document before the 20 minutes were finished. Members were given the option to not make comments and abstain from the discussion. No members choose this option.

Karen Buck said that it was not in the scope of the EA in terms of wanting to review all the current disinfection methods available today.

Karen Buck asked what HRT stands for. **Nancy Fleming** responded that it stands for *high rate treatment*.

Jim Neff asked if the appendices were included. **Nancy Fleming** indicated that the appendices were not

included because they are boiler-plate documents used in every City RFP.

Karey Shinn asked if it will be a federal EA. **Nancy Fleming** said that yes, the outfall will trigger a Federal EA through the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. Other federal authorities will be involved depending on the project description.

Nancy Fleming indicated that the City has decided to forgo the technical advisory committee. Its formation was not intended to cause controversy. Other federal groups/authorities will be involved as necessary.

Steven Whyte asked when the City meets with the Ministry of the Environment and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans how reporting will be done. **Nancy Fleming** responded that all reporting will go through her.

Michael Rosenberg said that the conditions of approval state that the kind of study proposed is only to be done if the studies completed for the OWRA application find that UV is not technically or economically reasonable. Our position is that studies on UV-only must be done first. If those studies found that it was not technologically or economically reasonable, then this study would be permitted. **Nancy Fleming** said that she noted this comment.

Michael Rosenberg said, regarding technical memorandum 4, that he would strike out the portion that indicates that this should be done using a weighted and ranking system. He suggested the following instead: 'the degree to which each option meets the criteria should be noted, but they should not be weighted in any particular way.' And then, you go to the later steps in the process to memorandum 5, and to select a preferred option based on the information collected earlier. That decision should be based on looking at the information in an integrated manner not by looking at it in a weighted numerical form. **Nancy Fleming** said that she noted this comment.

David Done said, regarding section 3.11, that it should only be pertaining to the bypass. It is important that UV disinfection only is used to treat secondary effluent in line with the Mediation Agreement and Environmental Assessment document. It is clear in the resolution 7 of the mediation agreement (clause 4, roman 3 on page 79), that this kind of process at this stage pertains only to treatment of the bypass. It should not be opened up beyond that. **Steven Whyte** said section 13.1 of the approval is relevant as well. **Nancy Fleming** said that we want to look at all disinfection methods available as we want to confirm whether UV disinfection is still the best alternative to treat the effluent.. This is not a study to discount UV disinfection. Since UV has been shown not to work for the bypass, it will also explore what will work for the bypass.

Karey Shinn said when looking at all the different characteristics of UV disinfection, that she does not see any review of the potential energy sources for it. She knows some plants that have gone to UV have had the energy released from the plant by introducing fine bubbling. They also found that the number of lights they needed, under most circumstances, were less than presented in academic studies. She indicated that she was unaware of what happened with the Toronto Hydro proposal to do co-generation, but that a lot of heat is being recovered from the plant. She wants to know where the energy can come from to carry out the mediation agreement directive to have UV on secondary effluents. The bypass may be different, but there is not an exploration here to resolve the energy requirements. It does say energy use on the top of the second page, but this could present the same problem that happened with the biosolids residuals masterplan. They assumed that all the trucks were going to be polluting the most harmful diesel fuel which is not a realistic way of looking at emissions. For example, ethanol could have been used instead. Energy use has to be looked at in terms of various energy uses that are possible at the plant.

William Sheehan asked what the limit is to reviewing emerging technologies. He wondered if it would be possible to consider the option of getting rid of the plant. **Nancy Fleming** said that getting rid of the plant would not be an option explored in this review.

William Sheehan said that economics should be added to the list of criteria as the City should consider technology that will start a revenue stream. **Nancy Fleming** indicated that 'life cycle capital and operation and

maintenance costs' are part of technical memorandum 5 considered for each option.

Karen Buck said that this scope of the work has been done multiple times; there have been three different studies throughout the years that addressed this. This is referred to in 13.1 of the mediation agreement with the principles outlined on page 84. **Nancy Fleming** indicated that the current scope of work takes these studies into consideration.

There was consensus among the group that they would like to advise Toronto Water that they do not need to explore the secondary effluent in this study. **Nancy Fleming** will bring this information back to her department.

Michael Rosenberg said, with respect to the bypass, that UV should be looked at first before going to other methods. He said that what is presented here is contrary to what the Ministry of the Environment says.

Jim Neff suggested that this was an illegal process as it goes against the direction of the City and the Ministry of the Environment and it is out of compliance with the mediation agreement.

Mary Ann said that in the past there were studies being done regarding state of the art treatment plants around the world. She wondered what happened regarding the exploration of using technology that relied on natural resources. **Robert Davis** said that this question relates to a larger discussion that could be attended to outside of the meeting as it would take significant time to discuss.

Michael Rosenberg said he did not think an economic solution here is emerging technologies as pursuing new and emerging technologies is part of why these projects become very expensive. Under the process of memorandum 4, it may be helpful to add a sentence such as: 'that when looking at different methods the detailed description of each method should be optimized so you are not comparing a bad version of one method to the bad version of another method'. Each method should be the best of its class so it is meaningful.

Steven Whyte said he was concerned about this draft. The Ministry of the Environment's decision on Section 9 indicates that you have to look at UV for the secondary effluent. In the scope you have to look at any improvements to UV disinfection technologies on the basis of due diligence. In 3.1, paragraph 14.1, it indicates that UV is the preferred option for secondary effluent. If look at section 13.1 for the treatment of the bypass, you can maintain your current draft to look for other options. On section 4, he was also concerned about the ranking and weighting system and share Michael's view. He asked if there have been disinfection studies that have gone through schedule C studies. **Nancy Fleming** replied that she did not know.

Steven Whyte asked, regarding section 3.2-1, if we are looking at technical memorandums or mini reports. **Nancy Fleming** said we are looking for actual written reports.

Steven Whyte asked, regarding section 3.3, if the drawings would be standardized to AutoCAD. **Nancy Fleming** responded yes.

Steven Whyte said there was no mention of tertiary treatment. Regarding section 3.2 -4, he was concerned regarding the length of the study; it should take close to a year. **Nancy Fleming** said that 6 months was used as a guide and that the proponents could propose shorter/longer schedules.

Steven Whyte asked if there would be a detailed design done and regarding section 3.4, what the role of Ministry of the Environment will be in terms of reviewing. **Nancy Fleming** said that this not a detailed design. It is just an assessment to review different disinfection options. Regarding reporting to the Ministry, as per the conditions of approval, there are 3 types of reporting requirements –the annual reports put together by ICMC; monitoring program put together by the City; and an annual compliance report. The annual compliance report tells the Ministry of the Environment what sorts of monitoring activities the City has undertaken over the past year.

Steven Whyte said that the group could petition the minister if they did not agree with the City's options and

have it changed from a Schedule B to a Schedule C. He was really concerned about what the approvals branch says about your final design. There could be delays if the Ministry of the Environment said “no” or there were disagreements.

Karey Shinn said she is concerned about the makeup of the steering committee. She also wondered if the bypass effluent was considering or not considering an increase in bypassing flows from a potential Don Trunk sewer in case they do not build a water reuse facility. She also thought that it was detrimental that the province has dictated that there should be the Portlands Energy Centre within the evacuation region of the chlorine tinker car. It is closer than the Hearn was. She is very concerned about the new situation we have with the nearby gas generating station. **Karen Buck** noted that this is on page 84, regarding the high risk to the community. She said that if the City continues to pursue the idea that the Don Trunk sewer be twinned that there would then be a huge amount of bypass liquid that will not be able to treated by the UV because of its constituents. This would present a huge problem at the bottom of the system.

Karen Buck said she would like to know what role Toronto Water sees for the ICMC as a steering committee and how the process will be made fair and equitable. **Nancy Fleming** said that this is the first of many RFPs that will be released and all of them will be brought forward to the ICMC for review as per the MOE conditions of approval. Future RFPs that are larger will have a dedicated meeting to review and discuss them. The ICMC will have the opportunity to comment on the draft scope of work for the design. There will also be an elected ICMC member representative involved in RFP marking. The soon to be hired public consultation person will put together the consultation plan with input from the ICMC.

Karen Buck asked why the group was not involved in the public consultation hiring process. In the past, there used to be an equal representation of members and staff involved in hiring. **Robert Davis** said that over time the purchasing process has become more rigid and decision making processes have changed.

Karen Buck said that this format sets up a situation where City staff can outvote the ICMC on RFPs. **Nancy Fleming** said that one person’s marking can make a large difference with RFP selection.

Jim Neff asked why there was not a representative from the NLC as well. He asked who decides who is on the evaluation team. **Nancy Fleming** said that it is as per the conditions of the Ministry of the Environment, the ICMC is to have input into the selection of the consultants hired to undertake the work regarding the approved EA undertaking.

Michael Rosenberg said that some of the City procedures put in place do not benefit or empower the public.

- **Selection of one member of the ICM steering committee to sit on City proposal selection team**

Nominations were cast to decide which ICMC member should be on the RFP evaluation committee. **David Done** nominated Karen Buck and **Karen Buck** nominated Karey Shinn. There were four votes for Karen Buck and 2 votes for Karey Shinn. Karen Buck will sit on the RFP review committee for the scope of work. Steven White and Karey Shinn will be the alternates. In the future, there will be the potential for different committee members to be involved in RFP selection processes.

Karey Shinn requested that minutes from the RFP evaluation committee meetings be shared. **Nancy Fleming** clarified that it will only involve one evaluation meeting, during which no minutes would be taken.

- **Discussion about NLC/ICMC/Steering Committee meeting format**

Michael Rosenberg presented **Nancy Fleming** with the letter titled ‘ICMC process suggestions Sep 24 2008’. This letter entails his suggestions for ICMC meeting improvements. He suggested that the NLC and ICMC meeting be held separated in order to provide a dedicated space of time for each meeting. He thought daytime meetings could be a possibility. **William Sheehan** said he would not be able to attend daytime meetings.

Robert Davis asked if monthly staff reports were going to continue at these meetings. **Nancy Fleming** said she would have to talk to the Director about this.

Robert Davis said the next meeting will combine NLC and ICMC meetings. At the next meeting the possibility of separating the meetings can be discussed.

Michael Rosenberg requested that a representative from the Ministry of the Environment be present at a future ICMC meeting. He requested that there be a way for ICMC members to contribute to setting the meeting agenda.

Karen Buck asked when the ICMC would see a revised RFP built on the revised comments. **Nancy Fleming** Now that the ICMC has reviewed provided comment on the scope of work, the RFP will be finalized and scheduled for release.

William Sheehan asked how much the RFP will be for and its submission deadline. **Nancy Fleming** said there is no budget included in the RFP and there has not been a due date set yet.

Next ICMC meeting: Thursday November 6, 2008.

- **Review and approval of ICMC minutes**

Deferred to the next meeting. At the next meeting we will have three sets of minutes to approve.

- **Review of ICMC action items and motions**

Deferred to the next meeting.

- **ICMC updates**

Deferred to the next meeting.

- **Other business**

No other business was discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 pm.

Letter from Dalton Shipway

September 9, 2008

To: Planning and Growth Management Committee
September 10, 2008-10-01

Subject: The City – Initiated Request to Amend the City of Toronto Official Plan (O.P.)

A “complete application” required by an applicant includes: official plan amendments, zoning by-law consent to sever applications and submission requirements for Site Plan Control applications.

- The O.P. amendment is to include minimum complete application requirements for development applications.
- The proposed O.P. amendment would apply to all lands in the City of Toronto.

This written comment proposes that the Committee pass with a resolution: that staff come back to this Committee and to Council with a report that says:

Information that City Council needs to make an informed decision shall include

- A. biological factors in the environment that include soil, water, flora and fauna and any issues that must be addressed so that a net improvement can be attained and that
- B. information from the City site registry (Public Health) that must apply to a complete application. Such information must have full public disclosure.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Dalton C. Shipway

cc: Mayor Miller
cc: Premier Dalton McGuinty
cc: Toronto Star
cc: ICMC

ICMC Process Suggestions

Michael Rosenberg

Sep 24, 2008

This is to address the concern that the City is moving ahead without meaningful ICMC involvement and is aimed at trying to figure out how we can all work together.

What follows is a response to the first two points of the Toronto Water work plan letter dated June 13, 2008 to ICMC members and Toronto Water's statements at the July 8, 2008 ICMC meeting.

1. Hire a facilitator to facilitate ICMC Committee, Advisory Committee and Public Meetings for all the EA projects

The ICMC does need staff assistance, including a facilitator as well as engineering staff attendance. However, we need to clarify the ICMC's involvement in the selection of the Facilitator, the disinfection RFP, the Terms of Reference of the Advisory Committee if there is to be one, the Public Consultation plan, and the studies resulting from the EA approval.

The ICMC involvement in these functions is described in Condition 8 of the Feb 22, 2008 EA decision. Also, in the Mediation Agreement page 89 in Resolution 8, 2.5 and 2.6, it is clear that the ICMC is to be the Steering Committee for the OWRA studies, hiring of consultants and reporting to Works Committee and City Council.

In order to facilitate the new work of the ICMC including the Steering Committee function, it will not be possible to have the ICMC meetings at the end of the ABTP NLC meetings. At this ICMC meeting it should be decided that ICMC meetings will take place during the day to facilitate attendance of Toronto Water staff and external stakeholders.

Recommendations:

- o That an MOE representative attend the ICMC Steering Committee portion of the ICMC meetings.
- o That the ICMC be consulted regarding placing all necessary and appropriate items on the ICMC Steering Committee section of the ICMC agendas, in order to facilitate moving the Work Plan forward.
- o That, rather than having a separate Advisory Committee, the other stakeholders attend every second or third ICMC Steering Committee meeting for the consultation and technical function.

A separate Advisory Committee could be acceptable only if:

- o The NLC has 2 members on the Advisory Committee, in addition to the 2 members from the ICMC. (The NLC passed a motion requesting this.)
- o The ICMC Steering Committee is consulted about the Advisory Committee agenda prior to each Advisory Committee meeting.
- o The inclusion of any item on the Advisory Committee agenda does not exclude that item from the ICMC Steering Committee agenda.
- o It may clarify matters if the committee were called the Technical Liaison Committee if that is the intention.

2. Release a RFP to assess all possible disinfection methods for ABTP effluent

In the MOE approval document on page 8, Condition 13, there is a process that the City is to use, if as a part of the OWRA application and detailed design, it was found to not be technically or economically feasible to use UV disinfection. It is clear that a new study of all possible methods is to be done only after the OWRA study on the UV system is done and only if that study finds that a UV system is not technically or economically reasonable.

Are the studies proposed for disinfection to be for the bypassed effluent, the secondary effluent or both, and why?

The RFP should be for the OWRA studies for the UV disinfection system and that this RFP should include determining if UV is technically and economically reasonable, but not include studying any other methods. An RFP for all methods should not be issued at this time, not even included as an optional extension in the first RFP, since it will bias the consultant's work if they think they can get work on an additional study if they find UV to be unreasonable.