



**Ashbridges Bay Treatment Plant (ABTP) Neighbourhood
Liaison Committee (NLC)
Meeting #96**

Mennonite New Life Centre (basement), 1774 Queen Street East
February 25, 2010
6:30 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

ATTENDANCE:

Karen Buck, NLC Co-Chair, Citizens for a Safe Environment
Karey Shinn, NLC Co-Chair, Safe Sewage Committee
Chris Blythe, Beach Triangle Residents Association
Caron Court, Leslie Street resident
Susan Court
Bob Kortright, Toronto Field Naturalists
Jim Neff, Leslieville Resident
Doug Phillips, Beach resident
Michael Rosenberg, Economics of Technology Working Group

CITY OF TORONTO:

Shabbir Dato, ABTP Engineer
Mike Logan, Public Consultation Unit

TORONTO TRANSIT COMMISSION

David Nagler, Community Relations Co-Ordinator
Lito Romano, Community Liaison Officer

REGRETS:

David Done
Peter Keiler
Joe MacDonald

1. Welcome and Introductions

Karen Buck called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. All present at the meeting introduced themselves.

- **Review and Approval of Agenda**

Michael Rosenberg asked to add a discussion of the mandate of the ABTP NLC. **Karen Buck** suggested this be added to New Business.

2. Review and Approval of ABTB NLC Minutes

• Meeting #95, November 19th, 2009

Karen Buck asked if anyone had comments on the minutes for meeting #95.

Karen Buck remarked that she did not receive a copy of the minutes for meeting #95 before tonight's meeting. **Mike Logan** indicated that he had sent out the minutes to all members but would double-check that she was on the distribution list.

Doug Philips noted that the minutes had a few typos; **Karen Buck** suggested that Doug speak with Mike Logan at the break about this. **Doug** pointed out that on page 3 of the minutes, Michael Rosenberg's question to Jean-Yves Urbain about a breakdown of the odour contributed by each building or process was not answered by Jean-Yves. **Doug** asked if this information could be made available. **Mike Logan** agreed to follow-up on this request.

Action Item #1: Mike Logan to ask Jean-Yves Urbain for the breakdown of odour contributed by each building or process.

Karen Buck invited any latecomers to respond to the minutes, when no comments were forthcoming, **Karen** asked for a motion to accept the minutes.

Jim Neff moved to adopt the minutes, and **Karey Shinn** seconded the motion.

3. Review of NLC Action Items

• **Meeting #88: Action Item #2 – Karen Buck/Karey Shinn to write a letter on behalf of the NLC to Toronto Water requesting a response on all pending Motions**

Karen Buck said that she and **Karey Shinn** were still not sure where to send this letter. **Mike Logan** remarked that this was an old Action Item and wondered what pending Motions the NLC was hoping to get a response to. **Karen** remarked that the NLC is still unsure about what happens to a motion once it has been made. **Mike Logan** replied that this depended on the motion and if anyone is asked to do anything.

Karey Shinn wondered if it was worth digging up and following up on old motions. **Karen Buck** said that to date the group has been unsuccessful in directing motions to the right people. **Michael Rosenberg** suggested that the group compile separate lists for tracking action items and motions. **Mike Logan** asked if this would mean going through old minutes to compile a list. **Michael Rosenberg** responded that this could be an initiative moving forward.

Action Item #2: Mike Logan to track non-procedural Motions with a list similar to how Action Items are currently tracked.

Disposition: Ongoing

Michael Rosenberg asked what happened to the Action Item to ask how much of the Veolia contract for building and operating the pelletizer is available to the public. **Karey Shinn** replied that the group had received part of the contract. **Michael** asked if the NLC's questions about financial penalties for delays in meeting the contract's obligations had been answered. **Shabbir Dattoo** drew the group's attention to the minutes of meeting #94 for the response to the question about the financial implications of a delay to the contract. **Michael Rosenberg** said that the minutes did not address whether or not a delay would incur financial penalties. **Shabbir** noted that contractual details could not be shared.

Michael Rosenberg asked if a motion could be made to find out pelletizer penalties for non-performance. **Karen Buck** remarked that the pelletizer had not been commissioned in fifteen years and no penalties had been levied against the original contractor, so another motion would not likely be very useful. **Shabbir Dattoo** stated that the pelletizer is fully operational and commissioned, but that Veolia had not passed the secondary testing process throughput requirements. **Shabbir** noted that the required performance/throughput continues to be negotiated, but this is not affecting the day to day operations of the pelletizer facility.

Karen Buck then asked latecomers to introduce themselves.

4. Update on TTC LRV M&SF construction

Karen Buck then invited **David Nagler** and **Lito Romano** to make a presentation on the Light Rail Vehicle Maintenance and Storage Facility (LRV M&SF). A copy of the presentation was distributed. The presentation will also be made available on the NLC website, and will be attached to the meeting minutes.

Lito Romano thanked **Karen Buck** and the ABTP NLC for their invitation to speak and said that he would use the time to run through the status of the project and the type of community input the TTC was looking for. **David Nagler** highlighted that the TTC is evaluating alternate routes for LRVs to access the new facility based on feedback received at the public meeting on February 18. The TTC plans to hold a further public consultation event to discuss possible routes.

Slide 2 outlined the decision-making process involved with choosing the Ashbridges Bay site (the south-east corner of Leslie Street and Lake Shore Boulevard East). **Karey Shinn** suggested that this decision-making was unacceptable because it did not consider the possible need to expand the wastewater treatment facilities in the future. **Karey** indicated that the lease between the City and the Toronto Port Authority (TPA) designated the use of the land as wastewater

treatment, or parkland. She also said that the mandate of the NLC is, in part, to provide advice and feedback on what is an appropriate land use on the ABTP site.

Lito Romano noted that the TTC was not a part of the negotiations that transferred ownership of the site from the TPA to the City of Toronto, so he could not speak to the details of the agreement. **Mike Logan** indicated that he had already spoken to Karen Buck regarding the NLC's request for more information about the land transfer. **Mike** indicated that he brought copies of the City Council minutes in which the transfer was approved. The debate and decision originally was carried out in an in-camera session of Council, but the decision indicated that the full agreement will be made public once it has been executed by both parties. **Mike** indicated that he has asked the Clerk to provide this document as soon as possible.

<p>Action Item #3: Mike Logan to distribute the agreement between the City and Toronto Port Authority regarding the transfer of land at the south-east corner of Lake Shore Boulevard East and Leslie Street to all members of the NLC.</p>
--

Mike Logan said that while it is important for the NLC to communicate on any proposed uses of the ABTP site, the land transfer decision has already been made, which could mean that this land is no longer part of the ABTP site.

Jim Neff asked if, at the end of the lease, the land would return to the City. **Karen Buck** said that she had spoken to Bill Jackman at the TPA who told her that a dollar had been exchanged between the Port Authority and the City for eighteen acres of land. **Karen** said that the land deal had not been conducted openly and that the deeded use of the land was for a wastewater treatment plant.

Lito Romano continued with his presentation. He indicated that consultations on the location of the facility were held on June 16-18, 2009. The site was decided partly based on feedback received at that consultation. Significant opposition was voiced towards the Eastern Avenue location option which was not chosen. An Open House on February 18, 2010 had solicited input on the design and aesthetics. Feedback received, particularly from residents of Leslie Street, made it very clear that additional routing options of the connection track need to be considered. **Lito** explained TTC is currently in preliminary planning phase. The next phase of the process would be the issuance of the Notice of Commencement for the formal Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) most likely in late March or April 2010. This would be followed by a 120 day period during which the environmental effects of the facility would be examined. After the TPAP there will be 30 days for the public to review an eventual environmental project report and submit comments to the Minister of the Environment.

Lito Romano indicated that the plan is for the majority of the 100 Light Rail Vehicles accessing the Ashbridges Bay site to leave the facility between 5am and 7am and 30% of those cars would return by 10am. **David Nagler** said the explanation provided by the project team at the February 18th open house for proposing Leslie as the connection track route is because it is thought to be the most direct and therefore most efficient route for both capital and operating costs. Leslie from Commissioners to Queen St. also happens to be designated as a future transit corridor

expansion element in Map 4 of the Toronto Official Plan. This means that there will be tracks on Leslie between Commissioners Street and Queen Street eventually even without the M&SF. However, the project team is revisiting alternative routes to see if other options are more suitable. **David** noted that typically in these types of analysis, community impact is as important as factors such as cost and traffic effects and a qualitative analysis is undertaken. He and **Lito** are looking to collect feedback and make sure all community concerns are taken into account by the TTC project team..

Lito Romano added that the TTC is seeking community input on whether or not to screen the facility with a berm. He said that there is sufficient property on Lake Shore Boulevard for 6-7m of landscaping and a 'green' acoustic wall. **Lito** said that the design of the building would maximize natural light and decrease energy costs and that the upper part of the building would be visible at street level. **Lito** said that the TTC clearly understands the 'greening' of Leslie Street and the area of the facility is a top priority for the community. .

Lito Romano pointed out that 400 000 m³ of non-hazardous contaminated soil needs to be moved from the site before construction can begin. This removal is expected to begin later in the spring and will take about 10 months to complete. Cleaning up the site is a priority and must be done with minimal inconvenience. Defining a truck route away from the community is a priority and feedback will be sought at future consultations.

Discussion

Michael Rosenberg said that residents were given insufficient notice of the December 16th meeting and that most did not realize the decision to approve the site as the new location for the TTC LRV M&S facility was happening at that meeting. **Michael** suggested that the TTC was not conducting this process transparently, as the site had been chosen without public consultation. **Michael** said that the selected site was needed for sewage use and that there was still time to evaluate other sites.

Mike Logan replied that three public open houses were held in June 2009 to consider site selection for this facility. These events were advertised in the Beaches Mirror and flyers were distributed widely, and a full report on the results of that consultation was prepared. The site was chosen based partly on this information.

Chris Blythe asked if all aspects of the process before the Notice of Commencement were conceptual. **David Nagler** replied that the project is currently in "preliminary planning" and yes, the renderings of the facility are conceptual. In the future a formal notice of commencement will be issued for the TPAP. Staff are currently working to answer questions arising from public consultation before the formal TPAP process begins.

Doug Philips suggested that the existing berm was to protect the community from a chlorine explosion. **Shabbir Datto** suggested that the possible purpose of the berm could have been to create a visual buffer around the wastewater plant. **Mike Logan** also reminded the NLC that Toronto Water plans to discontinue use of the rail cars of chlorine gas, and has completed an EA to determine the best disinfection method to implement. **Lito Romano** said that the berm being

proposed would be both a visual and noise barrier. **Doug Philips** asked what material was to be removed from the site. **Lito** said that the soil on site would not be used to create the new berm and that the contaminated soil will be moved to an approved site.

Caron Court said that Leslie Street residents were not aware that the street was a dedicated transit corridor and that she was working with Councilor Fletcher to find out when it was designated as such. **Chris Blythe** noted that the proposed track for Leslie Street would be a non-revenue track, so adding a track to Leslie Street wouldn't improve transit. **Lito Romano** responded that a connection track will be necessary in the future to enhance transit in the area by providing a link for the accessible new vehicles to the maintenance facility.

Caron Court asked why the report on the June open houses had not been made public yet and said that many residents were not aware of the meeting until it had already taken place. **Lito Romano** said the report would be available online within a week. **Caron** asked who took notes for the meetings. **David Nagler** replied that on February 18th, many staff took notes, and an independent consultant (LURA) was using those notes and all comments submitted in writing to prepare a comprehensive report on the consultation. He pointed out that submitting comments in writing (e.g. by e-mail, comment sheet) helps to ensure accuracy. **Mike Logan** said that he wrote the report on the June, 2009 consultations and submitted it to the TTC. He added that the Public Consultation Unit of the City of Toronto is also a neutral group.

Caron Court asked if the report contains original comments or a summary. **Mike Logan** explained that the consultation report usually summarizes comments, but that all original comments are archived and can be obtained through a Freedom of Information request. **David Nagler** said he understands that a majority of feedback from the June meetings highlighted opposition to a facility being located on Eastern Avenue – which was not selected. That said, he pointed out that consultation is not a voting process. He added that all opinions are important regardless of whether they formed the majority or minority.

Caron Court asked when soil removal was to begin on the site. **Lito Romano** replied that the soil removal was scheduled to begin in April, but the schedule was subject to change.

Caron Court asked when the next public consultation meeting was scheduled for the project. **David Nagler** replied that the next meeting would be announced once it had been confirmed with local Councillors. **David** said that everyone involved wants the meetings to be constructive and as open and transparent as possible.

Caron Court asked if other options for the connection track route will be discussed at the next public meeting. **David Nagler** replied that a number of issues such as the new vehicles which many residents have asked about will be addressed, but that a focus will indeed be the connection track routing. **Jim Neff** said that some community groups opposed to the connection track route may load the comment sheets. **David Nagler** replied that their concerns are important but noted that is an example of why public consultation is not always about numbers or voting.

Jim Neff asked if the Portlands Action Committee had been consulted. **David Nagler** replied that the TTC made a presentation to them in September, 2009.

Jim Neff said that the master plan for the portlands has always included a transportation route down Commissioners Street, and this has been discussed at public meetings for years. **Caron Court** replied that Leslie Street residents were unaware of the transit route designation. **Susan Court** commented that one hundred new streetcars traveling along Leslie Street at 5am was new. **Caron Court** said that a non-revenue track does not improve transit. **Lito Romano** asked if opinion about the track would be different if the track had stops on it (revenue service). **Caron Court** replied that she would have to consult her neighbours to find out.

Chris Blythe said that the transit plans for the portlands referred to by Jim Neff are conceptual but if Commissioners Street is to be serviced by transit the selected location for the M&SF makes sense. **David Nagler** suggested that he would request senior planners from the TTC address future long term plans for transit along Queen's Quay, Cherry and the rest of the Portlands at future consultations.

Jim Neff asked about the Russell Yard on Connaught Street. **Lito Romano** replied that it will remain very important, as it is where one quarter of the new fleet (52 vehicles) will be cleaned and stored. **Lito** added that the existing Roncesvalles Yard will also perform this function.

Karey Shinn asked if either **Lito Romano** or **David Nagler** had read the Mediation Agreement, which is part of the Ashbridges Bay Treatment Plant Environmental Assessment. **Lito Romano** replied that he was aware of it, but had not read the entire report. **Karey Shinn** pointed out that the NLC has a mandate to evaluate any proposed new uses of the ABTP site. This would include this new facility. **Karey** asked when the land became available, when did its use change and what is the status of its deeded use for sewage?

Karey Shinn then read a motion prepared by the ABTP NLC,

Motion 96.1:

The Ashbridges Bay Treatment Plant (ABTP) Neighbourhood Liaison Committee (NLC) opposes the siting of the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) Light Rail Vehicle facility on 18 acres of the existing ABTP site. The siting is in contravention of the primary purpose of the ABTP site. The ABTP site is designated to be reserved for future sanitary sewage treatment needs, as stated in the ABTP Environmental Assessment (EA) Mediation Agreement (MA) as approved by Council at its June meeting in 1999.

The ABTP NLC also opposes the substantial removal of approximately 10% of the ABTP site without any alternatives being brought to the ABTP NLC to provide and ensure that space for future sanitary sewage treatment needs can be accommodated.

The members of the ABTP NLC recognize the need for public transit infrastructure but we also recognize the need for sanitary sewage treatment. It is not reasonable that the TTC infrastructure needs are to be built at the expense of, or trump, sewage treatment needs. The ABTP is already experiencing secondary bypass events and, to date, no other sites or alternatives have been identified for the expansion of treatment of current and future sanitary flows in the City of Toronto.

The members of the ABTP NLC ask, once again, that this matter be brought to the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee for public deputations.

Attached please find an extract from the ABTP EA Mediation Agreement that supports our need for the above motion to be addressed and the need for the role of the ABTP NLC as a active party to developments on the ABTP Site as directed by the Mandate of the ABTP NLC.

It is further moved that the ABTP NLC Public Consultation Staff member, Mike Logan, be responsible for the circulation of the above motion to the His Honour the Mayor of the City of Toronto, to the Chair and Board members of the Toronto Port Authority, to the Chair and members of the TTC Board, to the TTC and City Staff carrying out the current LRV Siting process (EA), to the Ward 30 and 32 Councillors, to the Chair and members of the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee, to the Chair and members of the Board of Health and to any other interested members.

Excerpt from Mediation Agreement (Resolution #1: Guiding Principals, Pages 30-31):

5. The principle that the area of the MTP Site should be reserved primarily for activities and developments that are directly related to its primary purpose, to maximize the efficiency of the MTP and to minimize pressures for lakefilling. Activities or developments that are not directly related to the primary purpose of the MTP may be permitted at the MTP Site only if:
 - the MTP Neighbourhood Liaison Committee has been fully informed and consulted;
 - a comprehensive analysis of alternative locations has been conducted, having regard to the definition of the environment from the Environmental Assessment Act, and the MTP Site has been determined to be the preferred alternative;
 - the activity or development can be located at the MTP Site, without compromising the ability of the Site to accommodate future requirements for sanitary sewage treatment and without increasing pressures for lakefilling;
 - the activity or development will not compromise the beneficial use of biosolids at the MTP;
 - the approved Site Plan either contemplates the activity or development or can be amended to provide for it without compromising its integrity;
 - the activity or development will not cause any adverse impact on the quality of air, water or land in the vicinity of the MTP;
 - the activity or development will not cause any adverse impact on the quality of the final effluent from the MTP or on near shore water quality;
 - the activity or development will not increase off site nuisance impacts on residential, recreational or other sensitive land uses in the vicinity; and

- the activity or development will not cause an adverse visual impact from any off site location.

Karey said that the NLC's role as an active participant must be recognized by the City and the TTC and asked that **Mike Logan** give a copy of the motion to the Mayor's office.

Karey Shinn said that the TTC is appropriating land that will be required for expansion of the ABTP, and that the plant is already experiencing bypass flows.

Karey Shinn went on to read a second motion for consideration:

Motion 96.2:

The ABTP NLC moves to request that the details of the process used by the City to transfer the deeded use of the ABTP site be forwarded to the ABTP NLC. The request includes the following:

- How and when did the ABTP Site become available for a change in its deeded use and subject to a severance of a parcel of land to be deeded to the TTC and removed from the use of the ABTP?
- What is the status of the original deeded use on the whole of the ABTP site as a site reserved for sanitary sewage treatment needs for the current and future City of Toronto?

Doug Philips seconded both motions. The motions were voted on and passed.

Michael Rosenberg said that the TTC should have been at the NLC's November 19th meeting. **Michael** said that the city's interests are broader than transit and that the mediation agreement contains no escape clause for dealing with non-sewage use of the plant site. **Mike Logan** pointed out that an update from TTC was provided at the September 17th meeting, which clearly indicated that the Ashbridges Bay site was the preferred location.

Karen Buck asked if a committee had been established to consider routes for the connection track. **David Nagler** explained that Councilor Bussin had asked citizens to sign up for a potential committee, but that the TTC would prefer a community-wide meeting where everyone was invited. **Karen Buck** suggested that a construction liaison committee would occur after all of planning was complete and noted that the EA was a large part of the decision-making process. **David** noted that the TPAP (which is similar to an EA) has not actually started yet. He said that the site selection was a City Council decision. **Karey Shinn** said that the site was not legal and asked to see the agreement.

Karen Buck said that the dialogue conducted tonight should have been had sooner because the NLC has such a strong mandate for future use of the site. **Jim Neff** said that there were strong legal considerations to be made. **Karey Shinn** said that the Mayor wants TTC cars at all cost.

Karen Buck thanked **Lito Romano** and **David Nagler** for their presentation.

5. Mini-updates

Shabbir Dattoo provided the following information:

- **ABTP EA:** The disinfection EA will be getting released for 30 day public review on Feb 25th.
- **BMP and Pelletizer Status:** 3 of 4 Plants were approved in November (ABTP, NTTP, and HTTP). A follow-up report for HCTP was requested by Public Works and Infrastructure Committee (PW&I), which will go forward at the March meeting.

There is nothing of significance to report on the pelletizer. It continues to operate aside from typical maintenance-related shutdowns.

Lastly, a short report on the Biosolids program will be going to the March PW&I Committee meeting, which briefly addresses status and volumes processed in 2009.

Karen Buck asked if the pellets produced by the pelletizer and marketed as fertilizer product had been certified by CFIA. **Shabbir Dattoo** replied he would have to make some inquiries and get back to the NLC on this item.

Action Item #4: **Shabbir Dattoo** to obtain a copy of the fertilizer product certification from CFIA.

- **Odour Control Project:**
 - *M&T buildings:* construction in progress (completion planned by end of year)
 - *D Building:* construction tender closed Feb 2010, construction start scheduled for July 2010
 - *Aeration tanks ducting to main stack:* Design completed, tender scheduled for second quarter of 2010, construction start scheduled for third quarter 2010.
 - *Aeration tank pilot (tank #2):* pre-design is complete, tender scheduled for third quarter 2010 (will include one year pilot testing program for nitrification/de-nitrification)
 - *Aeration tanks #2-11:* pre-design complete, detailed design following completion of pilot above. Will be split into two contracts (tanks 1-6 and 7-11); schedule to be established dependant on future funding budgets.
 - *P Building:* design in progress, estimated time for design is 2.5 years.
- **Landscape Plan:** The Design is currently at the 75% stage. The Tender is anticipated for the end of June 2010, with construction commencing in August 2010 and continuing until the end of 2012. A one page update on contaminants within the site provided by the Project Team can be found in the document Pump House Park Update attached to these minutes.

Shabbir Dattoo asked if agenda item #4 concerning the Odour Reporting Protocol could be addressed. **Mike Logan** suggested it would need to be deferred to a future meeting due to time constraints.

Karen Buck pointed out that the NLC has never developed criteria for evaluating proposed uses or developments on the ABTP Site, which they were supposed to do according to their Terms of Reference (Section 1.1.2). This could have avoided the M&SF issue. She suggested that the group should dedicate some time at the next meeting to develop this. **Karen** asked if they could address this issue at a separate meeting before the regular May meeting. **Mike Logan** suggested that a specific working meeting to address this issue would be appropriate, and also suggested that the NLC consider the odour protocol at the same time. He indicated that Toronto Water staff would not need to attend, and those in attendance agreed.

Karen Buck asked if 311 was receiving odour complaints. **Shabbir Dattoo** replied that since the last meeting, only one complaint had been received and that he was not sure how it had been received, but 311 was prepared to receive these complaints. **Caron Court** asked how information about how to complain about odours is disseminated throughout the neighbourhood. **Karey Shinn** said that there were signs at the plant and on the plant website. **Karen Buck** suggested that the NLC could develop an outreach strategy. **Mike Logan** pointed out that 311 is a stream-lined contact number for all city services, which is an important step in making it easy for the public to file complaints.

Caron Court asked how odour is dealt with when a complaint is received. **Shabbir Dattoo** explained that the City is obligated to report all odour complaints received to the Ministry of the Environment. He went on to say that all complaints are investigated. In certain situations, it is possible to mitigate the source of the odour, but not always. In some cases, it is possible that the treatment plant might not even be the source of the odour.

6. Adjournment

Next Meeting: April 19, 2010 at the Mennonite New Life Centre. This will be a working meeting and not follow the normal agenda.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Pump House Park Update

The Landscaping Design for the Pump House Park (PHP) is currently at the 75% design stage. We anticipate going to Tender for Construction by the end of June 2010. Construction of the new PHP will begin in August 2010 and will continue until the end of 2012.

For the past year, the City has been undergoing environmental investigations of the site utilizing several environmental/engineering consulting firms. These investigations have identified metallic and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon contamination within soils at the site, as well as petroleum hydrocarbon-related contamination of groundwater, including light, non-aqueous phase liquid (LNAPL).

As discussed at the last Public Workshop, the soil impacts are widely distributed, and are likely associated with the inclusion of cinders, fly-ash, and similar materials within fill materials historically placed at the site. The groundwater impacts and LNAPL are located within the playing fields in the southwest corner of the site. Groundwater is generally located at depths between 2 m and 3 m below ground surface.

Given the extensive distribution of contaminants at the site, removal and replacement of impacted materials is not economically practical. However, the environmental investigations of the site have included evaluation of risks or hazards the contamination might pose to the general public (e.g., park users). These studies have concluded that risk/hazards to the general public associated with historical poor-quality fill materials may be mitigated by ensuring an adequate thickness of acceptable-quality soils overtop the historical fills, thereby eliminating potential contact with contaminated soils. Similarly, the depth to groundwater mitigates exposures of the general public to dissolved and liquid-phase contaminants at the site,

To ensure that the general public may continue to safely enjoy and make use of the park facilities, the City will be retaining environmental/engineering consultants to monitor site conditions on an ongoing basis.