

**HIGHLAND CREEK TREATMENT PLANT (HCTP)  
Neighbourhood Liaison Committee (NLC)**

**Meeting #15  
Monday, September 10, 2007**

**Highland Creek Treatment Plant Meeting Room  
51 Beechgrove Drive**

**Meeting: 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.**

---

**DRAFT SUMMARY NOTES**

---

**ATTENDANCE**

Francis Chang, Community Co-Chair	<b>City of Toronto</b>
John Hopkins	Anthony Pigaidoulis, Wastewater Treatment
Glen McTernan	Clarito Gonzales, Senior Engineer
Lynn McTernan	Samir Demian, Plant Manager
Ron Chicoyne	Joanne Di Caro, Toronto Water
Jean-Yves Urbain, Earth Tech	Nancy Martins, Public Consultation Unit
Hy Schwartz	Diane Sertic, Toronto Water
William F. Sheehan	Bruce Baker, Councillor Moser's Office
Charlie Stead	
James Matthews	
Desmond Vandenberg	Alpha Abebe, Note Taker
Maria Vandenberg	
Robert McIntosh	
Marilyn McIntosh	

**AGENDA**

1. Welcome and Introductions 7:00 p.m.
  - Community Co-Chair, Francis Chang
2. Review of Agenda and Summary Notes 7:05 p.m.
  - April 12, 2007
3. Sewer Use ByLaw Presentation – Joanne Di Caro 7:10 p.m.
4. Plant Updates 7:35 p.m.
  - Odour Control Project
  - Draft Biosolids and Residuals Master Plan
  - Incinerator Repairs
  - Review Odour Complaints
  - Other capital projects planned and underway

5. Other Business

8:15 pm

6. Next Meeting Agenda Items, Adjourn

## 1. INTRODUCTIONS

**Francis Chang**, Community Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. All participants present introduced themselves.

## 2. REVIEW OF AGENDA AND SUMMARY NOTES

Francis Chang commented that the summary notes were very detailed and recommended that they be adopted. The motion was seconded and the minutes from April 12, 2007, were adopted.

## 3. SEWER USE BYLAW PRESENTATION – Joanne Di Caro

**Joanne Di Caro**, Manager Environmental Monitoring and Protection, Toronto Water, gave a presentation on the Sewer Use Bylaw and reviewed its progress over the past 18 months. The following topics were reviewed:

- Objective of the sewer use by-law
- Highlights of the by-law
- Monitoring sewer use by-law compliance
- Enforcement
- Environmental Monitoring & Protection Unit
- What's new since 2005
- Achievements
- Recognition
- Highland Creek Sewershed
- Industries required to Prepare P2 plans & compliance rate

Please see Attachment A for a copy of the presentation.

### Questions/Comments:

**William Sheehan** asked what happened when residents call the spills hotline. He also asked whether potential polluters were notified before inspectors came in. **Joanne Di Caro** noted that they regularly receive complaints that they follow up with and there have been times when the unit has had to respond to up to 500 complaints in a year. She also noted that she has staff that work at night to cover evening work and respond to events in the evening hours. With regards to William Sheehan's second question, **Joanne Di Caro** replied that they do not usually alert companies when they go in for inspections. While there were companies that they did inspect regularly, they did not know when in the month the inspectors were coming in. **Joanne Di Caro** also noted that for some

large companies her unit did routine inspections where they did notify them that the inspectors were coming to ensure that someone familiar with the operations was available to show them around the facility.

**Desmond Vandenberg** asked about hexachlorine benzene and where it originates from. He also asked what was being done to reduce mercury and whether there were any concerns if the new numbers which had previously been underreported. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** answered that all variances would be looked at and that he would have to get back to Desmond Vandenberg about where hexachlorine benzene originates.

**Anthony Pigaidoulis** also noted that the information on the NPRI website is still being reviewed and that there was no concern with the current air emissions since all of the 2006 incinerator stack releases were within the provincially regulated limits.

**John Hopkins** asked **Joanne Di Caro** whether she worked with the Toronto Environmental Alliance. **Joanne Di Caro** replied that no one from the Toronto Environmental Alliance has ever contacted them but they would be welcome depending on how they were looking to get involved.

**William Sheehan** asked whether the fines Joanne Di Caro spoke about in her presentation covered enforcement. **Joanne Di Caro** replied that the fines did not cover enforcement. **William Sheehan** then asked how cross connections compared to CSOs. **Joanne Di Caro** explained that CSOs are combined sewers that have a storm and sanitary flow. During heavy rainfalls their capacity is maximized and there is an overflow. Cross connections are different, this usually happens during the construction of residential homes or renovations where plumbers or residents connect the pipes incorrectly, where the sanitary pipe is improperly connected to the storm pipe. **William Sheehan** also asked about beach closures and was informed of the Toronto Public Health website which provides daily updates on beaches that are unsafe for swimming.

**Francis Chang** asked Joanne Di Caro to expand on the ticketing package that she spoke of in her presentation. **Joanne Di Caro** answered that this would allow officers to be able to issue tickets on the spot. **Francis Chang** then asked whether this was the same as a notice of violation. **Joanne Di Caro** replied that notices of violation are not the same as tickets, but they were more like warning letters. Joanne Di Caro explained that tickets were an improvement because notices of violation act more like a paper trail while tickets are an immediate enforcement action. **Francis Chang** asked whether tickets carried a numerical amount and **Joanne Di Caro** replied they did and that the Attorney General usually determines the amount however, they could provide recommendations. **Joanne Di Caro** reported that in 2007 there were 207 notices of violation issued.

**Francis Chang** asked Joanne Di Caro to explain what Compliance Agreements were. **Joanne Di Caro** clarified that these are made with companies that have a discharge over limit and want to fix the problem but cannot do so immediately. The Compliance Agreement provides them with protection for a period of time until they can fix the problem. **Francis Chang** then asked whether there was a fee for this Compliance Agreement. **Joanne Di Caro** answered no.

#### **4. PLANT UPDATES**

**Anthony Pigaidoulis** provided the plant updates at this meeting. Anthony Pigaidoulis updated the group on the Odour Control Project explaining that the request for proposals

went out on August 31<sup>st</sup> and the tender period closes on October 17<sup>th</sup> 2007. He explained that this is a significant amount of time because the project is large in scope and they are anticipating awarding the project early 2008.

**Anthony Pigaidoulis** then updated the group on the draft Biosolids and Residuals Master Plan. He noted that a stakeholder meeting to talk about the peer review was held on September 5<sup>th</sup>. The draft Master Plan recommends that the Highland Creek plant move to fluidized bed incinerators and the document has been open for public review since 2004. **Nancy Martins** noted that they are accepting stakeholder comments on the composition of the Peer Review Panel until September 11<sup>th</sup>. Toronto Water, Toronto Public Health and Technical Services are involved in the project. The peer review will be completed by the end of this year. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** explained that after the peer review the master plan will be updated likely in early 2008.

**Anthony Pigaidoulis** followed with an update on the incinerator repairs. He explained that these repairs were being done to ensure the reliability of the current incineration facility. The design of the repairs was awarded to Earth Tech Canada. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** explained that they were looking to demolish the old heat treatment facility since it has been out of service since the early 1990s. A resident asked whether they were going to replace the incinerator with something new. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** replied that they were not replacing but repairing the same equipment. **Jean-Yves Urbain, Earth Tech**, added that it would take approximately 9 months for design plus an additional 1 ½ years for construction and that the repairs were a replacement by kind. They would simply be replacing the same equipment and that their job was to repair. For example, if a piece of steel is too thin then they just replace that piece.

**Francis Chang** asked how much the fluidized bed would cost. **Jean-Yves Urbain** replied that the fluidized plant would cost approximately 25-30 million dollars. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** noted that this project is only proposed and depends on the outcome of the draft master plan. **Francis Chang** commented that perhaps there could be a meeting next year to learn more about the different technologies and suppliers. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** replied that a workshop type meeting could be held after the recommendations in the master plan are approved.

**Desmond Vandenberg** asked how old the multiple hearth incinerators were. **Jean-Yves Urbain** replied that they were over 30 years old and had a life span of 40-50 years with maintenance. **Jean-Yves Urbain** added that the frame can last many years however it is the equipment around it that needs to be watched closely to see what can be changed and what must be repaired. **Desmond Vandenberg** then asked whether the incinerators were working to emission requirements. **Jean-Yves Urbain** replied that they were up to requirements however, there is better technology.

**John Hopkins** commented that they should be forgetting about the old way of doing things. He added that multiple hearth incinerators were much dustier. **John Hopkins** also noted that biosolids were organic and residuals were sand and sulphide particles coming out of the lake and the same technology should not treat both. **Francis Chang** added that they should seek newer and more advanced incineration technology rather than repairing what is currently there. **Hy Schwartz** agreed with that comment. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that the master plan does suggest that a new fluidized bed incinerator be built however, until that plan is passed they will have to continue to operate what they have, which means repairing the current technology. **Francis Chang**

asked how long it would take even if the plan were passed. **Samir Demian** answered that it was a minimum of 5 years after approval for design and construction of a new fluidised bed incinerator. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** added that, if required, an Environmental Assessment (EA) process for new technologies would approximately add another two years.

**William Sheehan** said that at the last meeting he suggested that they have an Environmental Assessment so that they could get new technologies. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** asked William Sheehan to clarify whether he was speaking of new technologies or repairs to existing technologies. **William Sheehan** replied that he said what staff had in mind required an Environmental Assessment because the substance coming out of the stacks would affect the environment. He asked Clarito Gonzales whether he followed up on the possibility of an EA with MOE. **Clarito Gonzales** replied that he did not speak with them directly but said it was up to proponent. He noted that the criteria indicates that if it is categorized as repair they can proceed as a schedule A and that is what they have on their hands. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** added that no decisions have been made regarding new technologies and we are awaiting the approval of the recommendation in the Biosolids and Residuals Master Plan. **William Sheehan** suggested that they have a new Environmental Assessment start right now to save them time and money.

A resident said that he went to a meeting 10 years ago before there was an anaerobic digester in place. He noted that they were told that once the digestors were in place the incineration would only be on an emergency basis since that is where they got a lot of their smell from. The resident noted that they are using open pits again and asked whether they were phasing them out. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** agreed that there are open ash lagoons onsite and that the idea of anaerobic digestion is to reduce sludge. However, the lagoons are for the ash and have to be there for the incineration process and the ash from those lagoons has to be trucked out. Many residents present at the meeting commented that the odour has increased many times over the past 3 years.

**Desmond Vandenberg** noted that the Biosolids Master Plan came out in 2004 and asked why it took so long to initiate the peer review. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** answered that questions related to the project schedule and committee decisions could be directed to the Project Manager of the Draft Master Plan or your Ward Councillor and also noted that the draft plan is still open for public comment.

**Hy Schwartz** suggested that residents measure the gases that cause the odours. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** informed that in 2005 an odour control assessment was completed by AWS Engineers and Planners for the HCTP. The outcome was approved by the City and they are now moving forward with implementing the recommendations of the odour assessment. **Nancy Martins** said that she had an executive summary of the report that she could provide to Hy Schwartz.

**Anthony Pigaidoulis** reviewed the odour complaints for the group. He noted that they have received 25 odour complaints this year. Most of the complaints were from the residents residing closest to the plant. There were 10 complaints in July, which was the most complaints in one month. Some people noticed a sewage smell, others smelled strong odours, burnt smells and chemical smells. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** noted that some of these smells could be coming from other neighbouring industries but carried to this area by the wind. He explained that they log the complaints when they come in and

check plant odour control equipment and ensure all doors are closed. Odours can be more noticeable at a given time for a number of reasons including the wind direction and temperature.

**Anthony Pigaidoulis** then updated the group on other capital projects that were planned and underway. He mentioned the project to replace the scum collector that have been out of service for many years. Parts have been ordered and will be received the first week of October. **Desmond Vandenberg** noted that the odour study shows that 90% of the odour comes from these tanks and asked why it has been 3 years since they have been out of service. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that he does not know the exact reason for why this work has been delayed and stated that this repair work has been scheduled to commence in October with the delivery of parts. **Desmond Vandenberg** asked whether there was a contingency budget for such repairs. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** replied that as far as he knew it was not a cost restraint issue. **Samir Demian** explained that the problem was the sludge gate and that these are not shelf items, they have to be manufactured. In the mean time they have a collector pump truck coming every couple of weeks to suck the scum and take it away. The contract has now been awarded and it will take 6-8 weeks after delivery of parts. **Samir Demian** noted that the tank would be empty during this time and the residents did not have to worry about a smell. He further explained that by next year the residents would see a lot of work being done at this plant compared to the last 15 months which have largely been paperwork.

**William Sheehan** said that City Hall works on the recommendation of staff and asked why the plant staff did not just recommend an Environmental Assessment. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** explained that recommendations have indeed been made in the Draft Biosolids and Residuals Master Plan. A peer review was recommended and is underway; afterwards the draft master plan recommendations will be updated.

**Anthony Pigaidoulis** continued updating the group on new projects. He explained that they have to purchase new dewatering centrifuges and thickening centrifuges - this is also a new project. Earth Tech Canada is working on consolidating the Certificate of Approval for air discharges. The HCTP are updating the current phosphorous removal plant and security contracts are also underway including cameras and new gates. The miscellaneous mechanical project which will repair the aeration system is planned and is currently under review for award of the design to an engineering consultant.

**William Sheehan** commented on the odour control project suggesting that City staff or sales people design the solutions for the plant. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** explained that these have to be designed by professional engineers. The engineers staffed by the City at the plant are operational engineers who initiate capital projects and operate the treatment plant. Jean-Yves Urbain from Earth Tech Canada is a design engineer who is qualified to design such projects.

**Anthony Pigaidoulis** reported that there were no odour complaints in the month of August and one so far in September. **James Matthews** mentioned that he made 8 of those odour complaints. He also added that the numbers are low because people are not aware of how complaints can be made. **Glen McTernan** noted that he gave out pamphlets himself to people in the neighbourhood. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that **Nancy Martins** and he were working on a community newsletter to be sent out early in the new year which will include the odour complaints line. He also mentioned that the City is working on a 311 system where residents can contact the City about anything

including odour complaints. These complaints would be accepted by a dispatcher and filtered to them. **James Matthews** noted that he noticed smoke on his route from Lawrence over the bridge and he can smell odours down there. He was concerned that the residents there did not know who to call regarding these odours. **Marilyn McIntosh** mentioned that she has handed out pamphlets on the other side of the bridge as well.

**Anthony Pigaidoulis** noted that out of the 25 odour complaints, none have been verified by the Ministry of Environment. He said that the MOE have people that they can send out to investigate but only during office hours, which poses a problem because sometimes the odour is gone by the time they come out to the site. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** explained that the implementation of the Odour Control Project would have a discernable difference here since it will include biofilters. The current technology was designed for hydrogen sulphide removal and not based on odour detection (odour units). The new Ministry guidelines constitute odour reductions quantified through scientific methods using an odour panel and computer modelling. **Francis Chang** asked whether these were all part of the 9 million dollar odour project. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** replied that it was more than that; Phase 1 of the Odour Study is a 9 million dollar implementation budget but could change, Phase 2 is 38 million dollars. He clarified that they have not awarded this contract and the current odour control project for implementing Phase 1 recommendation is out for tender – to close on October 17. **Francis Chang** asked what the Phase 1 target was to finish. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** replied that he could not guarantee these dates but estimated at least 12 months for design and consultation with the Ministry, making it at least a 2-3 year project.

**Desmond Vandenberg** asked whether their speculation was that construction would be completed in 3 years or just the planning and designing. **Jean Yves** replied that it would be about 12 months to get a contractor and about 2-3 years from construction. He also added that there would be about a 50% reduction in odours in the first year and the rest would follow after that.

## 5. OTHER BUSINESS

**Francis Chang** asked whether they were utilizing the biogas from their anaerobic digesters. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** replied that a requirement of the incinerator project is to utilize the biogas for the furnace. The HCTP currently utilized biogas for the plant heating boilers. **Francis Chang** asked for an update on biogas utilization for the next meeting.

## 6. NEXT MEETING DATE, AGENDA ITEMS, ADJOURN

**William Sheehan** suggested that the group have meetings once a month so they could deal with more items. **Francis Chang** was concerned that attendance would be poor if the meetings were too frequent and felt that monthly meetings were too much. **Samir Demian** added that if they had a meeting next month there would be nothing more to say about the progress of the projects.

**Anthony Pigaidoulis** suggested a newsletter go out in the new year and a meeting in late winter. **James Matthew** mentioned that he found out about this meeting because of a notice in his mailbox that a citizen had passed around and wondered why it is not advertised in the green booklet from Manse Valley. **Nancy Martins** said that she has

had contact with the Manse Valley Association members through the mailing list. She also noted that the newsletter is hardcopied and blanketed in the area – and use Canada post drop door to door to thousands in the area – in addition to mailing it out to the project mailing list. **Desmond Vandenberg** suggested that they advertise in the Scarborough Mirror and **Nancy Martins** said that they can consider this for the next meeting.

**Francis Chang** suggested a detailed educational workshop on incineration to replace the plant tour, on top of two meetings a year.

There was some discussion about when the next meeting would be. **Nancy Martins** suggested a newsletter go out in early January and the next meeting be on Monday March 3<sup>rd</sup> to avoid conflict with March Break. Monday March 3<sup>rd</sup> was agreed upon as the next meeting date.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.