

**Highland Creek Treatment Plant
Neighbourhood Liaison Committee
(HCTPNLC)
Meeting # 18
Monday, March 23, 2009
Highland Creek Treatment Plant Meeting Room
51 Beechgrove Drive
7:00 p.m. – 8:50 p.m.**

SUMMARY NOTES

ATTENDANCE

Desmond Vandenberg
Reg Marshall
Frank Moir
William F. Sheehan
Allen Elias
Barbara McElgunn

City of Toronto

Clarito Gonzales, Senior Engineer, Highland Creek Treatment Plant
Anthony Pigaidoulis, Engineer, Highland Creek Treatment Plant
Nancy Martins, Public Consultation Unit
Cheryl Dow, Public Consultation Unit

Callum MacMillan, Councillor Moeser's Office

AGENDA

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Welcome & Introductions | 7:00 p.m |
| 2. Review of Agenda & Summary Notes | 7:10 p.m. |
| • September 8, 2008 | |
| 3. Plant Updates | 7.15 p.m. |
| • Odour Control Project | |
| • Review Odour Complaints
Incinerator Repairs | |
| • Other capital projects planned and underway | |
| 4. Stack Emissions Testing 2008 | 8:05 p.m. |
| 5. Biosolids Master Plan Update | 8:20 p.m. |
| 6. Other Business | 8:40 p.m. |
| 7. Next Meeting Agenda Items, Adjourn | 8:50 p.m. |

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Nancy Martins of the Public Consultation Unit called the meeting to order at 7:00pm. All participants introduced themselves.

Nancy Martins introduced **Cheryl Dow** as the new Public Consultation facilitator.

2. REVIEW OF AGENDA AND SUMMARY NOTES

Nancy Martins reviewed the agenda. No changes were made to the agenda and the agenda was approved.

Nancy Martins asked if anyone had any comments on the summary notes from the last meeting that took place on September 8, 2008. **Frank Moir** had a comment about page 3 of the minutes, under "Review Odour Complaints" the 1st sentence of the 2nd paragraph reads, "he smells the plant all the time" and **Frank Moir** suggested changing it to, "he smells the plant often". The minutes were approved with the change.

3. PLANT UPDATES:

- Odour Control Project
- Review Odour Complaints
- Incinerator Repairs
- Other capital projects planned and underway

4. STACK EMISSIONS TESTING – 2008

5. BIOSOLIDS MATER PLAN UPDATE

(the above 3 agenda items were addressed in a presentation given by **Anthony Pigaidoulis**.)

Anthony Pigaidoulis responded to the action items from last meeting:

- *Action item: Anthony Pigaidoulis provide information on the 16" pipes being used for the effluent water upgrades.*
- Response: The pipe used is 16 inches in diameter, 316 stainless steel, corrosion resistant, and a schedule 10 pipe.

- *Action item: Anthony Pigaidoulis to investigate Barbara McElgunn's inquiry on chemicals released by the Plant.*
- Response: **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said he discovered that these chemicals are all used in dry cleaning operations. He also found out that in 2000, the City of Toronto implemented the sewer use by-law (By-law code 681), which sets limits on chloroform and trichloroethylene that industries have to meet before being discharged into the sewer. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** has a copy of the sewer use by-law.
- Next action item to be covered in the presentation.

Anthony Pigaidoulis gave a presentation entitled: *Emission compliance and capital improvements at highland creek treatment plant.* (Presentation is posted at: <http://www.toronto.ca/wes/techservices/involved/www/highnlc/index.htm>)

Presentation highlights:

- Solid treatment at the plant uses anaerobic digestion to create biosolids. These biosolids are then thermally reduced by the multiple hearth furnaces, producing ash and emissions as by-products. The ash is disposed in a landfill, and the emissions are scrubbed and emitted at the stack. The original installation of these two multiple hearth furnaces was in 1978. The emission point is the main stack, at 75 meters tall.
- For regulatory compliance, the plant must meet a few different compliance requirements. One is the Ontario Environmental Protection Act, under regulation 419/05, which is air pollution and local air quality. The plant also has individual certificates of approval for air, which allows the plant to operate these processes.
- In 2005 the Ministry of the Environment came out with guideline A8 and the province adopted Canada-wide standards for dioxins, furans and mercury. This is different from regulation 419; 419 uses modeling to predict point of impingement concentrations, whereas Canada-wide standards is looking at in-stack concentrations. These numbers are available on-line.
- Regulation 419 is uses scientifically-developed, risk-based point of impingement standards. These guidelines are put in place to safeguard the natural environment and to protect the public. They have to do dispersion modeling to assess compliance; they basically look at what emissions are coming out of the stack and at what rate they are coming out. This information is put into a computer program to model the dispersion effects on the surrounding area.
- The *point of impingement* is defined as: “the nearest point where contaminants emitted will impose or impinge, on a building or beyond the property line.” For this plant, the closest receptor is the south trail, which is just south of the incineration building.
- Summary of compliance for main stack: compliance conforming to all regulatory standards of regulation 419. The highest parameter was Total Suspended Particulates (TSP) which was about 1.59% of standard limit. An outside firm does this assessment every year. The testing plan must be pre-approved by the ministry.
- Test results were shown in a summary graph showing the POI summary parameters measured in August 2005, October 2006 and October 2008. Testing was not done in 2007. The graph showed parameters as the percent of the POI standard. Other parameters measured were sulfur, sulfur dioxide, hydrochloric acid and hydrofluoric acid; these range from 0.75 to 2.5. The other naturally occurring metals were all very close to 0.
- The test results of the heavy metals were shown on a log-scale graph to show a percent of the values measured. The data shows very low levels; well below standards set by the Ministry.

- The new Canada-wide standards set for dioxins, furans and mercury, have been adopted by nine provinces, and the Highland Creek had to comply by these standards by November 2006. They are required to do this testing every year. The parameters are based on concentration in the stack and not by point of impingement model
- In 2007 there was a spike in levels of dioxins and furans (94%). During that testing, one of the furnaces was not operating at its optimal temperature. When testing was done in October 2008, the results were at 50% of the standard.
- Mercury levels showed about 30% of the standard in October 2006, approximately 75% of the standard in October 2007, and in October 2008, levels were approximately 55%. Some variation with mercury is expected, depending on what's coming into the plant at different times.
- Emergency stub stacks: In 2008 the Ministry of the Environment amended the plant's certificate of approval to operate the equipment to include the stub stack emissions. The stub stacks are smaller stacks on the roof of the building – each furnace has its own stub stack, and they are used for emergency bypass. If the fans that pull the gases through the scrubber system fail for any reason, the plant operators must be able to remove the gases from the furnace. The stub stacks provide an emergency pressure relief from the furnace. This is un-scrubbed gas, and anytime it occurs it is considered a “spill” and it must be reported; every time there is a spill, the ministry must be notified.
- There is now continuous leakage from these stacks, which shouldn't be there under normal operating procedures. The dampers are so old that they are allowing some of the gases to leak across, even though they are going through the scrubber. The testing that was done in October 2008 also tested the stub stacks for dioxins, furans and mercury. The mercury was within the limits. The dioxins and furans exceeded the criteria by approximately 180% of the standard. This is of great concern to those at the plant. They are now in negotiations with the Ministry for a timeline to bring these stub stacks back into compliance. Fortunately, the plant is in the midst of a minor repair contract on the #1 furnace, where they anticipate they will be able to fix the problem.
- Minor repair contract: Work is currently taking place on the #1 furnace (which is now out of service). The work includes provision to temporarily address leakage from stub stacks. They will be retested at the end of the year to show the Ministry that it has been brought back into compliance.
- Major repair contract: Includes a provision to eliminate the leakage with the use of a permanent cap. Right now, the stub stack is open at the top with a butterfly damper on the inside which has some leakage going across. This will be repaired under the minor repair contract, but under the major repair contract this will be eliminated and a cap will go over the stub stacks, so only when pressure relief is required the cap open and allow furnace gases to be emitted.

- The minor repair contract is currently underway in the #1 furnace. The construction tender went out last year and was awarded for 2.5 million dollars. This work started earlier this year and is expected to take 6 months to complete, at which time emissions will be retested.
- The major repair contract will start with the #2 furnace, which is currently in service. Once the work on #2 is completed, it is anticipated that work will then move to #1. The major repair contract is currently in the design stage. The construction is estimated to start in early 2010 for the #2 furnace.
- In the incinerator complex, there is also a dewatering building where the centrifuges remove the water from the sludge so that it can be incinerated. The dewatering part of the building is in need of upgrades; designs are currently being made for putting in five new dewatering centrifuges, as well as the conveyance equipment that will convey it into the furnaces.
- The old heat treatment process in that building is going to be demolished. There will also be HVAC improvements and electrical upgrades, which are currently in the design phase as well.
- The waste activated sludge thickening project: The older thickening technology used was “Dissolved Air Flootation”, but they are now moving to a waste activated sludge thickening by centrifuges. Similar centrifuge technology used for dewatering will be used for thickening as well. They will be converting one of the buildings into a waste activated sludge centrifuge room. This is also currently in the design phase.
- Odour control project: This project implements the recommendations of the 2005 AWS report, which involved comprehensive odour testing of all parts of the plant and came out with recommendations. A recommendation that is been added, is the head-house improvements; a new head-house is planned to be constructed north of the existing head-house. The design is incorporated into the odour control project, along with bio-filtration, covering of certain portions of the primary tanks, inlet and outlet sides of the tanks, as well as the head-house upgrades.

Anthony Pigaidoulis said that the slides used in the presentation will be available on the HCTPNLC website following the meeting.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

William Sheehan commented that it is a good thing that the Ministry is monitoring the stub stacks; however, he also thought that the modeling criteria were not very effective because a theoretical model can't stand up in court. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** clarified that the plant must still meet the set criteria. **William Sheehan** said that ambient air monitoring was done in the past, but before that emission monitoring was used, which in his opinion, is far more accurate. He asked if there was any effort to reduce emissions to 0. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** responded by saying that with this type of technology, it is unlikely that emissions will ever be down to 0, because with the process of incinerating

sewage sludge, there is always going to be emissions. However, there is effort to reduce the emissions by having better air pollution control equipment.

William Sheehan asked how long the new scrubber technology will last. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** expects the technology that will be used in the major repair contract should last a relatively long time; depending on the maintenance of the equipment. However he couldn't say with any certainty how long this would be. **Clarito Gonzales** said that he could ask and find out for the next meeting.

Action Item: At the next meeting Clarito Gonzales to provide HCTPNLC members with information on the life span of new scrubber technology.

Allen Elias enquired as to how old some of the old equipment at the plant is. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that some of the equipment has been there since 1978 – but it has been modified over the years to keep up with operations. The minor repair contract is being put into construction to ensure the reliability of the furnaces, while they wait for the master plan on how the management of bio-solids will be done at this facility for the next 25 - 30 years.

Allen Elias has been in the neighbourhood for over 30 years, and has noticed significant improvements with respect to odours over the years. With the current emission levels, **Allen Elias** wondered if there are any potential health hazards for people who are exposed over extended periods of time. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that a report commissioned in 1989 was done because of residents' concerns regarding long-term health effects. The plant is now operating within regulated standards and attempting to bring back into compliance any emissions that were exceeding. However **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that he could not speak to the long term health effects with any certainty. **Allan Elias** asked if similar treatment plants in other areas ever share information with other treatment plants on how they operate. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that yes there is access to this information from other municipalities, and staff attends conferences to share information.

Barbara McElgunn commented that it is not easy to see the cause and effect of environmental exposures on health. But when you see levels measured above the margin of safety, it might be a good idea to test these levels in the stack every 5 years or so. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that there are other volatile organic compounds that are tested for which were not in the presentation, but were all well below the standards. The parameters in the 1989 report looked at the volatile emissions coming out of the tanks; not what was coming out of the stack. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** added that 2 of the 3 chemicals of concern that Barbara had asked him to look into were addressed in the sewer use by-law implemented in 2000. The limit set on chloroform is 0.4mg/L and the limit on tetrachloroethylene is 1mg/L. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that a presentation was given 3 meetings back discussing the enforcement of these regulations; this could be found on the website.

Barbara McElgunn asked if a fluidized bed incinerator would give off fewer emissions. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that at a public meeting about the master plan, held on February 2, the next steps for the plant were discussed. One of the short listed options was fluidized beds.

Desmond Vandenberg asked about the timeline for the minor repairs of the stub stack leakage. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said 6 months: the repairs are about one month in on the #1 furnace now. The stub stack leakage will be addressed under the minor repair contract for the #1 furnace. After the minor repair contract is completed, the major repair contract will start on the #2 furnace; once the #1 furnace is back in use.

Frank Moir asked about the dramatic changes in the dioxins and furans measurements between years, and wondered if any testing was done in between the measurements reported on the graph. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that the dioxins and furans test is only done once a year. The test that showed 4% of the standard had tested only one of the furnaces, whereas the test that showed 94% of the standard was done on both furnaces. The high levels in the second test were likely due to the temperature of one of the furnaces not being in the proper range. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** explained that they knew why the test measurements were so high, so they rectified through an operational change by increasing the temperatures and ensuring that the temperatures stay within an optimal range. **Frank Moir** pointed out that taking these measurements only once every year or two only provides a snap shot, and does not provide information on how the plant is operating the rest of the time. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that this has been considered, but by fixing the temperatures, the problem was likely resolved. **Clarito Gonzales** clarified that one unit below operating temp would create these elevated levels of dioxins and furans. Adjustments have since been made so that the furnaces are operating at the optimal temperatures at all times.

Frank Moir asked how often a stub stack would be used in a year. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that there were approximately 15 incidents last year. The duration of each incident depends on what causes the stub stack by-pass. The Ministry requires that the plant notify them each time a spill occurs. The Ministry documents when and why the spill occurred.

Anthony Pigaidoulis explained that the ID fan (induced draft fan) is used to suck the air out of the furnace, through the scrubber and up the stack. The ID fan can stop for a few different reasons:

- In a power failure, the ID fan goes off and the damper opens. The discharging lasts only for a few minutes. When the power comes back on, the fan restarts.
- Water can be lost to the scrubber (too little water). The ID fan has a high inlet temperature, if you go over that temperature, you risk damaging the fan; therefore if water is not constantly coming into the scrubber, there is a risk that the temperature might get too high, which stops the process.
- Too much water can do the same, because it creates a plug effect. If the scrubber has too much water in it, you cannot sustain the draft required.

The plant has taken measures to make sure over-filling or under-filling doesn't occur. The frequency of these events is declining.

Clarito Gonzales added that they consulted with Toronto Hydro, explaining to them that every time there is a power failure, one of these spills occurs. In the last 6 or 9 months the power failures have reduced significantly. **Frank Moir** asked if there is stand-by power, and **Clarito Gonzales** said that not right now, but they endeavour to put it into the next project.

William Sheehan asked where the water from the scrubber comes from. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that it is effluent from the plant also known as reclaimed water.

William Sheehan asked how often the stacks are tested for fluid particulates. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said once per year the source testing is done and the testing lasts for 3 days. He added that the minor repair contract does not trigger any C of A requirements to get a new C of A from the ministry. The major repair contract does require a new application process, because continuous emission monitoring is now a requirement, so it will happen in the major repair contract. This is better for the plant because there will be continuous feedback. **Barbara McElgunn** asked if this monitoring will be just for particulates, and **Anthony Pigaidoulis** explained that it would be for hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide, but not for VOCs.

Allan Moir asked if there is a variation in emission levels depending on the season. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that no, there is no difference.

• ODOUR COMPLAINTS

Anthony Pigaidoulis said that there have been 2 odour complaints since the last meeting; both were made in October.

Frank Moir commented that sometimes while walking along Beechgrove, he has occasionally noticed an odour detected close to the sewer grate. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that sometimes when there is more flow coming into the plants, there is more turbulence or agitation in the sewers, creating an increase in odours.

Reg Marshall inquired as to what action is taken when an odour complaint is made. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that the complaint is made by placing a phone call to the plant. The person answering the call will take all the information regarding when and where the odour was detected. They will then go through a checklist of what could have gone wrong to cause the disrupting odour. The staff person will call the caller back (if they request it) to explain the problem and inform them of what is being done to fix it.

Desmond Vandenberg asked why a verified odour complaint would require an officer of the Ministry of the Environment. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that a verified odour complaint is made under very serious circumstances, but he is not sure what exactly would constitute a “verified odour complaint.” **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that every complaint the plant receives is faxed to the Ministry of the Environment as soon as possible; usually within a few working days. The current environmental officer is Mr. Jake Shaw.

NOMINATION OF A NEW N.L.C. COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR PERSON

Nancy Martins reviewed the role of the co-chair. The community co-chair person will:

- welcome participants to the meeting
- assign the floor to whoever wishes to speak
- ensure that no one person dominates the discussion
- ensure that all sides are heard fairly
- remain neutral while in the chair position
- encourage full participation and balanced contribution by all members
- provide a quick summary of the discussion and any conclusions that are reached, or action items to follow up on
- identify points of consensus

- make sure the meeting moves along in a timely manner

The three people interested in the role as co-chair introduced themselves and briefly stated why they would like to act as co-chair for the committee.

1. **Frank Moir** volunteered because he would not want to see the meetings without a co-chair.
2. **William Sheehan** volunteered because he would like to make a positive contribution to the community and the meetings. Having experience with other committees, he would like to bring in certain issues to compliment what goes on at the NLC.
3. **Desmond Vandenberg** volunteered because he wants to make sure that the meetings continue. He feels that good things happen in the meetings and they also provide the community with an opportunity to be more informed.

Nancy Martins passed around pieces of paper to members of the committee to vote for the community co-chair.

Nancy Martins expressed thanks and appreciation to Francis (former community co-chair) for his contributions to the meetings.

Nancy Martins tallied the votes and **Frank Moir** was voted the next community co-chair

6. OTHER BUSINESS

William Sheehan said he noticed that security has decreased; across the road, he noticed that the gates were open. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that when an operator is working, the gates will be open. **Nancy Martins** pointed out that there are currently security cameras on the gates. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** added that there are numerous security cameras around the site that have recently been upgraded, as well as door readers and new front gates. There is a skeleton crew of 4 people on site at night. It is not only the staff's responsibility to watch the cameras; the cameras are fed to a centre at the Corporate security headquarters.

Barbara McElgunn asked about staff-testing of dioxin levels and wondered whether the limits that are set are the old limits or whether they are in line with Health Canada's most recent recommendations. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** assured her that the current limits at the plant are in line with the new POI (point of impingement) limits for dioxins and furans. He recently learned that the in-stack criteria standards in Canada are the most stringent in the world. The detection limits of the tests are in picograms (parts per trillion), which is very small. The current standards came into effect in 2005 at which time the plant was given 12 months to comply with these standards. The guidelines can be found on the Ministry website, under MOE guideline A8.

Anthony Pigaidoulis said that he can look into how the standards here compare to the standards of other places.

Action Item: Anthony Pigaidoulis to provide an update on how the in-stack criteria standards in Canada compare to the standards of other places.
--

Nancy Martins informed the committee that another meeting for the Biosolids Master Plan will take place sometime in the summer.

7. NEXT MEETING AND AGENDA ITEMS

Next meeting set for **Monday September 14th, 2009 at 7:00 p.m.**

Nancy Martins asked the group if there were any other items they would like to see on the agenda for the next meeting.

William Sheehan pointed out that a few years ago, the Ashbriges Bay Treatment Plant asked for, and received a health study of the area, because they were concerned about the stack emissions causing disease among the residents. The study was done by the Toronto Department of Health. **William Sheehan** suggested that something similar be done at the Highland Creek Treatment Plant.

William Sheehan commented that the ICMC has meetings every other month or so, and has an agenda dealing with issues which he feels this committee should also be addressing. He feels that this committee should be having more frequent meetings in order to address more issues.

Nancy Martins said that the ICMC is looking at the implementation of Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Ashbridges Bay Treatment Plant. There is currently no EA at the Highland Creek Treatment Plant.

William Sheehan would like to see more discussion on the issues of biosolid facilities, incinerators, air pollution, water pollution and land pollution. He also suggested that having more frequent meetings could allowed them to assess this information in more detail, and in these meetings, the things being done downtown should be compared to what is being done at the Highland Creek Treatment Plant.

Nancy Martins said that issues that relate to the HCTP and the community can be placed on the agenda, as long as the issues apply to this particular treatment plant's operation. **Cheryl Dow** added that any additional items the committee members want to add to the agenda can be considered prior to the meeting by calling the public consultation unit.

William Sheehan noted that the sewer use by-law has been discussed frequently at the ICMC meetings. **Nancy Martins** said that there was a presentation on the sewer use by-law about three meetings back. She suggested that an updated presentation on the sewer use by-law could be made at a meeting in the future if the committee wishes.

William Sheehan said that several years ago, at a meeting about the sewer use by-law, a number of convictions that had occurred were discussed and a significant drop was seen from one year to the next. This raised various questions as to what was going on, and the conclusion was that the inspectors were arguing over pay issues. **William Sheehan** would like to see City Hall being held accountable for what happens, and community members should be made more aware of these issues.

William Sheehan also discussed a decision that was made last January not to permit electronic pollution detectors into the sewers. This was based on a lawsuit judgment made to prevent explosion hazards. However, this past January the city had to spend 30 million dollars to fix a sewage problem at O'Connor Drive that had been detected by a robot with a camera on it; **William Sheehan** wondered if this was going against the decision made in the lawsuit that prohibited using anything electronic in the sewer.

Nancy Martins suggested that **William Sheehan** ask a committee member from the ICMC to let him know whether that issue was raised at the last ICMC meeting, which he had been unable to attend.

William Sheehan would like to see City Hall being held more accountable for expenditures and other decisions they make. He would also like to see this committee discuss the use of pelletizers for biosolids. **Nancy Martins** said that the ICMC and the Ashbridges Bay Treatment Plant receive updates on those issues. This committee will continue to focus on issues that are relevant to this plant. **William Sheehan** said that the biosolids issues should be an area of focus, because the tax payers should know how their money is being spent, they should know what is going on and they should also know about the pollution. He expressed that having only two meetings a year does not give enough chance to address these issues and solve the problems. **Nancy Martins** explained that the mandate of this committee is to look at issues relating to the operation of the Highland Creek Treatment Plant.

Frank Moir commented that the plant manager produces an annual report of the operation of the facility; he asked **Anthony Pigaidoulis** if this was a public document. **Anthony Pigaidoulis** said that it was, and that the document is submitted to the Ministry of the Environment. **Frank Moir** suggested that this document be made accessible to the committee, so that if there are items that appear important to anyone, more information could be requested. **Nancy Martins** said that she would look into that as an action item.

Action Item: Make available to the HCTPNLC a copy of the Plant's annual report that is submitted to the MOE annually.

William Sheehan commented that there are still only two meetings each year, and suggested that meetings be held every other month. **Allan Elias** said there is probably not enough interest to hold the meetings more than twice per year. **Barbara McElgunn** commented that there is not a lot of interest in the community about this plant; maybe because there is not a lot of information. **Barbara McElgunn** said that she wrote a letter to the editor of the CCRA Newsletter explaining that there is only a small representation of the community at these meetings. She asked if the newsletter would put in an article about the committee to encourage more people in the community to come to the meetings. Perhaps if more people were involved, there could be more frequent meetings. **Barbara McElgunn** suggested putting invitations to the meetings in other local publications. **William Sheehan** added that there should be some points to explain to community members why they should be interested in what happens at the Highland Creek Treatment Plant.

In response to **Anthony Pigaidoulis'** question, **Nancy Martins** said that the regular mailing list for the group is a few hundred people, but when the plant newsletters are

sent out, the distribution is to about 5000. **Nancy Martins** added that the last newsletter sent out in the winter of last year (2008).

Desmond Vandenberg asked if there was a notice about this meeting in a local newsletter. **Nancy Martins** said that she had requested that Don York place it in the Manse Valley Community Association newsletter. **Frank Moir** said that he doesn't know for sure if information was included, but the last newsletter was just distributed in the last few days. **Nancy Martins** said that community newsletters would be a good way to inform the community of future meetings.

William Sheehan suggested that another issue the committee could be dealing with would be alternatives to what is actually going on. He would like to hear about things before they have already been decided on by the plant. The city used to have a committee of New Technology, but it has since disappeared. **Nancy Martins** clarified that that New and Emerging Technologies committee was for solid waste and the group evolved into The Community Environmental Assessment Team that was looking at the Environmental Assessment for solid waste. This group then turned into the Residual Waste Working Group and they are still looking at site and technologies to manage residual waste. **William Sheehan** would like to know more about the technologies and hear about how they apply to what is going on at the Highland Creek Treatment Plant. Perhaps the committee could have more education on new technologies by inviting different groups or departments to do presentations. **William Sheehan** suggested having a presentation on the wet weather flow master plan, because there is talk of closing a beach at the Rouge River due to water pollution. Since the current flows from Highland Creek towards that area, he would like to understand more about this situation. **William** suggested adding a report from the City of Toronto on the Wet <http://www.toronto.ca/wes/techservices/involved/wws/highnlc/index.htm> Wheather Flow Master Plan and how it relates to the Highland Creek Treatment Plant.

William Sheehan said that the city approved the wet weather master flow plan in September of 2005. The budget was set at 12 million dollars, and he would now like to know how that money is being spent; for example how many combined sewers have been separated and whether or not that has any impact. He would like to know what the status is on the wet weather master flow plan in this area.

Cheryl Dow asked if anyone else had any ideas about issues to discuss at future meetings.

Barbara McElgunn said that the biosolids issue is important, and the question of how it is being used on farmland would be something she would be interested in learning more about. **Frank Moir** said that the biosolids from this plant aren't used for that purpose, but the biosolids from Ashbridges Bay are. **William Sheehan** pointed out that the anaerobic digesters across the street were constructed specifically to give City Hall the option of generating biosolids from this plant, and they had cost approximately 24 million dollars to construct.

William Sheehan made a motion for an earlier meeting in June, in order to discuss the biosolid issues. **Frank Moir** said that there is probably not enough interest. **Nancy Martins** said that the biosolid issues have been dealt with by a separate process – Biosolids Master Plan Update -and updates have been provided to this group.

Barbara McElgunn expressed interest in looking at the assessments that examine the environmental fate of certain of the chemicals (specifically those of concern such as phthalates and bisphenol A), which are not being tested for. This brings up concerns about the use of these biosolids and the fate of the chemicals after they are applied to pastureland and farmland. **Nancy Martins** said that the comments submitted at the Biosolids Master Plan Public Information Sessions in early February are being reviewed, and the project team will be putting out responses to those comments; this may be able to provide some answers to specific questions around biosolids and land use.

Next meeting: **Monday September 14th, 2009 at 7:00 p.m.**

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.