



## STAFF REPORT ACTION REQUIRED

### Sewers By-law 2010 and 2011 Compliance and Enforcement

<b>Date:</b>	March 22, 2012
<b>To:</b>	Public Works and Infrastructure Committee
<b>From:</b>	General Manager, Toronto Water
<b>Wards:</b>	All
<b>Reference Number:</b>	P:\2012\Cluster B\TW\pw12003

#### SUMMARY

---

This report provides a summary of the activities performed by Toronto Water in 2010 and 2011 with respect to compliance and enforcement of Municipal Code Chapter 681-Sewers (the “Sewers By-law”).

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

---

The General Manager, Toronto Water, recommends that:

1. The Public Works and Infrastructure Committee receive this report for information.

#### Financial Impact

There are no financial implications to the City as a result of this report.

The Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer has reviewed this report and agrees with the financial impact information.

---

#### DECISION HISTORY

At its meeting on September 21 and 22, 2011, during consideration of report PW7.6 from the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee, City Council requested the General Manager, Toronto Water, to reinstate the annual report to Council on Toronto Water activities, including Sewers By-law compliance and the Outfall Monitoring Program.

<http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2011.PW7.6>

During the previous term of Council (2006-2010) the General Manager, Toronto Water was requested to report annually to the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee on compliance and enforcement activities to support Municipal Code Chapter 681 – Sewers. <http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/decisions/2007-11-26-ex15-dd.pdf>

As requested, Toronto Water submitted Annual Reports to the April 9, 2008, June 3, 2009 and March 2, 2010 meetings of the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee.

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2008/pw/bgrd/backgroundfile-10406.pdf>  
<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2009/pw/decisions/2009-06-03-pw25-dd.htm>  
<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2010/pw/bgrd/backgroundfile-27381.pdf>

## **ISSUE BACKGROUND**

Each year Toronto Water inspects and samples industries in the City of Toronto with respect to Sewers By-law compliance. The term “industry” refers to establishments which undertake some form of industrial processing or manufacturing, along with commercial and institutional facilities, which generate wastewater. The term does not include warehouses or retail businesses. Toronto Water uses an established sampling and inspection target for industries based on the risk potential to pollute. Facilities are categorized into three categories: (a) High Potential (b) Medium Potential and (c) Low Potential in order to allocate resources effectively to the greatest risk to the sewer system and waste water treatment plants.

Industries that have the potential to discharge toxic organic or heavy metal contaminated wastewater to the sewer system or potentially cause an adverse effect on the treatment plant and receiving waters are generally classified as High Potential. In 2011, 93 industries were classified by Toronto Water as High Potential. These industries are generally sampled monthly and inspected annually at a minimum or as required.

An industry that discharges wastewater with oil and grease or conventional treatable parameters is generally classified as Medium Potential. There are several hundred Medium Potential industries that are targeted to be inspected annually and sampled every two to three months. A typical example of a Medium Potential would be a food processor.

Industries that have either low volume flows or have a low impact to disrupt the sewer system or wastewater treatment plants are classified as Low Potential. These industries are not visited as often as those of the aforementioned higher risk categories. Further, industries without wet processing, liquid storage, outdoor storage, or industrial discharges to sanitary/storm sewers are not part of the Toronto Water inspection and sampling protocol. When staff identifies these types of facilities, they are classified as Dry. Toronto Water Provincial Offences Officers also allocate time to compliance of the Water Supply By-law by performing inspections and follow-up on the installation and

maintenance of Backflow Prevention devices. There are limited overlaps of similar clients under the Water Supply By-law with the Sewers By-law.

The Provincial Offences Officers provide 24 hour response to spills and complaints seven (7) days a week where enforcement is required. This is achieved through a rotating schedule of Officers on-call every day and night.

Toronto Water also monitors storm and combined sewer outfall discharges to receiving waters during dry weather to find contaminated outfalls. This program is known as the Outfall Monitoring Program and samples are obtained from storm sewer outfalls and/or within the storm sewer system for analysis and comparison with the Sewers By-law. Investigation and identification of illegal discharges to the sewer system (including cross connections) is part of this program.

Toronto Water co-ordinates the collection and delivery of water samples taken from 11 supervised beaches across the city. During the beach season, water samples are taken daily and tested for E. coli levels. When water tests show high levels of E. coli bacteria, Toronto Public Health posts signs warning the public against swimming.

Toronto Water administers other projects such as the Industrial Water Rate Initiative (also known as 'Block 2'), Pollution Prevention (P2) planning, various Discharge Agreements and Permits, and Compliance Plan Agreements. There are also continued efforts with Toronto Public Health to ensure the presence of grease interceptors at restaurants and regular liaisons with Provincial Ministries and other Divisions.

## **COMMENTS**

This is the fourth annual report on Sewers By-law compliance and enforcement by Toronto Water. The Division's Environmental Monitoring and Protection Unit is charged with overseeing this By-law and has two primary responsibilities: (i) monitoring and control of industrial waste discharges into the sewer system and monitoring discharges from sewer outlets into receiving waters and (ii) by-law enforcement.

Toronto Water ensures that contaminants that may be harmful to the sewer system, such as heavy metals, solvents, etc. are restricted to the permissible levels noted within the Sewers By-law and identifies illegal cross connections to the storm sewer system.

In 2011, staff conducted 4,809 inspections and performed 7,529 sampling events that resulted in 27,911 laboratory analyses. A total of 855 Backflow Prevention Program inspections were also conducted in 2011. In addition, staff responded to 218 environmental sewer complaints and spills. Table 1, below, denotes a list of the number of compliance and enforcement activities undertaken by Toronto Water during the past three years.

**Table 1: Comparison of Sewers By-law Compliance and Enforcement Activities**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2009<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>Inspections</b>	4,809	4,785	4,235
<b>Sampling Events</b>	7,529	5,238	4,839
<b>Lab Tests Requested</b>	27,911	29,257	27,732
<b>Notice of Violations Issued</b>	1,117	1,132	718
<b>Complaints</b>	218	213	232
<b>Investigations</b>	51	31	21
<b>Prosecutions<sup>2</sup></b>	46	28	14
<b>Convictions<sup>3</sup></b>	21	6	4
<b>Unsuccessful Prosecutions</b>	0	0	0
<b>Withdrawn Prosecutions where charges laid<sup>4</sup></b>	0	1	0
<b>Fines (excluding 25% victim surcharge fee)</b>	\$181,250	\$29,000	\$36,500

Notes:

1. Six week Labour disruption;
2. Prosecution refers to the number of companies or people that had charges laid against them in that year and may still be before the courts for either Sewers By-law or Water Supply By-law as Toronto Water Provincial Offences Officers are responsible for both By-laws;
3. Convictions may include multiple prosecutions for a company/person and may include prosecution files concluded from prior years in the year reported;
4. Negotiated settlement with charges withdrawn.

If a violation of one or more Sewers By-law provisions is identified, Toronto Water staff may contact the facility to advise of the non-compliance and will issue a Notice of Violation (NOV) letter. Toronto Water issued a total of 1,117 NOV letters in 2011 and 1,132 NOV letters in 2010. In the event that multiple and/or re-occurring violations are identified, stricter enforcement action may be undertaken. It should be noted that a single violation of sufficient severity can result in Provincial Offences Officers collecting evidence and proceeding with formal charges under either By-law. Table 2 lists the violation categories that resulted in the issuance of Sewers By-law NOVs for Toronto Water.

**Table 2: Notice of Violation Categories under the Sewers By-law**

<b>Violation Types</b>
Sanitary & Combined Sewer Requirements
Storm Sewer Requirements
Lack of Grease Interceptor
Lack of Grease Interceptor Maintenance
Maintenance Access Hole Requirement
P2 Plan Requirement
Septic Waste Haulers

For more serious violations requiring immediate action, an Order can be served. Non-compliance with the Order can result in an immediate prosecution and/or the City remedying the situation at full cost to the person or company. In 2010, one such Order was issued to a company to provide its self monitored analytical data, in its possession relating to the groundwater that was entering the sanitary sewer system. The company complied with the Order. In 2011, an Order was issued to a company to remove a lock installed over a manhole that was obstructing an Officer from sampling. The company complied within the 3 days noted in the Order.

There were six (6) convictions in 2010 resulting in \$29,000 in fines, excluding victim surcharge fine (VSF) of 25%. During 2011, Toronto Water investigated 51 companies for potential prosecution. Forty-six (46) of the investigations from 2011 and some from 2010 resulted in companies or people being charged with offences. Many of these prosecution cases are presently before the courts. In 2011, there were 21 convictions, resulting in \$181,250 in fines, excluding victim surcharge fine (VSF) of 25%. Of the 21 convictions, one conviction was for non-submission of a Pollution Prevention Plan resulting in a fine of \$3,500.00 received for that offence. In another prosecution case of a repeat offending company, the Corporate Director of the company was also charged and convicted under the Sewers By-law. The Corporate Director charge is a first under the Sewers By-law and the Corporate Director was personally fined \$50,000 excluding (VSF) of 25%. Additionally, some prosecutions from previous years continue to remain before the courts. Appendix A, Tables 1 and 2, provide details of the Sewers By-law and Water Supply By-law convictions for 2010 and 2011.

In 2010, there were 129 facilities with active Industrial Waste Surcharge Agreements (IWSA) which generated \$8.2 million in revenue. In 2011, there were 157 facilities with active (IWSA) that were monitored. These agreements generated approximately \$8.9 million in revenue for Toronto Water.

Toronto Water also oversees the Pollution Prevention (P2) Program which requires Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (ICI) facilities to prepare and submit mandatory P2 plans or follow Best Management Practices (BMP). The P2 Program requires industry to review processes and identify and reduce any of the 38 Subject Pollutants listed in the Sewers By-law. Industrial sectors such as automotive repair, photofinishing and car washes follow BMP's to minimize contaminant releases to the sewer system.

During 2010 and 2011, under the Outfall Monitoring Program, staff found 67 cross connections of which, 60 were corrected. The Outfall Monitoring Program has found 551 cross connections since the program's inception in late 2005. Five hundred and thirty (530) cross connections have been corrected leading to the delisting of 58 priority outfalls. The difference in cross connections found and corrected are a result of the cross connections yet to be repaired but are in progress.

### **1) Routine Industrial Inspection and Sampling Program**

Toronto Water Provincial Offences Officers inspect industries to determine whether there are any concerns about a facility's wastewater discharge to the sewer system. These inspections typically include evaluation of the manufacturing or production process, chemicals and products used or stored, and waste streams that are generated on-site. During an inspection, the Officers make notes, take pictures, interview staff, obtain copies of documents and/or process inventory logs, and can collect samples. During routine inspections, the Officers may make observations or issue directives to rectify issues that were identified. The Officers also collect samples from the various facilities that discharge to the sewer system. These samples are analyzed by the Toronto Water Laboratory and the results are assessed for compliance with the Sewers By-law parameter limits.

When time permits, Officers conduct street-by-street searches for new/unknown or unlisted industries to increase the industry database listing and assess the risk of the facility to the sewer system. The latter is how Toronto Water was able to increase its surcharge program. Gap analyses are also performed on sector industry listings that are obtained from other Divisions or regulatory agencies. Inspections are conducted using a new streamlined annual inspection form that was established in 2009 to allow for efficient and standardized work and also newer sector specific inspection forms were introduced in 2010.

In 2011, under industrial waste control, there were 2,482 industry inspections conducted and 6,523 industrial sampling events performed.

In 2010, a gap analysis performed on car wash industries found an additional 108 facilities that were not in the Toronto Water database system. An information package containing a Best Management Practices (BMP) document, a BMP agreement form and a letter outlining the requirements were mailed to these facilities and the resulting compliance rate was 14 %. In 2011, a dedicated effort to inspect the non-compliant

carwash facilities occurred. As a result of the inspections and follow-up phone calls, the Sewer By-law BMP compliance rate increased to 92% for the carwash sector.

In 2010, a gap analysis review of meat processors licensed by the Ontario Ministry of Agricultural Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) list identified 160 possible facilities that required an inspection. In 2011, each facility was inspected for grease interceptors, backflow prevention device and other general issues. From the inspections, three (3) NOVs were issued for lack of grease interceptors. All these facilities have or will be sampled to determine compliance under the Sewers By-law.

In 2010 and 2011, work was performed in the Hotel sector. Surveys were mailed to 108 hotel facilities in Toronto, regarding compliance with the Sewers By-law requirement for installing and maintaining grease interceptors and Pollution Prevention Planning. As well the survey addressed the Water Supply By-law requirement for Backflow Prevention Device premise isolation.

Inspections targeting the non-compliant hotel facilities started in 2011 and it is expected to be completed in 2012. By the end of 2011, 60 hotels or 56% replied to the survey and there were many inquiries on how to abide by the by-laws; 43 P2 Plans were submitted from these facilities and another 17 facilities were exempt from P2 Plans. As well, many facilities were required to install and/or maintain their grease interceptors and install and test their backflow prevention devices. Sampling of some hotels has revealed that they could be eligible for an Industrial Waste Surcharge Agreement or Permit, and need to control chloroform wastewater issues from on site laundry operations.

## **2) Industrial Waste Surcharge and Sanitary Discharge Agreements**

Industries that exceed the wastewater sanitary concentration limits for four (4) specific and treatable parameters have the option of entering into an Industrial Waste Surcharge Agreement (IWSA) with Toronto Water or installing on-site treatment to comply with the By-law. Most facilities tend to enter into an IWSA as it is generally more cost effective than installing a separate wastewater treatment system on-site.

The four (4) parameters permissible under an IWSA include: Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD), Total Suspended Solids (TSS), Phosphorous, and Phenols; all of which are treatable at the wastewater treatment plant. Under an IWSA, sample data are used to evaluate the quality of wastewater generated by companies for the purpose of recovering the costs of providing treatment for the excess amount over the By-law limit.

In 2011, at peak levels, there were 157 companies under an IWSA (refer to Appendix B for a complete list of surcharge companies). Thirty-three (33) facilities were newly added to the IWSA program and 9 companies closed operations at some point during 2011. Additionally, through the work of the Provincial Offences Officers, 12 more facilities were identified as possible surcharge industries following initial grab sampling. These facilities are now being evaluated for an IWSA following the company's commitment to enter into an IWSA. This is expected to raise the number of companies on

an IWSA in 2012. It should be noted that the IWSA program generated Toronto Water \$8.2 million in revenue in 2010 and \$8.9 million in revenue in 2011. The 2011 revenue is \$2.2 million more than the 2009 revenue of \$6.7 million.

Industries that have entered into an Industrial Waste Surcharge Agreement are sampled up to sixteen (16) times per year. A four quarter rolling average determines the industry's discharge concentration for billing purposes. The concentration combined with volume of water purchased/or used by the company and the set fee (under Municipal Code Chapter 441 - Fees and Charges) of 57 cents per kilogram, determines the quarterly bill issued to companies. It should be noted that the fee has not increased since 1996. In 2011, Toronto Water began a review of the adequacy of the fees for cost recovery.

As a result of an amendment to City of Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 441 - Fees and Charges, a change was made to the Industrial Waste Surcharge and Sanitary Discharge Agreements or Permits to reflect that a fee of \$500 be applied to industry to offset the City's time and analysis for those companies where less than \$500 invoices would result. In 2010, Toronto Water billed 26 companies for the \$500 minimum surcharge and generated \$13,000 in revenue. In 2011, Toronto Water had 58 companies on a \$500 minimum surcharge generating \$29,000 in revenue. Appendix B lists the industries in the IWSA programs, and those that closed operations in 2011, but were billed during a portion of 2011.

In April 2011, Toronto Water engaged in notifying companies with IWSA's of the need for a new IWSA created to address 2008 Auditor General Recommendations. The "old" agreement would be sunset. To date, all but seven (7) facilities have signed the new IWSA and progress has been made with those companies having outstanding agreements such that they should all be signed within a few weeks.

The City of Toronto also enters into agreements with industries that draw from private water supplies (e.g. Lake Ontario, ground water) and only require a sanitary collection service. For these industries, water is not purchased but still requires treatment. Therefore, a special fee is applied to the volume of wastewater discharged to the sanitary sewer for treatment. There are two types of agreements: (i) long-term agreements, known as Sanitary Discharge Agreements, which generally apply to site decontamination and decommissioning work and (ii) "one-time" Short Term Permits which apply to construction and excavation sites. The wastewater quality received from the customers using private water supplies must meet existing sanitary Sewers By-law parameters limits; if not, the industry may also need to enter into an IWSA where applicable. There were 33 Sanitary Discharge Agreements and 36 Short Term Permits issued in 2010. In 2011, there were 36 Sanitary Discharge Agreements and 33 Short Term Permits issued. The Short Term Permit is issued with a minimum fee of \$500. The Sanitary Discharge Agreements brought in revenues of approximately \$380,000.00 in 2010 and \$371,000 in 2011 to Toronto Water. The revenue for Short Term Permits was \$18,000 in 2010 and \$41,000 in 2011. The total Sanitary Discharge revenues generated amounted to \$398,000 in 2010 and \$412,000 in 2011 for Toronto Water.



### **3) Compliance Programs**

The Sewers By-law has a provision that allows a company which requires additional time to obtain the necessary equipment to remedy the factors contributing to a Sewers By-law violation to enter into a formal Compliance Agreement with the City. This enables the company to discharge to the sewer under new temporary higher parameter limits while taking the required corrective action based on strict conditions and timelines, as defined in the agreement, to address and resolve the problem.

In 2010 and 2011 there were 31 and 29 facilities respectively with compliance agreements. These companies need to comply with the terms and conditions of the Compliance Plan agreement, including submission of progress reports. Failure to do so may result in amendments and/or termination of the initial agreement which is signed by each party.

### **4) Grease Issues**

Grease build up in the City sewers is an ongoing issue. Grease blockages can create potential health concerns by attracting rodents, causing sewer back-ups, and other problems. In an effort to alleviate the problem, restaurant and industries with large volumes of grease production were targeted by Toronto Water Provincial Offences Officers for inspections in 2010 and 2011.

Other efforts involved Toronto Water and Toronto Public Health (TPH) working closely together. In 2007-2008, a pilot project was established to ensure that restaurants installed and maintained grease interceptors at their facility. The project involved inspections of restaurants in the downtown core. Toronto Public Health would check for the presence or absence of grease interceptors during restaurant inspections under the Dine Safe Program. Restaurants without grease interceptors, or those with a history of sewer backups, would be referred to Toronto Water for a further detailed inspection and enforcement under the Sewers By-law, if required.

The pilot project was a success and was expanded to include Scarborough area restaurants in 2009. In 2010, the project expanded city wide. Due to the success of the pilots, Toronto Water received 1,481 referrals in 2010 and 43 referrals in 2011 compared to 63 and 261 that were received in 2008 and in 2009, respectively, for restaurants without grease interceptors. The 2011 referrals are dramatically less and can be attributed to the fact that most food establishments requiring grease interceptors have already been accounted for since 2008. Maintenance of grease interceptors continues to be a challenge for restaurants. Without proper maintenance, the grease interceptors will fill up with grease and solids and not function as expected and may cause grease to be pushed out into the City sewers causing blockages. Continuous outreach is required to address this matter.

In 2010, Toronto Water issued 496 NOVs for grease interceptor installation and 346 grease interceptors were installed. In 2011, Toronto Water issued 200 NOVs for grease

interceptor installation and 145 grease interceptors were installed. The difference between the number of violations issued and the number of grease interceptors installed are a result of either a restaurant requiring additional time to install their grease interceptors or subsequently closing their business for other reasons. Restaurants that have not responded to NOV's are contacted for follow up and additional enforcement tools considered. The follow up work is prioritized with the greatest risk being addressed first; i.e. the potential for grease to block sewers.

## **5) Spills & Complaint Response / Customer Service Response**

Toronto Water Provincial Offences Officers are on a rotating weekly schedule responsible for responding to complaint calls requiring By-law enforcement. This is achieved through night and weekend shifts to respond to discharge complaints/spills to ensure 24 hour coverage. Examples of complaints may include a resident dumping paint into a street catch basin or a resident reporting foam or discoloured water in a creek. Toronto Water uses customer service metrics to measure the percentage of customer calls responded to within 2 hours. In 2010, staff received and attended to 213 complaints/spills and 218 complaints/spills in 2011. To date, staff has a 99% response rate for responding to these calls in a timely manner, providing a high level of customer service.

The requirements for the discharge of swimming pool or hot tub water were amended in the Sewers By-law in 2008 to clearly outline the parameters that must be met and the procedure that must be followed when discharging from a residential swimming pool/hot tub. Toronto Water Officers respond to swimming pool complaints on a regular basis especially in spring for the opening of pools and in the autumn for the closing of pools. In 2010, there were 26 swimming pool complaints and in 2011 there were 25 swimming pool complaints in which Toronto Water responded. Residential swimming pool complaints are addressed as an opportunity to educate the public on the Sewers By-law and the requirements for discharging into the sewer system. If additional complaints for the same property occur, Toronto Water issues NOV's. In 2010 and 2011 Toronto Water issued 2 and 3 NOV's respectively, for swimming pool violations.

## **6) Industrial Water Rate - Block 2**

Based on Council's decision to offer a lower Block 2 water rate, industrial customers can receive a lower industrial water rate if they have an industrial tax classification, consume water in excess of 6,000 m<sup>3</sup> per year, use the water for industrial or manufacturing processes, and submit an acceptable Water Conservation Plan (WCP). Additionally, to continue to receive the lower Block 2 rate, the industrial customer must comply with the Sewers By-law and submit a WCP annual progress report by July 1<sup>st</sup> of each year. If any of these conditions are not met, the customer loses the Block 2 rate and reverts back to paying the higher Block 1 rate, until compliance is achieved.

If an industrial customer does not comply with the Sewers By-law they will be issued a NOV. The industrial customer is allowed up to two (2) NOV's within a given year and

still has the opportunity for reinstatement to the Block 2 rate, once compliance is achieved, as determined by Toronto Water. If the industrial customer is issued a third NOV in the same year, the industrial customer will be deemed a 'habitual offender' and will lose the Block 2 rate for a year. Before becoming eligible to return to the Block 2 rate, the industrial customer will be required to comply with the Sewers By-law for 12 consecutive months starting from the date of issuance of the third NOV. In 2010, 6 industrial customers received 3 NOVs and were taken off Block 2 rate until they can demonstrate one year of compliance with their sampling results. In 2011, 2 additional industrial customers were also taken off the block 2 rate until one year of compliance is demonstrated. As of 2012, all 'high volume companies', these are companies that meet the eligibility for a Block 2 rate but have not applied or submitted a WCP, are being sampled according to Toronto Water's risk pollutant classification and will no longer be sampled once per quarter. If a 'high volume' company should apply for the Block 2 rate, the sampling data now exists for these companies and compliance may be determined upon application to the program.

Toronto Water takes a proactive approach to encourage industrial customers to stay on the Block 2 rate program. In 2010 and 2011, Toronto Water met with 11 and 6 industrial customers, respectively, that received 2 NOVs in the referred year, to discuss a compliance program and/or other solutions that would correct their non-compliance.

To date, 83 industrial customers are part of the Block 2 Water Rate Initiative. As of December 31, 2011, 65 industrial customers were in compliance and were receiving the Block 2 rate, and 10 industrial customers were not in compliance and lost the Block 2 rate. The remaining 8 industrial customers received 3 NOVs and continue to remain off the Block 2 rate as they have yet to demonstrate one year of compliance with their sampling results.

On November 29, 2011 Council provided the General Manager of Toronto Water with the authority to resolve non-compliance matters affecting an industry's entitlement to the Block 2 rate within six months of the effective date of non-compliance. Toronto Water staff will be implementing a new process for using this new authority later this year.

## **7) Liaison with Provincial Ministries**

In 2010 and 2011, Toronto Water continued to work with the Ontario Ministry of Environment (MOE) and Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) on matters of similar interest. For example, one of the requirements for waste haulers is to have a current Certificate of Approval from the MOE to ensure proper haulage and disposal of wastes. The MOE provides Toronto Water Certificate of Approval information or lack thereof for waste haulers. Toronto Water requires facilities such as restaurants to use MOE certified waste haulers. Additionally, Toronto Water approached OMAFRA with an idea to develop a guide for food processors to better understand wastewater and the Sewers By-law. The Provincial Ministry agreed with the idea and they have started to develop a guide which is expected to be finalized in 2012.

Another project included a partnership with the MOE to conduct a study on emerging pharmaceuticals in wastewater from institutions and the effects they have on wastewater treatment plants and the environment. The study included sampling of old age homes, hospitals and veterinarian offices. The City, in co-operation with the MOE, selected representative sites for the study. The City obtained all the samples and submitted the samples to the MOE for analysis. The data from the study will be used to produce a report on the topic by the MOE.

## **8) Auditor General Recommendations**

The Auditor General (AG) in his November 4, 2008 report to the Audit Committee recommended that Toronto Water review inspection and sampling targets to ensure that they are reasonable given risks to pollute and the staff resources available. A number of changes have been made since the 2008 Audit to ensure targets and metrics are met. Examples include re-assignment of areas to Officers, using two dedicated Provincial Offences Officers for specialty sectors and the creation and implementation of a streamlined inspection checklist form. An assessment of the inspection and sampling metrics is still under review as a result of these changes and the additional requirement of Provincial Offences Officers addressing Water Supply By-law issues. Information will be reported once a complete assessment and review has been performed.

Two additional audit recommendations were completed in 2011. Toronto Water and Municipal Licensing and Standards (MLS) staff met and reached agreement that facilities such as restaurants, initially, followed by automotive repair shops and vehicle wash shops, applying for an MLS license will require approval from Toronto Water to ensure such facilities have equipment as required by the Sewers By-law. Before referrals could be made to Toronto Water, MLS required the preparation of a list of frequently asked questions and a template clearance letter for their staff to use. This was provided by Toronto Water in the third and fourth quarter of 2011.

The other completed recommendation is the development of a work management system called iPACS that will track various performance requirements outlined in the audit report. iPACS was initiated in late March 2011 and is now fully functional. iPACS is able to produce a quarterly sampling, enforcement, and inspection report.

Seven (7) out of the 22 AG Recommendations made are still incomplete and Toronto Water is expecting that they will all be completed by the end of 2012.

## **9) Pollution Prevention (P2) Plan Program**

Toronto was the first City in Canada with a Sewers By-law that required Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (ICI) facilities to prepare mandatory Pollution Prevention (P2) Plans. These plans identify ways to avoid, reduce or eliminate the creation of subject pollutants at the source. Currently, full P2 Plans are required to be submitted by ICI sector firms every six years. Six thousand (6,000) facilities fall under the program.

In 2010, 190 P2 Plans (does not include BMPs) were reviewed. In 2011, Toronto Water reviewed 113 P2 Plans. Failure to submit a P2 Plan results in the issuance of an NOV. Also, any P2 plan submitted which does not meet the By-law requirements can be rejected (via NOV). The first prosecution and conviction of a company for failing to submit a P2 plan occurred in 2009. In 2011, there were 6 summonses for failing to submit a P2 Plan leading to total fines of \$11,500, excluding 25% Victim Surcharge Fee.

It should be noted that the current Sewers By-law only requires the preparation and submission of P2 Plans and not the implementation of those Plans. When the P2 Program was incorporated into the Sewers By-law, authority did not exist under the former Municipal Act to enforce implementation of P2 Plans. A legal review to determine if such authority exists under the *City of Toronto Act, 2006* was completed to satisfy a 2008 Auditor General Recommendation. Toronto Water will review the findings in 2012 and determine the feasibility of mandating the implementation of P2 Plans prepared by businesses.

For some industries, the second six year cycle for reporting P2 Plans to the City started in June 2007, while other establishments had a June 2008 submission deadline. Based on past experience, during the initial P2 Plan submission phase, there is a period of time required to meet with companies so as to raise the compliance percentages. As many establishments are still in the initial stages of the second six year cycle, higher compliance percentages for 2011 have not yet been achieved. Routine industrial site inspections that are conducted by Toronto Water staff include ensuring whether or not a P2 plan has been submitted to the City by the company. As site inspections are undertaken, it is anticipated that the level of compliance will also increase. Further, it is a challenge for industry to remember their obligation to re-submit a new plan 6 years later and there are also administrative challenges to the City including the need to follow-up. One dedicated program staff member conducts P2 submission reviews.

Table 3 highlights the industry statistics with respect to the percentage of P2 plan submissions received by the City.

**Table 3: Pollution Prevention - Industry Statistics Related to Reporting**

<b>P2 Plan and BMP Submission Reporting Statistics – as of December 31, 2011</b>				
<b>Organization Type</b>	<b>Total Number of Facilities</b>	<b>P2 &amp; BMP Compliance Rate</b>		
		<b>2011</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2009</b>
<b>Autobody Refinishing</b>	553	58%	57%	55%
<b>Automotive Services</b>	2615	51%	48%	46%
<b>Dental Offices</b>	1561	81%	81%	79%
<b>Photo Labs</b>	206	58%	58%	58%
<b>Metal Finishing</b>	115	88%	97%	96%
<b>Printing</b>	351	62%	60%	58%
<b>Non Sector</b>	28	69%	84%	94%

<b>Manufacturing</b>	195	77%	75%	70%
<b>Dry Cleaners &amp; Commercial Laundry</b>	298	100%	100%	99%
<b>Textile and Industrial Laundry</b>	43	86%	84%	83%
<b>Hospital/Health Care</b>	38	86%	82%	79%
<b>Total</b>	6003			

New facilities are being added to the P2 Program through gap analysis and sampling of non-sector industries. Non-sector industries are not required to submit P2 Plans unless subject pollutants are found in their wastewater. The Metal Finishing and Non Sector groups added new facilities in 2011 that have yet to submit a P2 Plan. This resulted in lower 2011 compliance rate for both sectors.

Also, as the Pollution Prevention program is now a decade old, it was thought that P2 reminder letters should not be necessary and thus no mass mail out was done in 2010 and 2011. To increase compliance in 2012, targeted inspections, notices of violations, and telephone calls will be required. As well, head offices will be contacted for an up to date list of their facilities. The Photo Labs sector, for example, have changed dramatically and many locations have closed and/or have become "Dry" (no process effluent). Toronto Water is also working closely with the ChemTrac program of Toronto Public Health and comparing their list of facilities.

Certain commercial operations are required to follow Best Management Practices (BMP) which provides a number of "do's and don'ts" designed to improve effluent quality of that particular commercial operation. The BMP, when followed, minimizes the release of pollutants to the sewer system. This approach has proven to be more effective for smaller businesses, rather than submitting P2 Plans. Businesses that follow a BMP include photofinishing, automotive repairs, gas stations and vehicle wash facilities.

## **10) Storm Sewer Outfall Monitoring Program**

At its meeting on November 5, 2005, the Works Committee directed that an annual report be submitted on the status of the Outfall Monitoring Program (OMP). Previous progress reports can be reviewed at the following links:

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/2005/agendas/committees/wks/wks051108/it002b.pdf>

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/2006/agendas/committees/wks/wks060911/it061.pdf>

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/3pw/bgrd/backgroundfile-8876.pdf>

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2009/pw/bgrd/backgroundfile-21575.pdf>

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2010/pw/bgrd/backgroundfile-27381.pdf>

The Outfall Monitoring Program accomplished a great deal despite its sampling work being weather dependent. Table 4 compares some key statistics for the program from 2009 to 2011.

**Table 4: Comparison of Cross Connections Found and Corrected, Priority Outfalls, Outfalls of Concern and De-listed Priority Outfalls during 2009, 2010 and 2011.**

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
<b>Precipitation (mm)</b>	879.9	745.8	917
<b>Cross Connections Found</b>	315	27	40
<b>Cross Connections Corrected</b>	312	28	32
<b>Priority Outfalls</b>	53	97	102
<b>Outfalls of Concern</b>	0	46	39
<b>De-listed Priority Outfalls</b>	17	14	14

During the summer of 2010, Toronto Water completed at least two rounds of sampling for the outfalls surveyed, in Highland and Mimico Creeks. That year outfalls along Humber River were initially surveyed. In the summer of 2011, the Humber River outfall survey was completed along with two rounds of sampling. The sampling data was used to classify Priority Outfalls, which are those that show signs of contamination. The Priority Outfalls were incorporated into the current list for active investigation. Outfalls classified as Outfalls of Concern require additional sampling data for classification. Also in the summer of 2011, Toronto Water started the Lake Ontario outfall surveys and will continue this surveying in 2012. Table 5 provides a summary of the Humber River and Lake Ontario outfalls surveyed and the number outfalls that had a dry weather flow, in 2010 and 2011.

**Table 5: Survey of Humber River and Lake Ontario Outfalls**

<b>Watershed</b>	<b>Survey Started</b>	<b>Survey Completed</b>	<b>Total Outfalls Surveyed</b>	<b>Outfalls With Dry Weather Flow</b>
<b>Humber River</b>	May 2010	May 2011	484	269
<b>Lake Ontario</b>	May 2011	Ongoing	86	25

Toronto Water performed numerous outfall related inspections and sampling events, for storm water quality monitoring and enforcement. From these activities in 2010 and 2011, Notices of Violation (NOVs) were issued for non-compliance with the Sewers By-law (storm section). Refer to Table 6 for summary of stormwater related tasks.

**Table 6: Summary of Stormwater Related Tasks for 2010 and 2011**

<b>Stormwater Related Tasks</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
<b>Inspections</b>	2,646	2,327
<b>Sampling Events</b>	1,051	1,006
<b>Laboratory Analyses</b>	14,655	11,332
<b>Notices of Violation Issued</b>	15	26

There were a total of 53 Priority Outfalls at the beginning of 2010 and 102 Priority Outfalls at the beginning of 2011. From the beginning of 2010 to the end of 2011, all Priority Outfalls were under investigation within Black Creek, Humber River, Mimico Creek, Don River, Etobicoke Creek, Highland Creek, Lake Ontario, Rouge River and Taylor Massey Creek watersheds. The investigations led to 361 property dye tests and the discovery of 67 cross connections (47 residential, 10 commercial, 1 industrial, 3 institutional, and 6 sewer infrastructure problems) (refer to Appendix C -Table 1).

Of these cross connections, 60 were corrected (43 residential, 9 commercial, 1 industrial, 3 institutional, 4 sewer infrastructure problems). This contributed to 28 Priority Outfalls being de-listed from the Priority list. A de-listed outfall means one in which 3 consecutive samples of the outfall show no contaminants have been found since the cross connection was corrected upstream. Refer to Appendix C-Table 2 for a list of de-listed priority outfalls in 2010 and 2011 along with the corresponding watersheds their respective wards. Appendix C-Table 3 provides a summary of Priority Outfalls and de-listed outfalls for 2009, 2010 and 2011.

The use of Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) equipment has continued to be a benefit in detecting cross connections in storm sewer systems. Normally staff would take samples along the storm sewer system to verify and narrow down a source of contamination. Contamination from cross connections is usually found by dye testing properties and visually inspecting the dye as it enters the sewer lines. Contamination sources can be traced more accurately along these storm sewer lines using CCTV. Investigations are more targeted and efficient as to minimize investigating and dye testing entire neighbourhoods. Of the cross connections found in 2010 and 2011, 17 were found with the aid of CCTV, while performing only 62 related property dye tests.

The Outfall Monitoring Program has found 551 cross connections since the program's inception in late 2005. Five hundred and thirty (530) cross connections have been corrected, of these, 58 priority outfalls have been deleted. The City's storm water quality has improved as a direct result of this program, and this has contributed to less pollution entering the natural environment.

## **11) Collaborative Surface Water Monitoring Programs**

Toronto Water is also involved with the Beaches Monitoring Program with Toronto Public Health and Toronto Police Services (seasonal beach lifeguards). During the summer beach season, beach water quality is monitored by testing for E. coli. In 2011, Toronto Water staff trained lifeguards to collect beach water samples and from the sample results, Toronto Public Health posts publicly whether it is safe to swim. This year, Toronto Water co-ordinated a total collection of 6,359 beach water samples along Toronto's 11 beaches and waterfront.

Toronto Water also works with the University of Guelph to support Transportation Services Division's Salt Management Plan. Watercourse monitoring stations are strategically located in the Highland Creek watershed to sample flow rate and chloride



levels year round. This effort is aimed at assessing the chloride contribution from road salt used for roadway de-icing purposes in winter months.

## **CONTACT**

Diane Sertic, Supervisor  
Environmental Monitoring  
& Protection  
Toronto Water  
(T) 416-392-3489  
(F) 416-392-9338  
[dsertic@toronto.ca](mailto:dsertic@toronto.ca)

Joanne Di Caro, Manager  
Environmental Monitoring  
& Protection  
Toronto Water  
(T) 416-392-2929  
(F) 416-392-9338  
[jdicara@toronto.ca](mailto:jdicara@toronto.ca)

## **SIGNATURE**

---

Lou Di Gironimo  
General Manager, Toronto Water

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- Appendix A: 2011 and 2010 Sewers and Water Supply By-law Convictions
- Appendix B: Organizations invoiced for Industrial Waste Surcharge Agreements or Permits, as of December 31, 2011
- Appendix C: Outfall Monitoring Program Summary

## Appendix A:

**Table 1: Sewers and Water Supply By-law Convictions for 2011**

Conviction Date	Company	Ward	No. of Parameters charged	Conviction	Fines (excluding 25% Victim Surcharge)	Positive Outcome of Prosecution File
01/11/11	Color Pak, A Division of Atlantic Packaging Products Ltd.	37	2	Sanitary: Zinc (2)	\$8,000	Company spent \$250,000 in time and pollution prevention equipment to be in compliance.
01/12/11	Hoi Tin Food Products Limited	35	2	Sanitary: BOD & TSS	Suspended sentence	Company agreed to pay surcharge assessment back to the beginning of 2010 and therefore given a suspended sentence.
03/09/11	Forestview Restaurant / 2188185 Ontario Inc.	20	5	Storm: Failure to report a spill, failure to do everything possible to prevent spill of grease	\$2,000	Toronto Public Health, Toronto Water, and the Police worked together - \$15,000 in total fines.
03/14/11	Colmar Corporation	2	12	Storm: Failure to report spill.	\$2,000	Company understands spills need to be reported.
03/30/11	Perfect Poultry Inc.	7	3	Sanitary: TSS, BOD, Phosphorus	Suspended Sentence	The company was given a suspended sentence for each count for agreeing to enter an IWSA and making retroactive payments to 2009 of approximately \$13,000 to Toronto Water.
04/20/11	Almon Equipment Ltd.	2	3	Storm: Discharge of sewage, failure to report spill.	\$1,750	Company understands spills need to be reported.
05/13/11	Chemtura Canada Co./CIE	44	3	Failing to submit a P2 Plan Summary.	\$3,500	Fine for P2 Plan non-submission.

Conviction Date	Company	Ward	No. of Parameters charged	Conviction	Fines (excluding 25% Victim Surcharge)	Positive Outcome of Prosecution
06/08/11	Toronto Linen Rental Inc.	7	3	Sanitary: Chloroform (3)	\$3,000	
07/08/11	Toronto Abattoirs Limited	19	4	Sanitary: Oil & Grease (non-mineral), Phosphorus, TKN.	\$3,000	New Compliance agreement signed by company to actively upgrade its treatment system.
08/03/11	Accurate Industrial Waste Limited	Head office in Vaughan but collection of hauled sewage in Toronto	4	Sanitary: Aluminum, Copper, Lead, Zinc	\$8,000	The procedure for receiving hauled sewage in the City of Toronto had been changed significantly since 2006 to specifically capture any misuse of the Hauled Sewage Program.
8/15/2011	Elbee Meat Packers Limited	11	14	Sanitary: pH (5), Oil and grease (non-mineral), Water Supply By-law: tampering with water meter seal, refusing request of Inspector to produce documents	\$16,000	Installed pH Controls.
08/24/11	Halltech Inc.	44	4	Sanitary: Toluene (2)	\$6,000	Company closed off discharge drain; now in compliance.
08/24/11	Vision Coaters Canada Ltd	7	2	Sanitary: Zinc	\$1,000	Now in compliance after steps taken to mitigate the problem.
09/12/11	Bluescape Construction Management Inc.	24	2	Storm: TSS	\$1,500	Company understands it must comply with sanitary discharge permit at all times and seek new permit upon expiry.

Conviction Date	Company	Ward	No. of Parameters charged	Conviction	Fines (excluding 25% Victim Surcharge)	Positive Outcome of Prosecution
09/26/11	Arts Metal Finishing Ltd.	8	3	Sanitary: Chromium, Nickel	\$10,000	Over \$290,000 was spent on new wastewater treatment system for Chromium and Nickel. The company is now in compliance.
10/03/11	Victory Laundry & Linen Rental / 2259671 Ontario Inc.	37	3	Sanitary: Chloroform	\$2,500	The company has decreased the chloroform concentrations and working to becoming a chlorine-free facility.
10/12/11	White Veal Meat Packers Ltd.	7	7	Sanitary: BOD, Oil & Grease (non-mineral)	\$3,500	Company signed an Industrial Waste Surcharge Agreement in 2011.
10/12/11	Crown Metal Packaging Canada Inc.	7	3	Sanitary: Aluminum	\$2,500	After the company's head office implemented training and treatment system corrections, the company became compliant with Toronto's Sewers By-law in 2011.
10/24/11	The Daniels Group Inc.	28	2	Storm: TSS	\$1,000	Company understands it must apply for and be granted a permit to discharge groundwater to the sewer system.
10/25/11	Eastend Plating Co. Ltd.	42	7	Sanitary: Zinc (4), Chromium, pH, failure to submit P2 Plan Update	\$56,000	
10/25/11	Mr. Tony Baccio – Corporate Director of Eastend Plating Co. Ltd.	42	7	Sanitary: Zinc (4), Chromium, pH, failure to submit P2 Plan Update	\$50,000	Two-year Probation Order was issued to Tony Baccio wherein he is prohibited from discharging Zinc in excess of 2 mg/L. First Corporate Director charged and convicted under Sewers By-law.
					<b>Total</b> <b>\$181,250</b>	

**Table 2: Sewers and Water Supply By-law Convictions for 2010**

Conviction Date	Company	Ward	No. of Parameters charged	Conviction	Fines (excluding 25% Victim Surcharge)	Positive Outcome of Prosecution
02/22/10	Masco Metal Finishing Co. Ltd.	7	4	Sanitary: Zinc	\$6,000	Company spent \$70,000 on process to eliminate cyanide. Installed closed-looped system to eliminate Zinc.
03/03/10	Castlewall Marble and Tile Inc.	12	1	Water Supply: Tampering with water meter	\$1,500	
06/29/10	Serenas <sup>1</sup>	7	1	Charges withdrawn	N/A	Charge withdrawn with agreement to pay \$6,100 for water taken.
07/29/10	Vienna Meat Products Limited	41	2	Sanitary: Oil & Grease (non-mineral)	\$1,500	\$70,000 worth of new interceptors installed before court date.
10/04/10	Victor De Sousa (Brite Site Building Services) – mobile service	Mississauga based company working in ward 20	2	Water Supply: Taking water from a fire hydrant without a permit.	\$500	.
11/08/10	Guild Electric Limited	37	2	Storm: Discharge of sewage, failure to report a spill	\$17,500	Company re-introduced its employee training program for spills & paint handling
12/21/10	M. Stanton Electroplating Inc.	38	2	Sanitary: Nickel	\$2,000	
					<b>Total</b>	
					<b>\$29,000</b>	

**Note 1:** No conviction was registered because the company agreed to reimburse the City for the quantity of water taken by the company without a water meter present, despite a signed letter by a P.Eng that a water meter was in place for such purpose.

## Appendix B:

### Organizations invoiced for Industrial Waste Surcharge Agreements or Permits, as of December 31, 2011

No.	Industry Name	Address	Ward	Status as of 2011
1	1562541 Ontario Ltd. (Rex Services)	100 Silver Star Boulevard	41	Active
2	2168587 Ontario Ltd. (Upper Crust Bakery)	55 Canarctic Drive	8	Active
3	3321061 Canada Inc.(Sunrise Soya Foods)	21 Medulla Avenue	5	Active
4	573349 Ontario Ltd. (The Butcher Shoppe)	121 Shorncliffe Road	5	Active
5	A. Lassonde Inc.	95 Vulcan Street	2	Active
6	Agropur Cooperative (Natrel)	1275 Lawrence Ave East	34	Active
7	Amsterdam Brewing Company Limited	21 Bathurst Street	20	Active
8	Atlantic Packaging Products Ltd.	350 Midwest Road	37	Active
9	Bank Bros. & Son Ltd.	116 Glen Scarlett Road	11	Active
10	BASF Canada Inc.	10 Constellation Court	2	Active
11	Beechgrove Country Foods Inc.	20 Minuk Acres	44	Active
12	Belmont Meat Products Limited	230 Signet Drive	7	Active
13	Bento Nouveau Ltd.	19 Skagway Avenue	36	Active
14	Best Baking Inc.(Dufflet Pastries)	166 Norseman Street	5	Active
15	Bona Foods Limited	184 Toryork Drive	7	Active
16	Campbell Company Of Canada	60 Birmingham Street	6	Active
17	Canadian Linen and Uniform Service Co.	24 Atomic Avenue	5	Active
18	Toronto Solid Waste Div	35 Vanley Crescent	8	Active
19	Central - Epicure Food Products Limited	501 Garyray Drive	7	Active

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Status as of 2011</b>
20	Chai Poultry Inc.	115 Saulter Street	30	Active
21	Charlie's Meat & Seafood Supply Ltd.	61 Skagway Avenue	36	Active
22	Charlie's Meat & Seafood Supply Ltd.	65 Skagway Avenue	36	Active
23	Chemtura Canada Co./CIE	10 Chemical Court	44	Active
24	Chrysler Canada Inc.	15 Brown's Line	6	Active
25	Cintas Canada Limited	23 Torlake Crescent	6	Active
26	Cintas Canada Limited	3370 Dundas Street West	13	Active
27	Coca-Cola Refreshments Canada Company	24 Fenmar Drive	7	Active
28	Color-Pak, a Division of Atlantic Packaging Products Ltd.	80 Progress Avenue	37	Active
29	Commercial Bakeries Corp.	45 Torbarrie Road	7	Active
30	Del's Pastry Limited	344 Bering Avenue	5	Active
31	Delmare Quality Foods Inc.	122 Judge Road	5	Active
32	DF Foods Mfg. Inc.	75 Vickers Road	5	Active
33	Dimpflmeier Bakery Limited	26-36 Advance Road	5	Active
34	DMX Plastics Limited	200 Hymus Road	35	Active
35	Dominion Colour Corporation	199 New Toronto Street	6	Active
36	Elbee Meat Packers Limited	1 Glen Scarlett Road	11	Active
37	Emery Oleochemicals Canada Ltd.	425 Kipling Avenue	6	Active
38	Faster Linen Service Limited	89 Torlake Crescent	6	Active
39	Fiera Foods Company	220 Norelco Drive	7	Active
40	Fiera Foods Company	50 Marmora Street	7	Active

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Status as of 2011</b>
41	G & K Services Canada Inc.	940 Warden Avenue	37	Active
42	Gay Lea Foods Co-Operative Limited	100 Clayson Road	7	Active
43	Gay Lea Foods Co-Operative Limited (Longlife)	180 Ormont Drive	7	Active
44	Gibson's Cleaners Co. Limited	4241 Dundas Street West	5	Active
45	Give and Go Prepared Foods Corp.	6650 Finch Avenue West	1	Active
46	Grande Cheese Company Ltd.	175 Milvan Drive	7	Active
47	Great Lakes Brewing Co. Ltd.	30 Queen Elizabeth Boulevard	5	Active
48	Griffith Laboratories Limited	757 Pharmacy Avenue	35	Active
49	GTAA	311 Corvair Drive	N/A	Active
50	Halltech Inc.	465 Coronation Drive	44	Active
51	Heng Lee Food Products Co. Ltd.	605 Middlefield Road	41	Active
52	Hoi Tin Food Products Ltd.	439 Birchmount Road	35	Active
53	International Cheese Ltd.	67 Mulock Avenue	11	Active
54	Irving Tissue Corporation	1551 Weston Road	11	Active
55	Joriki Inc.	3431 McNicoll Avenue	41	Active
56	Kerr Bros. Limited	956 Islington Avenue	5	Active
57	KIK Operating Partnership	13 Bethridge Road	2	Active
58	KIK Operating Partnership	2000 Kipling Avenue	2	Active
59	Kraft Canada Inc.	5 Bermondsey Road	31	Active
60	Kraft Canada Inc.	40 Bertrand Avenue	37	Active
61	Kraft Canada Inc.	277 Gladstone Avenue	18	Active



<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Status as of 2011</b>
62	Kraft Canada Inc.	2150 Lakeshore Boulevard W	6	Active
63	Kraft Canada Inc.	370 Progress Avenue	37	Active
64	Kretschmar Incorporated	71 Curlew Drive	34	Active
65	Liberte Natural Foods Inc.	60 Brisbane Road	8	Active
66	MacGregors Meat & Seafood Ltd.	265 Garyray Drive	7	Active
67	Maple Leaf Foods Inc.	150 Bartor Road	7	Active
68	Maple Leaf Foods Inc.	100 Ethel Avenue	11	Active
69	Maple Leaf Foods Inc. (Cappola Food Inc.)	92 Cartwright Avenue	15	Active
70	Marsan Foods Limited	160 Thermos Road	37	Active
71	Maypole Dairy Products Ltd.	64 Fordhouse Boulevard	5	Active
72	McCain Foods Limited	55 Torlake Crescent	6	Active
73	Molson Canada 2005	1 Carlingview Drive	2	Active
74	Morrison Lamothe Inc.	399 Evans Avenue	6	Active
75	Morrison Lamothe Inc.	141 Finchdene Square	42	Active
76	Ms. Clean Laundry & Linen Services Inc.	25 Windsor Street	6	Active
77	Multi-National Manufacturing Ltd.	65 Melford Drive	42	Active
78	National Dry Company Limited	30 Arrow Road	7	Active
79	Nestle Canada Inc.	72 Sterling Road	18	Active
80	Newalta Corporation	55 Vulcan Street	2	Active
81	New Forest Paper Mills LP	333 Progress Avenue	37	Active
82	Nitta Gelatin Canada, Inc.	60 Paton Road	18	Active

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Status as of 2011</b>
83	Oak Leaf Confections Co.	440 Comstock Road	35	Active
84	Organic Resource Management Inc.	290 Garyray Drive	7	Active
85	Parmalat Canada Inc.	25 Rakely Court	3	Active
86	Pepe's Mexican Foods Inc.	122 Carrier Drive	1	Active
87	Pizza Pizza Limited	58 Advance Road	5	Active
88	Planway Poultry Inc.	26 Canmotor Avenue	5	Active
89	Portuguese Cheese Company Limited	2 Buckingham Street	6	Active
90	Quantex Technologies Inc.	309 Cherry Street	30	Active
91	Redpath Sugar Ltd.	95 Queen's Quay East	28	Active
92	Rohm and Haas Canada LP	2 Manse Road	44	Active
93	Rocktenn-Container Canada L.P.	730 Islington Avenue	6	Active
94	Ryding- Regency Meat Packers Ltd.	70 Glen Scarlett Road	11	Active
95	Select Foods Products, Limited	120 Sunrise Avenue	34	Active
96	St. Clair Ice Cream Limited	2859 Danforth Avenue	32	Active
97	Steam Whistle Brewing Inc.	255 Bremner Boulevard	20	Active
98	Tiffany Gate Foods Inc.	195 Steinway Boulevard	1	Active
99	Topper Linen Supply Limited (North)	26 Mulock Avenue	11	Active
100	Topper Linen Supply Limited (South)	24-36 Mulock Avenue	11	Active
101	Toronto Abattoirs Limited	2 Tecumseth Street	19	Active
102	Toryork Catering Limited	230 Milvan Drive	7	Active
103	Trillium Beverage Inc.	55 Mill Street	28	Active

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Status as of 2011</b>
104	Trillium Beverage Inc.	300 Midwest Road	37	Active
105	Turtle Island Paper Co.	242 Cherry Street	30	Active
106	Unilever Canada Inc.	195 Belfield Road	2	Active
107	Univar Canada Ltd.	64 Arrow Road	7	Active
108	Vegfresh Inc. & GMASJ Ontario Inc.	1290 Ormont Drive	7	Active
109	Vienna Meats Products Limited	170 Nugget Avenue	41	Active
110	W.T. Lynch Foods Limited	72 Rainside Road	34	Active
111	Wageners Meat and Delicatessen Limited	40-44 Six Point Road	5	Active
112	Wing Hing Lung Ltd.	50 Torlake Crescent	6	Active
113	Wing Hing Lung Ltd.	275 Albany Avenue	20	Active
114	Wrigley Canada Inc.	1123 Leslie Street	25	Active
115	1458935 Ontario Ltd. (Shefa Meats)	195 Bridgeland Avenue	15	New Active Surcharge
116	Ace Bakery Limited	1 Hafis Road	12	New Active Surcharge
117	ADP Direct Poultry Ltd.	34 Vansco Road	5	New Active Surcharge
118	Allseas Fisheries Corp.	55 Vansco Road	5	New Active Surcharge
119	Canada Bread Company, Limited	130 Cawthra Avenue	11	New Active Surcharge
120	Canada Bread Company, Limited	35 Rakely Court	3	New Active Surcharge
121	Cargill Limited	25 Newbridge Road	5	New Active Surcharge
122	City Linen Inc.	1680 Midland Avenue	37	New Active Surcharge
123	Dare Foods Limited	143 Tycos Drive	15	New Active Surcharge
124	Deluxe Toronto Ltd.	350 Evans Avenue	6	New Active Surcharge

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Status as of 2011</b>
125	Earthfresh Farms Inc.	131 Brown's Line	6	New Active Surcharge
126	FGF Brands	1295 Ormont Drive	7	New Active Surcharge
127	Global Egg Corporation	283 Horner Avenue	6	New Active Surcharge
128	Golden Cut Poultry Ltd.	42 Taber Road	2	New Active Surcharge
129	Hans Dairy Inc.	36 Taber Road	2	New Active Surcharge
130	Korex Canada	104 Jutland Road	5	New Active Surcharge
131	Lush Handmade Cosmetics Ltd.	63 Advance Road	5	New Active Surcharge
132	Metropolitan Toronto Condominium Corporation No. 960	328 Passmore Avenue	41	New Active Surcharge
133	Norampac, a division of Cascades Canada ULC	450 Evans Avenue	6	New Active Surcharge
134	Norampac-Lithotech, a division of Cascades Canada ULC	5910 Finch Ave East	42	New Active Surcharge
135	Owens-Corning Insulating Systems Canada LP	3450 McNicoll Avenue	41	New Active Surcharge
136	Perfect Poultry Inc.	239 Toryork Drive	7	New Active Surcharge
137	Pyung Hwa Food Company Inc.	7 Kenhar Drive	7	New Active Surcharge
138	Ready Bake Foods Inc. (Annette's Donuts)	1965 Lawrence Avenue W	11	New Active Surcharge
139	Ready Bake Foods Inc.	675 Fenmar Drive	7	New Active Surcharge
140	Real Food for Real Kids Inc.	41 Dovercourt Road	19	New Active Surcharge
141	Reneé Gourmet Foods Inc.	21 Coronet Road	5	New Active Surcharge
142	Stonemill Bakehouse (BCE Place) Inc.	426 Nugget Avenue	41	New Active Surcharge
143	Superior Sausage & Meat Products Limited	1004 Dundas Street West	19	New Active Surcharge
144	Supreme Egg Products Inc.	17 Newbridge Road	5	New Active Surcharge
145	Surati Sweet Mart Limited	26 Carnforth Road	34	New Active Surcharge

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Status as of 2011</b>
146	The Tripe Factory Corporation	95 Milliken Boulevard	39	New Active Surcharge
147	U-Pak Disposals (1989) Limited	15 Tidemore Avenue	2	New Active Surcharge
148	Warmia Deli and Meat Products Ltd. (Andy's Sausage)	63 Mulock Avenue	11	New Active Surcharge
149	White Veal Meat Packers Ltd.	37 Fenmar Drive	7	New Active Surcharge
150	Wilben Investments Limited	22 Eddystone Ave	7	New Active Surcharge
151	York Chicken Wholesale Limited	188 New Toronto Street	6	New Active Surcharge
152	Zhi Fong Trading Company Ltd.	46 Kensington Avenue	20	New Active Surcharge
153	Give and Go Prepared Foods Corp.	300 Humber College Boulevard	1	Terminated (Dec. 23 2011)
154	Delcorp Foods Inc.	76 Densley Avenue	12	Terminated (Nov. 15, 2010)
155	Chemtura Canada Co./CIE	36 Upton Road	35	Closed (June 30, 2010)
156	Honeyman's Beef Purveyors	130 The West Mall	5	Closed (July 15, 2011)
157	KIT LP (Sequel Brand Foods)	61 Signet Drive	7	Closed (Jan. 28, 2010)
158	Martha's Garden	475 Horner Avenue	6	Closed (Sept.15 ,2011)
159	Open Window Bakery Ltd.	1125 Finch Avenue West	8	Closed (Jan. 17, 2011)
160	Precise Finishers Limited	1960 Ellesmere Road	37	Closed (March 19, 2011)
161	Schenectady Canada Ltd. (SI Group)	309 Comstock Road	35	Closed (Feb. 2, 2010)
162	Siena Foods Limited	16 Newbridge Road	5	Closed (April 2010)
163	Toronto Linen Rental Inc.	62 Bartor Road, Unit 6	7	Closed (Nov 2010)
164	Cargill Limited	71 Rexdale Blvd.	2	Closed (June 30, 2011)
165	1730500 Ontario Ltd. (Tofu Superior)	175 Weston Road	11	Active
166	Apotex Inc.	150 Signet Drive	7	Active

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Status as of 2011</b>
167	Atlantic Packaging Products Ltd.	111 Progress Avenue	37	Active
168	CMS Ontario Limited	134 Norfinch Drive	8	Active
169	Campione Restaurant Supply Inc.	844 Caledonia Road	15	Active
170	Canada Post Corporation	1860 Midland Avenue	37	Active
171	Canada Bread Company Limited	2 Fraser Avenue	14	Active
172	Canadian Select Meats Inc.	145A Bethridge Road	2	Active
173	Can-Wall Systems Inc.	151 Toryork Drive	7	Active
174	Chair-Man Mills Inc.	184 Rainside Road	34	Active
175	Celestica Inc.	844 Don Mills Road	26	Active
176	Culinary Destinations Limited	35 Jutland Road	5	Active
177	Estee Lauder Cosmetics Ltd.	161 Commander Boulevard	41	Active
178	European Quality Meats & Sausages	16 Jutland Road	5	Active
179	Feather Industries (Canada) Ltd	115 Glen Scarlett Road	11	Active
180	Filicetti Foods Inc.	350 Garyray Drive	7	Active
181	Future Bakery	106 North Queen Street	5	Active
182	Gelato Fresco	60 Tycos Drive	15	Active
183	Global Laundry & Linen Supply Co.	100 McLevin Avenue	42	Active
184	Harcan Kingsoya	33 Casebridge Court	42	Active
185	J.J. Derma Meats	61 Torlake Crescent	6	Active
186	LB SCG King Edward ULC	37 King Street East	28	Active
187	Lantic Sugar Limited	198 New Toronto Street	6	Active

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Status as of 2011</b>
188	Larry Linen Rental Ltd.	91 Penn Drive	7	Active
189	Lincoln Electric Co. of Canada Ltd.	179 Wicksteed Avenue	26	Active
190	Lounsbury Foods Limited	11 Wiltshire Avenue	17	Active
191	Marsan Foods Limited	46 Modern Road	37	Active
192	Medina Wholesale Poultry Inc.	128 Sunrise Avenue	34	Active
193	North Fish Co. Ltd.	23 Six Point Road	5	Active
194	Osler Fish Warehouse	16 Osler Street	18	Active
195	Paragon Linen/Laundry Services Inc	10 Melford Drive	42	Active
196	Purolator Courier Ltd.	62 Vulcan Street	2	Active
197	Quebecor Media	2250 Islington Avenue	2	Active
198	Salsicharia Pavao Delicatessen	1435 Dundas Street West	18	Active
199	Santa Maria Foods Corporation	353 Humberline Drive	1	Active
200	ShaSha Bread Co. Inc.	10 Plastics Avenue	5	Active
201	ShaSha Bread Co. Inc.	20 Plastics Avenue	5	Active
202	Shelmac Brand Products Inc.	1289 Caledonia Road	15	Active
203	Solo Cup Canada	2121 Markham Road	42	Active
204	Tasty Chip (2008) Inc.	10 Shorncliffe Road	5	Active
205	Tencorr Packaging Inc.	188 Cartwright Avenue	15	Active
206	Terrazzo Mosaic & Tile Company Ltd.	900 Keele Street	17	Active
207	Toronto Transit Commission	580 Commissioners Street	30	Active
208	Toronto Transit Commission	400 Evans Avenue	6	Active

<b>No.</b>	<b>Industry Name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Status as of 2011</b>
209	Toronto Transit Commission	400 Greenwood Avenue	30	Active
210	Tremco Canada Ltd.	220 Wicksteed Avenue	26	Active
211	Via Rail Canada Inc.	50 Drummond Street	6	Active
212	Victory Linen	165 Midwest Road	37	Active
213	Weston Bakeries Ltd.	462 Eastern Avenue	30	Active
214	Winsun Laundry and Linen Supply Ltd.	689 Warden Avenue	35	Active



## Appendix C:

### Outfall Monitoring Program Summary

Table 1: Cross Connection Summary (January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2011)

Watershed	Cross Connections found <sup>1</sup>	Cross Connections Corrected <sup>2</sup>
Black Creek	11	9
Don River	4	4
Etobicoke Creek	1	1
Highland Creek	23	17
Humber River	3	0
Lake Ontario	2	0
Mimico Creek	8	10
Taylor Massey Creek	14	18
Rouge River	1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>60</b>

<sup>1</sup> Of the total cross connections found, 47 were residential, 10 were commercial, 1 was industrial, 3 were institutional, 6 were sewer infrastructure problems.

<sup>2</sup> Of the total cross connection corrected, 43 were residential, 9 were commercial, 1 was industrial, 3 were institutional, 4 were sewer infrastructure problems

**Table 2: Priority Outfalls removed / de-listed from the Priority Outfall List in 2010 and 2011 due to 3 samples no longer showing contamination after cross connection has been corrected**

<b>Outfall ID</b>	<b>Watershed</b>	<b>Ward</b>
BC120	Black Creek	12
BC31	Black Creek	12
BC235	Black Creek	8
EC56	Etobicoke Creek	3
HRE418	Humber River	7
MC54	Mimico Creek	5
MC79	Mimico Creek	3
TC23	Taylor Massey Creek	31
TC73	Taylor Massey Creek	35
TC89	Taylor Massey Creek	37
HC49	Highland Creek	44
HC48-1	Highland Creek	44
HC20	Highland Creek	44
HCW25	Highland Creek	43
HCW70-1	Highland Creek	38
HCW02	Highland Creek	43
HCW183	Highland Creek	37
HCW178	Highland Creek	37
HCW78	Highland Creek	37
HCW238	Highland Creek	40
HCW207	Highland Creek	41
HCW204	Highland Creek	41
HCE13	Highland Creek	38
HCE17	Highland Creek	38
HCE120	Highland Creek	42
HCE123	Highland Creek	42
HCE137	Highland Creek	41
RR11-5	Rouge River	42

**Table 3: Comparison of Priority Outfalls and De-listed Outfalls in 2009, 2010 and 2011**

<b>Watershed</b>	<b>Priority Outfalls as of Dec. 31, 2009</b>	<b>Priority Outfalls De-listed in 2010</b>	<b>Priority Outfalls as of Dec. 31, 2010</b>	<b>Priority Outfalls De-listed in 2011</b>	<b>Priority Outfalls as of Dec. 31, 2011</b>	<b>Priority Outfalls De-listed since start of OMP</b>
<b>Black Creek</b>	11	2	9	1	8	9
<b>Etobicoke Creek</b>	1	1	0	0	0	3
<b>Don River</b>	2	0	0	0	0	2
<b>Highland Creek</b>	1	5	44	12	32	17
<b>Humber River</b>	1	1	0	0	18	1
<b>Lake Ontario</b>	1	0	1	0	1	0
<b>Mimico Creek</b>	0	2	10	0	10	2
<b>Rouge River</b>	3	0	3	1	2	1
<b>Taylor Massey Creek</b>	33	3	30	0	31	23
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>58</b>