



Gardiner East Contaminated Soil Monitoring and Review Committee (GECSMRC) – Meeting #3 Minutes - DRAFT

7 Leslie Street (Works and Emergency Services Building)

September 2, 2004, 4:00 – 6:30 p.m.

Attendance

Paul Young, South Riverdale health Centre

William Brown, Resident

Ellie Perkins, Resident

Holly Penfound, Councillor Paula Fletcher's Office

Gurpal Basra, Environmental Health Officer, Toronto Public Health

Steven Vetore, City of Toronto, Transportation Services

Larry Pelechaty, City of Toronto, Transportation Services – Road Operations

David Crichton, City of Toronto, Technical Services – District Engineering Services

Christine Iamonaco-Dagg, Public Consultation & Community Outreach, City of Toronto

Regrets:

Dalton Shipway, Resident

John Minor, Sr. Environmental Specialist, Works and Emergency Services, City of Toronto

New Action Items

- **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** will look into the status of the Leslie St re-development plans and determine the location of the planned TRCA office.
- Get a list of parameters tested at the monitoring wells, as well as the frequency of testing.
- Determine the amount of testing and hydro-seeding on Site A.
- Determine the depth of soil cover and contamination.
- Determine whether contaminants have migrated through the soil to the groundwater level.
- **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** to revise the Soil Cover Integrity Inspection Form. The form should (1) query whether a disturbance is greater than one foot deep, (2) include a notes section, and (3) provide a diagram of the geotextile membrane where staff can note disturbances (Figure 2, and a cross-section diagram, from the Figures section of the SSRA document). The map or diagram will cover the region between Coxwell and Don Roadway and specifically identify Site A and B.
- **Holly Penfound** to proceed on the signage issue, in consultation with **David Crichton**.
- **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** to determine whether the original Council directive establishing the GECSMRC included a timeline.

- **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** to inform federal and provincial representatives (i.e. Jack Layton and Marilyn Churley) that the GECSMRC is meeting, and invite them to attend the meetings or receive minutes of the meetings.
- **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** to check the Council Directive to determine whether the meetings are open to observers and whether GECSMRC membership is capped.
- **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** to revise the Terms of Reference. She will remove any references to the GECSMRC as a sub-committee of the South Riverdale Environmental Liaison Committee (e.g. second line under the title). She will add “i.e. soil monitoring and vegetative uptake” to the line “other as agreed upon by the City” under Section 3.1.
- **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** will draft a letter to **John Minor** requesting soil testing and phytotoxicology. The letter will ask **John Minor** to inform the GECSMRC if he knows of any other sources of funding for the testing.
- GECSMRC members to read Section 4.2 on p42 of the SSRA document for the next meeting.

1.0 Tour of Sites A and B

The following is a summary of discussion:

- Are the weeds tested for contaminants?
- How do the trucks leaving the salt plant impact the vegetation?
- Who does the maintenance? **David Crichton** said the transportation department is responsible for maintaining the site and ensuring the integrity of the soil. This involves making sure nobody digs up the soil or makes contact with the soil. A contractor monitors the sites twice yearly.
- **David Crichton** said Site B has lead and heavy metal contamination. Actions taken to address the contamination include capping the area, using plastic liners where trees are plants, excavation of some contaminated soil, sodding, and ongoing maintenance.
- **David Crichton** said there is no significant difference between the treatment of Sites A and B. There are more hydrocarbons on Site B.
- GECSMRC members and staff discussed development plans for Site A.

Action Item: **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** will look into the status of the Leslie St re-development plans and determine the location of the planned TRCA office.

- GECSMRC members asked about the status of signage on the contamination. One member said the City is not proceeding quickly enough on this. **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** said she will ask **Holly Penfound** about signage.

Action Item: Get a list of parameters tested at the monitoring wells, as well as the frequency of testing.

Action Item: Determine the amount of testing and hydro-seeding on Site A.

Action Item: Determine the depth of soil cover and contamination.

Action Item: Determine whether contaminants have migrated through the soil to the groundwater level.

2.0 Review July 20, 2004 Meeting #2 Minutes

There were no comments on the minutes.

3.0 Review Action Items

The following Action Items from the July 20 meeting were reported as complete:

- **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** to send out SSRA Guidelines.
 - Sent on August 8, 2004.
- Staff to locate information on groundwater movement.
 - See SSRA Executive Summary, Page 1, paragraph 2.
- Staff to provide maps and briefing notes.
 - See May 14 2002 SSRA Report, Executive Summary and the section entitled “Drawings”. Drawings 1 and 2 are of particular relevance).
- **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** to distribute original Terms of Reference.
 - **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** noted minor revisions to the Terms of Reference. For example, the membership application was removed, and the East End Community Health Centre will not be participating.
- **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** to request report on observational monitoring from Rob Orpin’s staff.
 - **Larry Pelechaty** distributed Soil Cover Integrity Inspection Form at the September 2, 2004 meeting.

The following Action Items from the July 20 meeting are outstanding:

- **John Minor** to look into monitoring schedule.
- **John Minor** to obtain information on “as built” design (i.e. the post-construction report).
- **John Minor** to provide the new MOE Contaminated Soil Guidelines.

Discussion of the Soil Cover Integrity Inspection Form

Larry Pelechaty explained the Soil Cover Integrity Inspection Form and made some comments about the May 14, 2003 and August 17, 2004 inspections.

- *May 14, 2003 Report:* **Larry Pelechaty** said a neighboring fitness facility removed one tree because it interfered with their signage. Some skateboarders were seen using the first tier of the former ramp. City staff removed some dead trees. Toronto Hydro left some tire marks on the site but they repaired it after finishing their work. Otherwise, there was no traffic on the site.
- *August 17, 2004 Report:* The City only does litter pick-up on Site A. The site is left in its natural state because geese nest there in the spring.

The following is a summary of the committee's discussion:

- Committee members discussed how to make the inspection form more descriptive. While staff keeps journal notes on the inspection, the form does not have a notes section or diagrams. The form should include a diagram of the geotextile membrane from the Figures section of the SSRA document. The inspection form should specifically indicate where disturbances have occurred. The form should note when the disturbance occurred, when the disturbance was noted and how long the disturbance was present. **Larry Pelechaty** said some disturbances (particularly those that occur during the winter under snow cover) are not noted immediately. **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** said staff should note the condition of the soil during their inspections two times per year.
- **Larry Pelechaty** said monitoring staff do not look at the completed Soil Cover Integrity Inspection Forms. Contractors can reference these forms.
- **Ellie Perkins** lead measurements were too high to turn Sites A and B into a park after the removal of the Gardiner. Instead, park-like elements like bike trails, flower beds, and sidewalks were built. The GECSMRC's role is to ensure that the contaminated soil is not dug up, putting lead back in the air. To do this, the GECSMRC must determine how much clean topsoil there is and where this topsoil is. This information can only be obtained from the people doing the ongoing landscaping or maintenance. **Larry Pelechaty** said he can ask the landscapers how much soil they put into the site.
- A member said staff should be briefed on the history of this project, because they do not seem to have this information.
- **Gurpal Basra** said any disturbance beyond one foot in depth should be addressed immediately. The fill material is 30 cm deep and is covered with 50 cm of topsoil. This information is in the SSRA Executive Summary. A member said **Gurpal Basra**'s comments assume no upward migration of the contaminants. **Gurpal Basra** said the committee should recommend monitoring if this is a concern. **Larry Pelechaty** said disturbances deeper than one foot are rare. Equipment is required to make disturbances of that depth.
- **David Crichton** said the SSRA document provides maps of only some of the areas where a geotextile membrane should be. Some areas have no membrane and are only covered by topsoil and fill. Members asked whether they should be concerned about contamination only in areas where there is a geotextile membrane. **David Crichton** said the geotextile membrane is in place to protect trees' roots. Contamination may be present in areas where there is no geotextile membrane.

Action Item: **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** to revise the Soil Cover Integrity Inspection Form. The form should (1) query whether a disturbance is greater than one foot deep, (2) include a notes section, and (3) provide a diagram of the geotextile membrane where staff can note disturbances (Figure 2, and a cross-section diagram, from the Figures section of the SSRA document). The map or diagram will cover the region between Coxwell and Don Roadway and specifically identify Site A and B.

Discussion of Signage

- Members discussed signage for Site A and B. A member said the signage should tell the story behind the sites. People should be informed about the history of the project and the soil and air problems. **Paul Young** offered to provide the GECSMRC with a report containing recommendations on air issues. **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** said the signage could contain links to the website.

Action Item: **Holly Penfound** to proceed on the signage issue, in consultation with **David Crichton**.

4.0 Terms of Reference

- A member said that the meeting timeline of 2-5 years was never agreed upon (p.5, section 5(b)). If the timeline is set by a Council directive, the GECSMRC can request an extension. If not, the Terms of Reference can state that the GECSMRC will meet at its discretion.

Action Item: **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** to determine whether the original Council directive establishing the GECSMRC included a timeline.

- A member said Section 6 should include Jack Layton. Another member asked whether provincial or federal representatives should be invited to attend meetings. **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** said she copied Jack Layton on the Terms of Reference.

Action Item: **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** to inform federal and provincial representatives (i.e. Jack Layton and Marilyn Shirley) that the GECSMRC is meeting, and invite them to attend the meetings or receive minutes of the meetings.

- A member asked whether the meetings are open to the public.

Action Item: **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** to check the Council Directive to determine whether the meetings are open to observers and whether GECSMRC membership is capped.

- A member said the Terms of Reference should refer specifically to soil monitoring and vegetative uptake. A member said soil monitoring and vegetative uptake should be requested in addition to the Terms of Reference. A new agenda item was added to the meeting to discuss this issue.

Action Item: **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** to revise the Terms of Reference. She will remove any references to the GECSMRC as a sub-committee of the South Riverdale Environmental Liaison Committee (e.g. second line under the title). She will add “i.e. soil monitoring and vegetative uptake” to the line “other as agreed upon by the City” under Section 3.1.

5.0 Newsletter or Flyer Information for the Public

- This discussion was deferred to the next meeting. A member said the signage, newsletter and public meeting should be seen as a package with the same key message. The GECSMRC, and not the City, will determine what will be communicated. **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** said **Steven Vetore** from Transportation Services could provide input after the committee develops some initial ideas.

6.0 Public Meetings – Dates and Agenda

This discussion was deferred to the next meeting.

7.0 Soil Monitoring Request

- **Holly Penfound** said soil monitoring and vegetative uptake testing should be done in addition to the water monitoring. A member said MOE used to do this testing but their current testing schedule is unknown. He suggested that testing be done when roots start to move into the contamination zone. Members said there should be a baseline for any testing. A member said the baseline would be the condition of the soil (e.g. the fill and the topsoil) that went into Sites A and B.
- **David Crichton** said the request for testing should go to Environmental Services, not Technical Services. Technical Services does not do ongoing monitoring. Environmental Services probably does not have funds for this testing.

Action Item: **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** will draft a letter to **John Minor** requesting soil testing and phytotoxicology. The letter will ask **John Minor** to inform the GECSMRC if he knows of any other sources of funding for the testing.

SSS

- **David Crichton** said it is logical to assume that the soil is alright if the groundwater is alright.
- **Holly Penfound** recommended deferring the decision on how to proceed. If the GECSMRC hears that funding for testing is unavailable and/or testing will not be done, it may choose to pursue a political route. The GECSMRC should get clarification on who should be doing this monitoring and should address its request for monitoring to Technical Services.
- A member noted that recontamination is always possible. The GECSMRC must ask whether the membrane is keeping the contaminant out, and whether there is any recontamination that could harm the sites' users. These questions can only be answered by testing the surface and the leaves.
- Members noted that there are some plants that can indicate contamination (e.g. the presence of lead).

Action Item: GECSMRC members to read Section 4.2 on p42 of the SSRA document for the next meeting.

8.0 Next Meeting and Agenda Items

The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for October 6 at 3:30 pm. at the Queen Street Health Centre. Alternatively, the meeting can be held on October 5 at 6:00 p.m.

The meeting ended at 6:40 p.m.