



Gardiner East Contaminated Soil Monitoring and Review Committee (GECSMRC) – Meeting #5 Minutes

South Riverdale Community Health Centre, 955 Queen Street East

February 28, 2005, 6:30 - 8:00 – p.m.

Attendance

Paul Young	South Riverdale Health Centre
William Brown	Resident
Ellie Perkins	Resident
Holly Penfound	Councillor Paula Fletcher's Office
Dalton Shipway	Resident
Gurpal Basra	Toronto Public Health
David Crichton	City of Toronto
Christine Iamonaco-Dagg	City of Toronto
Tom Marjanovich	Toronto Public Health
John D. Minor	City of Toronto

New Action Items

1. Staff to find out the budget for signage.
2. **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** to prepare draft wording for the signage based on GECSMRC input and the Council Directive. The draft will be circulated to GECSMRC for feedback and will be reviewed at Meeting #6.
3. Staff will provide the GECSMRC with the name of the MOE contact person.
4. **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** to provide GECSMRC members with copies of the 2004 groundwater report for Sites A and B.
5. Subsequent groundwater reports for Sites A and B should contain a cumulative results table.
6. Staff to find out how long the City will continue groundwater testing on Sites A and B.
7. Staff to find out to whom the GECSMRC should address its recommendation to undertake long-term groundwater testing on Sites A and B.
8. Staff to modify the website to indicate which libraries carry relevant reports.
9. **John Minor** to provide a brief summary on the new greenbelt legislation, as per **Dalton Shipway's** request.
10. The next meeting agenda to include an opportunity to brainstorm or discuss lessons learned from the GECSMRC process.

1.0 Welcome and Introductions

Christine Iamonaco-Dagg opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m. Committee members and City staff introduced themselves.

2.0 Review July 20, 2004 Meeting #4 Minutes

Christine Iamonaco-Dagg reviewed changes to the Meeting #4 draft minutes.

3.0 Discussion of Signage

David Crichton presented proposed text for a sign. **Bill Brown** also presented a proposal based on input from some GECSMRC members. **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** said the GECSMRC must decide on a process for selecting content for the signs and resolving the discrepancy between the two proposals.

The following is a summary of GECSMRC discussion:

- **Ellie Perkins** asked whether any contaminated soil was removed. **David Crichton** said some soil was removed but did not have details on how much soil was removed. Soil removal is not necessarily based on tests. Soil may have been removed in areas of suspected contamination where trees were to be planted.
- **Bill Brown** said facts are important. The sign should refer to the fact that the soil is very contaminated and that a cover has been used that may or may not be effective.
- **Holly Penfound** said the purpose of the signs should determine its content. **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** said City Council's directive should be a reference point when determining the purpose, design, number, and placement of the signage. The directive indicates that the main purpose of signage is to inform the community about the history of the dismantling of the Gardiner, and about the soil contamination and how it was capped.
- **Dalton Shipway** said there is a cover-up culture in North America which condones covering up problem sites. The community contested the value of covering up the contamination. **Paul Young** said public health is the issue, not the proper environmental approach to soil contamination. Cyclists and rollerbladers should be told they face air quality issues when traveling along major roadways. **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** said issues not specifically related to contamination on Sites A and B will not be included on the signage.
- **Paul Young** said the signs should include a cross-sectional image of the sites.
- **John Minor** said the sign can refer to a website. The website can provide additional detail that cannot fit on the sign.
- **Holly Penfound** asked whether City legal staff could look at the proposed signage wording. **John Minor** said legal staff should review all potential signs that deal with environmental contamination issues.
- **Ellie Perkins** requested information about the sign selection and approval processes.

- **Paul Young** said the signage should be movable because of the potential for development in the area. Staff said this increases the risk of vandalism and said developers would likely pay for new signs.
- The signage should be long-lasting. Bronze signs should be considered.

Christine Iamonaco-Dagg said she will work on another draft using GECSMRC input and the Council Directive. Signage discussions should be completed by the next meeting so that signage may be put up by summertime. While the GECSMRC’s approval of signage decisions is important, the City must ultimately approve whatever option is selected.

Action Item #1:

Staff to find out the budget for signage.

Action Item #2:

Christine Iamonaco-Dagg to prepare draft wording for the signage based on GECSMRC input and the Council Directive. The draft will be circulated to GECSMRC for feedback and will be reviewed at Meeting #5.

4.0 Review Action Items from Meeting #4

Staff provided a report on Action Items from the Meeting #4:

Meeting #4 Action Item #1: The GECSMRC should appoint one of its members to review city contracting activities related to site inspection and monitoring.

Meeting #4 Action Item #3: Christine Iamonaco-Dagg to add questions about vegetative cover to the Soil Cover Integrity Inspection Form. Questions on the form should be more specific, in order to elicit better feedback. The top of the form should have a sentence explaining the purpose of the inspections (e.g. “Areas on map have contaminated soil that must be monitored on an ongoing basis for health reasons.”)

Meeting #4 Action Item #4: Christine Iamonaco-Dagg to seek staff input on the Soil Cover Integrity Inspection Form and attach a testing schedule to the form.

- **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** will speak to Rob Orpin about Meeting #4 Action Items #1, 3, and 4.

Action Item #2: An area representative from the MOE should be invited to attend GECSMRC meetings on a regular basis (as per Dalton Shipway’s request).

- **Christine Iamonaco-Dagg** reported that the MOE is on the GECSMRC mailing list. Staff will provide the GECSMRC with the name of the contact person.

Meeting #4 Action Item #5: Staff will clarify the differences between the conditions and treatment of Sites A and B.

Meeting #4 Action Item #7: John Minor will follow up with forestry staff at the City of Toronto to develop a rough outline of procedural mechanisms for a minimum two-year period.

- **John Minor** said he obtained as-built drawings from **David Crichton**. He will provide forestry staff with the drawings because forestry staff would like more information before making a commitment. University of Toronto academics wanted to see a cross-section of the site. They seemed interested in a vegetation monitoring initiative. Graduate students may undertake monitoring of the sites as part of their projects.

Meeting #4 Action Item #6: John Minor to access groundwater monitoring data from the Toronto Waterfront Regeneration Trust library.

- **John Minor** asked why groundwater monitoring data was requested. The waterfront revitalization will realign the mouth of the don but not with the intent to fix existing problems. **Dalton Shipway** said the GECSMRC needs information about groundwater movement. **John Minor** said the relevant question for the GECSMRC is whether groundwater contamination levels on Sites A and B meet safety standards set by the SSRA.
- **Holly Penfound** said testing should be separated from GECSMRC monitoring. While it is unclear that the GECSMRC will continue indefinitely, it may be necessary to continue testing indefinitely. What is the City's commitment to long-term testing on the site? **John Minor** said the City's normal procedure is to comply with MOE minimum requirements (i.e. 1-2 years of monitoring). Occasionally, an SSRA will require longer-term testing. Members said 1-2 years of monitoring is unreasonable given the unique nature of Sites A and B.
- **David Crichton** provided the 2004 groundwater report for Sites A and B.
- **Holly Penfound** said the GECSMRC may wish to make a recommendation for long-term testing. The following draft recommendation was suggested: Subject to a change in conditions (e.g. as indicated by vegetation monitoring), ongoing testing and monitoring of groundwater is recommended. The GECSMRC discussed frequency of testing and triggers for increasing or decreasing testing. The GECSMRC did not have enough information to decide on the frequency of testing. A more detailed recommendation will be made at a later date.
- **Paul Young** suggested the groundwater monitoring on Sites A and B can be rolled into the larger project of soil and groundwater monitoring that is part of the ongoing waterfront development.

Action Item #3:

Staff will provide the GECSMRC with the name of the MOE contact person.

Action Item #4:

Christine Iamonaco-Dagg to provide GECSMRC members with copies of the 2004 groundwater report for Sites A and B.

Action Item #5:

Subsequent groundwater reports for Sites A and B should contain a cumulative results table.

Action Item #6:

Staff to find out how long the City will continue groundwater testing on Sites A and B

Action Item #7:

Staff to find out who will receive the GECSMRC's recommendation to undertake long-term groundwater testing on Sites A and B.

5.0 Mini-Update: Reporting to Community

GECSMRC members agreed it is too soon to hold an open house for the public. The signage should be put up soon after the open house.

Christine Iamonaco-Dagg reported that the GECSMRC website was launched today. It contains photos, minutes, and a map. Agendas and additional information including pictures may be posted.

Action Item #8:

Staff to modify the website to indicate which libraries carry relevant reports.

6.0 Other Business and New Business

- **Dalton Shipway** requested an update on the new greenbelt legislation.
- **Paul Young** said the GECSMRC should make a document containing lessons learned from the process, because redevelopment of brownfield sites is happening all over the City.
- **Dalton Shipway** recommended the book "The Great Work" by Thomas Berry.

Action Item #9:

John Minor to provide a brief summary on the new greenbelt legislation, as per Dalton Shipway's request.

Action Item #10:

The next meeting agenda to include an opportunity to brainstorm or discuss lessons learned from the process.

7.0 Next Meeting and Agenda Items

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for May 2, 2005 at 6:30 p.m. at the South Riverdale Community Health Centre.

The meeting ended at 8:30 p.m.