IMPROVED LAKEFILL QUALITY CONTROL PROGRAM

MONTHLY REPORT

AUGUST 1991

Contents

I Introduction.....Page 1

II Fill Received Statistics.....Page 1

III Rejected Material.....Page 1-2

IV Chemical Test Audit Results.....Page 2-3

V Site by Site Breakdown of Fill Volumes.....Page 4

VI Appendix A - Lakefill Location Soil Acceptability Checklists

VII Appendix B - Violation Reports

To : Canadian Environmental Law Association
517 College St.
Suite 401
Toronto, Ontario
Attention, Sarah Miller

I Introduction

The following report contains the fill received statistics for all lakefill sites in the month of August, 1991.

II Fill Received Statistics

Table 1. Destination Area Breakdown for August, 1991.

	Volume (m^3)		
	Open Water	Protected	Confined
Large Projects	5,100	0	1,590
Small Projects	0	0	4,420

Table 2. Fill Volume Totals for August, 1991.

	Volume(m^3)	% of Total
Large Projects	6,690	60.3
Small Projects	4,420	39.7
Total	11,110	100

III Rejected Material

A. Material rejected at the application stage by chemical analysis results contained in a detailed environmental report.

- EV02212 - 1535 Kingston Rd.(ambulance station) - 3,250 m3 rejected by chemical analysis results representing 100% of the total excavation volume. The MTRCA subsequently informed the MOE that fill from this site was being deposited in a residential area in Scarborough which was potentially in disagreement with the recommendations of

the consultants original soils report. The MOE was to investigate.

B. Material rejected after visual inspection of excavation sites. These projects were all rejected in their entirety.

- EV02185 - 1503-1515 Sandbeach Rd. - 190 m3 rejected, because of it's location in an industrial area, representing 100% of the total excavation volume.
- EV02195 - Evans Ave. - 190m3 rejected, because of it's location in an industrial area, representing 100% of the total excavation volume.
- EV02225 - 22 Canmotor Ave. - 100m3 rejected, because of its location in an industrial area, representing 100% of the total excavation volume.

C. Truck loads, submitting a bill of lading, which were rejected by visual inspection at a lakefill site .

- No truck loads were rejected in this manner in August, 1991.

IV Chemical Testing Audit Results

Table 3. Summary of Test Results Obtained as part of the I.L.Q.C.P. Internal Auditing Program in August, 1991.

Type of Sample	# of Results Received	# Failing Open Water Guidelines	# Failing Restricted Guidelines
Taken from trucks originating from "small projects"	3	1	1
Taken from trucks originating from "large projects"	9	5	2

OWG= Ontario Ministry of the Environment "Open Water Disposal Guideline"
RLUG= Ontario Ministry of the Environment "Restricted Land Use Guideline"

Results Discussion

One "small site" audit sample was found to exceed the RLUG which is the ultimate criteria for disposal of small site soils in "confined" lakefill locations;

1. Project number EV02116(373 Parkview Ave.) showed an exceedance of the RLUG for oil and grease. 373 Parkview is in a well established residential area and hence this result was not expected. This project was rejected immediately upon receipt of this result.

Of the five audit samples from "large sites" failing the OWG, only three were obtained from trucks presenting "open water" bills of lading. These three audited projects will be discussed separately. The other two samples exhibited audit results which concurred with the original environmental report.

1. Project number EV01998(19 Greenbelt Dr.) exhibited an exceedance of both the OWG and the RLUG for mercury. Since 11 samples had been previously tested and no exceedances for mercury found, no action was taken.

2. Project number EV01953(various streets, service trench) exhibited oil and grease concentrations above the OWG. None of the 15 samples in the original environmental report showed any oil and grease exceedances however two of five audit samples taken to date have exceeded the OWG for oil and grease. The MTRCA and the soils consultant agreed that the oil and grease concentrations were likely as a result of asphalt mixed in with the soils since the excavation is a low depth trench along various city streets.

3. Project number EV01851(lane east of Greenwood Dr.) exhibited a marginal exceedance of the RLUG for oil and grease. Given that the truck was presenting a confined bill of lading and that the exeedance was marginal, no action was taken.

V Fill Volumes Received by Site

Table 4. Site by Site Breakdown of Fill Volumes Received in August 1991.

Site	Volume (cubic metres)		
	Open Water	Protected	Confined
Leslie St	3,850	0	0
Sam Smith	530	0	2,990
Guildwood	720	0	3,020
Totals	5,100	0	6,010

VII Appendix A

Lakefill Location Soil Acceptability Checklists

Note: No reports issued in August 1991.

VIII Appendix B

Violation Reports

Note : No violation reports were issued in August 1991.