IMPROVED LAKEFILL QUALITY CONTROL PROGRAM

MONTHLY REPORT

JULY 1991

Contents

I Introduction.....Page 1

II Discussion.....Page 1

III Fill Received Statistics.....Page 1

IV Rejected Material.....Page 2

V Chemical Test Audit Results.....Page 3

VI Site by Site Breakdown of Volumes.....Page 4

VII Appendix A - Lakefill Location Soil Acceptability Checklists

VIII 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 July 1991 as well as discussions of fill disposal applications rejected and results of the ILQCP chemical analysis audit.

II Discussion

In July, the ILQCP staff began utilizing a MicroTip photoionization detector which is designed to detect the presence of volatile organics in soils etc. It is the MTRCA's intention that this device be eventually used at the entrance to lakefill sites as an additional screening tool. The device can give accurate readings of total volatile organics within 30 seconds which will allow trucks to be tested with a minimum of disruption to site operations. Staff are currently conducting experiments with the MicroTip in the hopes of arriving at a parts per million reading at which loads of fill will be automatically rejected. The progress of this investigation will be detailed in future reports.

III Fill Received Statistics

Table 1. Destination Area Breakdown for July 1991.

	Volume (m^3)		
	Open Water	Protected	Confined
Large Projects	5,190	0	150
Small Projects	0	0	3,290

Table 2. Fill Volume Totals for July 1991.

	Volume (m^3)	% of Total
Large Projects	5,340	61.9
Small Projects	3,290	38.1
Total	8,630	100.0

IV Rejected Material

A. Material rejected at the application stage by chemical analysis results.

- EV02093 - 233 Broadview Ave.(apartment building addition)- 500 m3 rejected representing 33% of the total excavation volume.
- EV02165 - 320 King St. West (theatre)- 4,000 m3 rejected representing 7% of the total excavation volume.
- EV02216 - Redway Rd.(storm water tank)- 1,500 m3 rejected representing 25% of the total excavation volume.

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

- EV02115 - 232^ Lawrence Ave. E.- 20 m3 rejected, due to questionable site history, representing 100% of the total excavation volume.
- EV02144 -137-139 Wendell- 190 m3 rejected, due to this being an industrial area and the presence of storage tanks, representing 100% of the total excavation volume.

C. Truck loads, presenting Bills of Lading, rejected by visual inspection at a lakefill site.

- No truck loads were rejected in this manner in July 1991.

V Chemical Testing Audit Results

Table 3. Summary of Test Results Obtained as part of the ILQCP internal auditing program in July 1991.

Type of Sample	#of Results Received	# Failing Open Water Guidelines	# Failing Restricted Guidelines
Taken from trucks originating from "small projects"	6	2	0
Taken from trucks originating from "large projects"	5	2	0

Results Discussion

Both of the soil samples from Large Sites which exceeded the OWG in our audit were obtained from excavation sites presenting Open Water bills of lading. These two cases will be discussed separately;

1. Project Number EV00797(Bay Adelaide Centre) showed exceedances of the OWG for lead, PCB and oil and grease. No action was taken in this case because the project had already been suspended by the MTRCA before the arrival of these audit results. The project was suspended after the ILQCP staff learned that the consultant was no longer present on site to distribute the bills of lading and distinguish between lakefill quality soils and soils required to be sent to landfill. This project is suspended pending letters of explanation from the consultant and the applicant.

2. Project Number EV01835(Queen St. East/ Kingswood Rd.) showed a minor exceedance in PCB concentrations. Neither the three samples taken in the original environmental report nor one other audit sample obtained by the MTRCA showed any PCB exceedance. For this reason no action was taken.

VI Fill Volumes Received by Site

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

Site	Volume (cubic metres)		
	Open Water	Protected	Confined
Leslie Street	4,560	0	10
Sam Smith	0	0	450
Guildwood	630	0	2,980
Totals	5,190	0	3,440

VII Appendix A

Lakefill Location Soil Acceptability Checklists

Note: No reports issued in July 1991.

VIII Appendix B

Violation Reports

METROPOLITAN TORONTO AND REGION CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

VIOLATION REPORT

APPLICANT _____ JOB NUMBER _____

INFRACTION NUMBER 037

COMMENTS AT 9:00 am I ~~RECEIVED~~ RECEIVED A CALL FROM BRIAN DUNDAS WHO HAD BEEN INFORMED THAT A MIXED LOAD OF RUBBLE, GARBAGE AND FILL AND BEEN DUMPED AT THE BOTTOM OF GOLDWOOD PKWY. I WAS AT THE TOP SO I QUESTIONED THE DRIVER. HE HAD BILLS OF LADING FOR 4 GOLDCREST OUT BROUGHT THIS LOAD IN AS RUBBLE. HE CLAIMED IT WAS HIS FIRST TIME HERE DIDN'T KNOW THE RULES AND NOT HIS FAULT. DON PARKINSON WENT TO THE PROJECT SITE AND THE EXCAVATOR CLAIMED TO BE INNOCENT OF PUTTING GARBAGE IN THE LOAD. DON THEN WENT TO THE BOTTOM OF GOLDWOOD PKWY. AND SAW THE GARBAGE THAT HAD BEEN DUMPED AND WAS TOLD BY SIM AUSTIN THE FLAG MAN THAT THE TRUCK "NICK KOSTANTINI WHO WAS WORKING FOR M. PROSTOS ENT. WAS INDEED THE GUILTY PARTY.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE Kevin Keith DATE July 16/91

EMPLOYEE NO. 190 TIME 9:30 AM

ACTION TO BE TAKEN ~~Permanent~~ Indefinite rejection of "4 Goldcrest" project.

SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____

TIME _____