The Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority

IMPROVED LAKEFILL QUALITY CONTROL PROGRAM

MONTHLY REPORT

August 1992

CONTENTS

I	Introduction.....	Page 1
II	Fill Received Statistics.....	Page 1
III	Rejected Material.....	Page 2
IV	Chemical Test Audit Results.....	Page 2
V	Appendix A - Lakefill Location Soil Acceptability Checklists	
VI	Appendix B - Violation Reports	

I Introduction

The following report contains the fill received statistics for all lakefill sites in the month of August 1992.

II Fill Received Statistics

Table 1. Destination Area Breakdown for August 1992.

	Volume (m^3)		
	Open Water	Protected	Confined
Large Projects	9,010	0	0
Small Projects	0	0	0
Total	9,010	0	0

Table 2. Fill Volume Totals for August 1992.

	Volume (m^3)	% of Total
Large Projects	9,010	100
Small Projects	0	0
Total	9,010	100

Table 3. Site by Site Breakdown of Fill Volumes Received in August 1992.

	Volume (cubic metres)		
Site	Open Water	Protected	Confined
Leslie St.	9,010	0	0
Totals	9,010	0	0

III Rejected Material

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

- EV02507 - Lanes, first east of Main St. from second lane north of Danforth to 140 metres north - municipal re-paving project - 250 cu. m rejected representing 37% of the total excavation volume.
- EV02503 - Lanes, east of Major St. and north of College St. - municipal re-pavement project - 300 cu. m rejected representing 44% of the total excavation volume.
- EV02518 - 31 Glen Watford Dr. - community centre - 10,000 cu. m rejected representing 67% of the total excavation volume.
- EV02519 - 73 Corley Avenue - 1,000 cu. m rejected representing 33% of the total excavation volume.

B. Material rejected after visual inspection of excavation sites.

(These projects were all rejected in their entirety.)

- No projects were rejected in this manner in August 1992.

IV Chemical Testing Audit Results

Table 4. Summary of test results obtained as part of the ILQCP internal auditing program in August 1992.

Sample Taken From	#of Results Received	#Failing OWG	#Failing RLUG
Small Site trucks	0	-	-
Large Site trucks	8	0	0

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

Results Discussion :

As shown on Table 4, 8 soil samples were obtained from trucks entering lakefill sites for the purpose of auditing the effectiveness of the ILQCP. The 8 soil samples were obtained from four different large projects. No exceedances of the OWG's were observed.

V Appendix A

Lakefill Location Soil Acceptability Checklists

Note : no reports were issued in August 1992.

VI Appendix B

Violation Reports

Note : no reports were issued in August 1992.

The Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority

IMPROVED LAKEFILL QUALITY CONTROL PROGRAM

MONTHLY REPORT

JULY 1992

CONTENTS

I	Introduction.....	Page 1
II	Fill Received Statistics.....	Page 1
III	Rejected Material.....	Page 2
IV	Chemical Test Audit Results.....	Page 2-3
V	Appendix A - Lakefill Location Soil Acceptability Checklists	
VI	Appendix B - Violation Reports	

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR ILOCP MONTHLY REPORTS

1. City of Toronto
   Environmental Protection Office
   6th Floor, East Tower
   City Hall
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: Marie Muir

2. The Toronto Harbour Commissioners
   60 Villiers St.
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: A. (Sandy) Wallace

3. The Ontario Ministry of the Environment
   7 Overlea Blvd.
   East York, Ontario

   Contact: Bob Shaw

4. Waterfront Trust
   207 Queens Quay West
   P.O. BOX 4111, Station A
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: Ms. Hollingsworth

5. Canadian Environmental Law Association
   517 College St.
   Suite 401
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: Sarah Miller

I Introduction

The following report contains the fill received statistics for all lakefill sites in the month of July 1992.

II Fill Received Statistics

Table 1. Destination Area Breakdown for July 1992.

	Volume (m^3)		
	Open Water	Protected	Confined
Large Projects	1,900	0	0
Small Projects	0	0	20
Total	1,900	0	20

Table 2. Fill Volume Totals for July 1992.

	Volume (m^3)	% of Total
Large Projects	1,900	99
Small Projects	20	1
Total	1.920	100

Table 3. Site by Site Breakdown of Fill Volumes Received in July 1992.

	Volume (cubic metres)		
Site	Open Water	Protected	Confined
Leslie St.	1,900	0	0
Sam Smith	0	0	20
Totals	1,900	0	20

III Rejected Material

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

- EV02508 - Lanes north of Dupont and east of Franklin- 50 cu. m rejected representing 31% of the total excavation volume. This is a municipal paving project.
- EV02505 - Lane, first north of Carlton St.running east from Ontario St. - 20 cu. m rejected representing 4% of the total excavation volume. This is a municipal laneway paving project.
- EV02448 - Lanes bounding Spadina , Relmar and Lonsdale Rds - 140 cu. m rejected because of audit results representing 48% of the total excavation volume.

B. Material rejected after visual inspection of excavation sites.

(These projects were all rejected in their entirety.)

- No projects were rejected in this manner in July 1992.

IV Chemical Testing Audit Results

Table 4. Summary of test results obtained as part of the ILQCP internal auditing program in July 1992.

Sample Taken From	#of Results Received	#Failing OWG	#Failing RLUG
Small Site trucks	0	0	0
Large Site trucks	11	4	0

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

Results Discussion :

A total of 11 samples were taken from 9 different Large Site excavations in the month of July 1992. Of the 11 samples, four were judged to fail the open water guidelines against the expectations of the bill of lading which was submitted for those loads.

One of the failing samples was obtained from a City of Toronto watermain excavation on Geary Avenue (project number EV02446). This sample exhibited a marginal exceedance of the Open Water Guideline for lead. The original

environmental report for this project gave results for six soil tests, none of which exhibited an exceedance for lead. This was judged to be an isolated case and no action was taken.

Another sample failing the OWG in July 1992 was taken from a project at the Yonge / Bloor subway station (project number EV02437). This sample showed a slightly elevated oil and grease result which was due to the presence of asphalt in the soil. A visual examination of the sample before it was sent to the laboratory revealed asphalt pieces mixed in with the soil.

The final two samples which were judged to have failed the OWG's were taken from trucks hauling material from a City of Toronto lane way pavement project near Spadina Avenue (project number EV02448). Both samples exhibited minor exceedances of the OWG for lead and one sample showed a minor exceedance for PCB's. Due to the fact that two of four total samples obtained from this project failed the OWG, this project was rejected from lakefilling.

V Appendix A

Lakefill Location Soil Acceptability Checklists

Note : no reports were issued in July 1992.

VI Appendix B

Violation Reports

Note : no reports were issued in July 1992.

The Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority

IMPROVED LAKEFILL QUALITY CONTROL PROGRAM

MONTHLY REPORT

JUNE 1992

CONTENTS

I	Introduction.....	Page 1
II	Fill Received Statistics.....	Page 1
III	Rejected Material.....	Page 2
IV	Chemical Test Audit Results.....	Page 2
V	Appendix A - Lakefill Location Soil Acceptability Checklists	
VI	Appendix B - Violation Reports	

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR ILOCP MONTHLY REPORTS

1. City of Toronto
   Environmental Protection Office
   6th Floor, East Tower
   City Hall
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: Marie Muir

2. The Toronto Harbour Commissioners
   60 Villiers St.
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: A. (Sandy) Wallace

3. The Ontario Ministry of the Environment
   7 Overlea Blvd.
   East York, Ontario

   Contact: Bob Shaw

4. The Royal Commission on the Future of the Toronto Waterfront
   207 Queens Quay West
   P.O. BOX 4111, Station A
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: Ms. Hollingsworth

5. Canadian Environmental Law Association
   517 College St.
   Suite 401
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: Sarah Miller

I Introduction

The following report contains the fill received statistics for all lakefill sites in the month of June 1992.

II Fill Received Statistics

Table 1. Destination Area Breakdown for June 1992.

	Volume (m^3)		
	Open Water	Protected	Confined
Large Projects	3,330	0	230
Small Projects	0	0	0
Total	3,330	0	230

Table 2. Fill Volume Totals for June 1992.

	Volume (m^3)	% of Total
Large Projects	3,560	100
Small Projects	0	0
Total	3,560	100

Table 3. Site by Site Breakdown of Fill Volumes Received in June 1992.

	Volume (cubic metres)		
Site	Open Water	Protected	Confined
Leslie St.	3,330	0	0
Sam Smith	0	0	230
Totals	3,330	0	230

III Rejected Material

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

- EV02484 - The Belt Line (Forest Hill) - utility excavation - 1,000 cu. m rejected representing 100% of the total excavation volume.
- EV02493 - Lanes - West of Ossington Ave. and South of Baden St.- pavement reconstruction - 40 cu. m rejected representing 44% of the total excavation volume.
- EV02495 - Sammon Ave.- sewer construction - 1000 cu. m rejected representing 9% of the total excavation volume.
- EV02496 - Bernice Cres.- utility excavation - 1,00 cu. m rejected representing 12.5% of the total excavation volume.
- EV02497 - Vimy Ave.- utility excavation - 200 cu. m rejected representing 28.5% of the total excavation volume.

B. Material rejected after visual inspection of excavation sites.

(These projects were all rejected in their entirety.)

- EV02479 - Elder Ave., from 32nd St. to 27th St. - pavement reconstruction - 190 cu. m rejected representing 100% of the total excavation volume. This project was rejected by visual inspection as well as through the use of the volatile organic detector.

IV Chemical Testing Audit Results

Table 4. Summary of test results obtained as part of the ILOCP internal auditing program in June 1992.

Sample Taken From	#of Results Received	#Failing OWG	#Failing RLUG
Small Site trucks	0	0	0
Large Site trucks	7	0	0

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

Results Discussion:

The seven soil samples obtained in June were taken from trucks originating from 4 different Large Sites. As indicated on the table, there were no exceedances.

V Appendix A

Lakefill Location Soil Acceptability Checklists

Note : no reports were issued in June 1992.

VI Appendix B

Violation Reports

Note : no reports were issued in June 1992.

The Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority

IMPROVED LAKEFILL QUALITY CONTROL PROGRAM

MONTHLY REPORT

May 1992

CONTENTS

I	Introduction.....	Page 1
II	Fill Received Statistics.....	Page 1
III	Rejected Material.....	Page 2
IV	Chemical Test Audit Results.....	Page 2
V	Appendix A - Lakefill Location Soil Acceptability Checklists	
VI	Appendix B - Violation Reports	

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR ILOCP MONTHLY REPORTS

1. City of Toronto
   Environmental Protection Office
   6th Floor, East Tower
   City Hall
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: Marie Muir

2. The Toronto Harbour Commissioners
   60 Villiers St.
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: A. (Sandy) Wallace

3. The Ontario Ministry of the Environment
   7 Overlea Blvd.
   East York, Ontario

   Contact: Bob Shaw

4. The Royal Commission on the Future of the Toronto Waterfront
   207 Queens Quay West
   P.O. BOX 4111, Station A
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: Ms. Hollingsworth

5. Canadian Environmental Law Association
   517 College St.
   Suite 401
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: Sarah Miller

I Introduction

The following report contains the fill received statistics for all lakefill sites in the month of May 1992.

II Fill Received Statistics

Table 1. Destination Area Breakdown for May 1992.

	Volume (m^3)		
	Open Water	Protected	Confined
Large Projects	10,310	0	0
Small Projects	0	0	0
Total	10,310	0	0

Table 2. Fill Volume Totals for May 1992.

	Volume (m^3)	% of Total
Large Projects	10,310	100
Small Projects	0	0
Total	10,310	100

Table 3. Site by Site Breakdown of Fill Volumes Received in May 1992.

	Volume (cubic metres)		
Site	Open Water	Protected	Confined
Leslie St.	10,310	0	0
Totals	10,310	0	0

III Rejected Material

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

- EV02464 - 10 Tracy St. - Non-profit Housing - 800 cu. m rejected representing 40% of the total excavation volume.
- EV02476 - Villiers St. - Cherry to the Don Roadway - sewer project - 150 cu. m rejected representing 88% of the total excavation volume.

B. Material rejected after visual inspection of excavation sites.

(These projects were all rejected in their entirety.)

- No projects were rejected in this manner in May 1992.

IV Chemical Testing Audit Results

Table 4. Summary of test results obtained as part of the ILQCP internal auditing program in May 1992.

Sample Taken From	#of Results Received	#Failing OWG	#Failing RLUG
Small Site trucks	0	-	-
Large Site trucks	18	1	1

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

Results Discussion :

As shown on Table 4, 18 soil samples were obtained from trucks entering lakefill sites for the purpose of auditing the effectiveness of the ILQCP. The 18 soil samples were obtained from ten different large projects.

As noted on the above chart, one sample obtained failed both the Open Water Guidelines and the Restricted Land Use Guideline. The sample was obtained from a large excavation at 1070 Queen St. in Toronto. This project had been audited 10 times previous to this sample and had shown no exceedances of the OWG. Despite this, the failure of this sample to satisfy the RLUG (Mercury = 1.35) was serious enough to warrant suspension of lakefilling privileges.

V Appendix A

Lakefill Location Soil Acceptability Checklists

Note : no reports were issued in May 1992.

VI Appendix B

Violation Reports

Note : no reports were issued in May 1992.

The Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority

IMPROVED LAKEFILL QUALITY CONTROL PROGRAM

MONTHLY REPORT

APRIL 1992

CONTENTS

I	Introduction.....	Page 1
II	Fill Received Statistics.....	Page 1
III	Rejected Material.....	Page 2
IV	Chemical Test Audit Results.....	Page 2-3
V	Appendix A - Lakefill Location Soil Acceptability Checklists	
VI	Appendix B - Violation Reports	

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR ILOCP MONTHLY REPORTS

1. City of Toronto
   Environmental Protection Office
   6th Floor, East Tower
   City Hall
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: Marie Muir

2. The Toronto Harbour Commissioners
   60 Villiers St.
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: A. (Sandy) Wallace

3. The Ontario Ministry of the Environment
   7 Overlea Blvd.
   East York, Ontario

   Contact: Bob Shaw

4. The Royal Commission on the Future of the Toronto Waterfront
   207 Queens Quay West
   P.O. BOX 4111, Station A
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: Ms. Hollingsworth

5. Canadian Environmental Law Association
   517 College St.
   Suite 401
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: Sarah Miller

I Introduction

The following report contains the fill received statistics for all lakefill sites in the month of April 1992.

II Fill Received Statistics

Table 1. Destination Area Breakdown for April 1992.

	Volume (m^3)		
	Open Water	Protected	Confined
Large Projects	9,010	0	0
Small Projects	0	0	0
Total	9,010	0	0

Table 2. Fill Volume Totals for April 1992.

	Volume (m^3)	% of Total
Large Projects	9,010	100
Small Projects	0	0
Total	9,010	100

Table 3. Site by Site Breakdown of Fill Volumes Received in April 1992.

	Volume (cubic metres)		
Site	Open Water	Protected	Confined
Leslie St.	9,010	0	0
Totals	9,010	0	0

III Rejected Material

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

- EV02442 - R17-25 Curzon St. - 50 cu. m rejected representing 25% of the total excavation volume.
- EV02449 - Lane, first north of Price from 30 m east of Yonge St. to 160 m east of Yonge St. - 20 cu. m rejected representing 4% of the total excavation volume. This is a municipal laneway paving project.
- EV02453 - Commercial Rd. - 100 cu. m rejected representing 26% of the total excavation volume. This is a municipal sidewalk installation.
- EV02454 - Allen Rd. Diversion - 1,000 cu. m rejected representing 17% of the total excavation volume. This project involves an isolated relocation of Allen Rd. for construction access purposes.

B. Material rejected after visual inspection of excavation sites.

(These projects were all rejected in their entirety.)

- No projects were rejected in this manner in April 1992.

IV Chemical Testing Audit Results

Table 4. Summary of test results obtained as part of the ILQCP internal auditing program in April 1992.

Sample Taken From	#of Results Received	#Failing OWG	#Failing RLUG
Small Site trucks	0	0	0
Large Site trucks	12	1	1

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

Results Discussion :

As indicated on Table 4., the April chemical testing audit uncovered one exceedance of the Open Water Disposal Guidelines. In fact, the sample in question also exceeded the Restricted Land Use Guideline. This sample was obtained from a large utility excavation underway in the Rosedale area of Toronto (job # EV01953). Including this sample, project EV01953 has now been chemically audited 12 times by the ILQCP.

Three of the twelve audit samples have exceeded the OWG for oil and grease and a fourth, the sample in question, exceeded the OWG and the RLUG for mercury. In previous monthly reports we have indicated that the oil and grease exceedances were likely due to asphalt contamination of soil samples. The high mercury levels indicated in this most recent sample, however, cannot be explained. In 15 sample results from the original environmental report and in 11 of our audit results, mercury levels have been consistently very low, often at or near the laboratory detection limits. Despite the apparent isolated nature of this mercury contamination, project EV01953 has been rejected from lakefilling pending further investigation by the environmental consultant.

V Appendix A

Lakefill Location Soil Acceptability Checklists

Note : no reports were issued in April 1992.

VI Appendix B

Violation Reports

Note : no reports were issued in April 1992.

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR ILOCP MONTHLY REPORTS

1. City of Toronto
   Environmental Protection Office
   6th Floor, East Tower
   City Hall
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: Marie Muir

2. The Toronto Harbour Commissioners
   60 Villiers St.
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: A. (Sandy) Wallace

3. The Ontario Ministry of the Environment
   7 Overlea Blvd.
   East York, Ontario

   Contact: Bob Shaw

4. The Royal Commission on the Future of the Toronto Waterfront
   207 Queens Quay West
   P.O. BOX 4111, Station A
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: Ms. Hollingsworth

5. Canadian Environmental Law Association
   517 College St.
   Suite 401
   Toronto, Ontario

   Contact: Sarah Miller

The Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority

IMPROVED LAKEFILL QUALITY CONTROL PROGRAM

MONTHLY REPORT

March 1992

CONTENTS

I	Introduction.....	Page 1
II	Fill Received Statistics.....	Page 1
III	Rejected Material.....	Page 2
IV	Chemical Test Audit Results.....	Page 2
V	Appendix A - Lakefill Location Soil Acceptability Checklists	
VI	Appendix B - Violation Reports	

III Rejected Material

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

- EV02433 - 43-53 Goldwin Ave. - 10,000 m3 rejected representing 50% of the total excavation volume. The project involves an excavation for a residential basement. 20000 m3 ?
- EV02430 - Lanes west of Lawlor Ave., south of Swanwick Ave - 10 m3 rejected representing 2% of the total excavation volume. This project is a utility excavation.
- EV02431 - Ossington Ave. from Dundas St. to College St. - 30 m3 rejected representing 2% of the total excavation volume. This project is a utility excavation.

B. Material rejected after visual inspection of excavation sites.

(These projects were all rejected in their entirety.)

- No projects were rejected in this manner in March 1992.

IV Chemical Testing Audit Results

Table 4. Summary of test results obtained as part of the ILQCP internal auditing program in March 1992.

Sample Taken From	#of Results Received	#Failing OWG	#Failing RLUG
Small Site trucks	0	-	-
Large Site trucks	6	0	0

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

Results Discussion :

As shown on Table 4, six soil samples were obtained from trucks entering lakefill sites for the purpose of auditing the effectiveness of the ILQCP. The six soil samples were obtained from four different large projects. All six samples satisfied the open water guidelines upon testing.

V Appendix A

Lakefill Location Soil Acceptability Checklists

Note : no reports were issued in March 1992.

VI Appendix B

Violation Reports

Note : no reports were issued in March 1992.

I Introduction

The following report contains the fill received statistics for all lakefill sites in the month of March 1992.

II Fill Received Statistics

Table 1. Destination Area Breakdown for March 1992.

	Volume (m^3)		
	Open Water	Protected	Confined
Large Projects	23,230	0	0
Small Projects	0	0	0
Total	23,230	0	0

Table 2. Fill Volume Totals for March 1992.

	Vol me (m^3)	% of Total
Large Projects	23,230	100
Small Projects	0	0
Total	23,230	100

Table 3. Site by Site Breakdown of Fill Volumes Received in March 1992.

	Volume (cubic metres)		
Site	Open Water	Protected	Confined
Leslie St.	23,230	0	0
Totals	23,230	0	0