"Duncan Smith" <duncan.smith@sym</pre> To: <ohashid@region.halton.on.ca> patico.ca> cc: <jknoll@oakville.ca>, <kfranklin@oakville.ca>, <kflynn@oakville.ca>, 02/06/2003 11:57 <foliver@oakville.ca>, <kbird@oakville.ca>, PM<amulvale@oakville.ca>, <elgar@oakville.ca>, <savoline@region.halton.on.ca>, <jsanderson@oakville.ca>, <rrobinson@oakville.ca>, <lhardacre@oakville.ca>, <jwright@oakville.ca>, <jcaster@oakville.ca>, <tsmith@oakville.ca> Mid- Halton Subject:

Dear Mr. Ohashi,

WWT Plant Expansion

\hat{A} \hat{A}

servicing infrastructure is essential to all communities, however the process of growth first, followed by remedial measures to correct the environmental damage later, have failed. The current version of the Halton

Master Water and Wastewater Plan will in my opinion only lead to further

degradation of our communities and Lake Ontario, if we do not slow down and

alter how we grow.

The reason why we need to alter our thinking arises from what has been called the three P's relating to degradation of the aquatic environment ?

People, Pollution, Phosphorus.

 $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ The following thoughts are offered with those three factors in mind with

emphasis on phosphorus control, since this is a key factor in controlling

the growth of Cladophora and the resulting massive odour problem along our

shoreline in late Summer and Fall.

 $\{ \mbox{My apologies for the typing and rather messy layout since I was forced to$

do a "scissors and paste" job after losing much of the material due to

power outage last night. (saving to file frequently would have been much

a much better option than relying on an UPS back-up system!) \hat{A} Since the

deadline is tomorrow I simply have run out of time to do further editing.}

•

1) Change in Land use in the Region and effect on Phosphorus run-off:

 $\hat{\mathbf{A}} \ \hat{\mathbf{A}} \ \hat{\mathbf{A}} \ \hat{\mathbf{A}}$ The Proposed construction of an expansion to the Mid-Halton plant $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ is

a $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ logical $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ extension of an earlier HUSP study (and its $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ environmental

assessment review at the time) which gave the "green light" for \hat{A} urban

expansion to proceed in the Region and identified preferred water and waste

water strategies.

However, in my opinion \hat{A} there is an urgent need to review the HUSP study

and its conclusions as to sustainability and lack of adverse effects before we proceed with WWT expansion under the Halton Water and Wastewater

Master Plan since we now Â have a potential crisis $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1$

near-shore waters of Lake Ontario.

The Master Plan Speaks to the "assimilative capacity" of Lake Ontario as

a receiving water and I believe this should be reviewed and updated to take cognizance of changing conditions.

 $\hat{\text{A}}~\hat{\text{A}}~\hat{\text{A}}~\hat{\text{A}}~\hat{\text{A}}~\hat{\text{A}}$ The HUSP study is, I understand, currently $\hat{\text{A}}$ being reviewed. At the

Mid -Halton Algae/ Sewage Treatment Plant Public Meeting on January 29

 $2003 \text{ it} \hat{A} \text{ was } \text{mentioned} \hat{A} \text{ that the 5 year revision of HUSP had just started}$

the part of Regional staff.

I do notâ believe the originalâ environmental assessmentâ included a review

of possible elevation of phosphorus (P) losses through changes in land use

resulting from urban expansion and I wonder if the present HUSP review includes such a study. Erosion and sediment control would doubtless have

been studied to include the short-term land impacts of change of land use

which can be seen in $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right$

of a change in land use which are manifested in the average annual runoff

for an area.

 $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ (In the section below on "Non ?Point " sources of $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ - phosphorus (P) and

in the attachment I have presented evidence from other studies of the increase in \hat{A} P transfer which may be expected, in grams per hectare per

year, from land to the aquatic environment when urbanization takes place)

2)ÂÂÂÂÂÂ Thermal Bar:

 $\hat{\mathbf{A}} \ \hat{\mathbf{A}} \ \hat{\mathbf{A}} \ \hat{\mathbf{A}} \ \hat{\mathbf{A}} \ \hat{\mathbf{A}}$ To my knowledge the existence of the thermal bar which $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ traps

nutrients and heat \hat{A} in the near shore waters of Lake Ontario \hat{A} for \hat{A} two or

more months in the Spring of the year was not taken into consideration in

setting P loading limits for Mid-Halton (or indeed for any other WWT plant discharging directly to the Lake to date) in the Ministry of the Environment C of A's for P loadings or concentrations . \hat{A} \hat{A} It appears that

effluent target concentrations and loadings of P have been set by the Province for Lake Ontario WWT plants using criteria developed through IJC

total P loading figures which were designed to keep P levels in the Lake

as a whole at 10 micrograms per liter of P or less \hat{A} -- a concentration

level of $\mbox{\sc P}$ which would not lead to eutrophication . $\mbox{\sc A}$ In other words the

Lake is treated as a vast "sink" A largely unaffected by gradually rising A P loadings.

3)ÂÂÂÂÂÂÂ Zebra Mussels:

 $\hat{\mathbf{A}} \ \hat{\mathbf{A}} \ \hat{\mathbf{A}} \ \hat{\mathbf{A}} \ \hat{\mathbf{A}}$ Certainly few people could have foreseen the effect of the invasion

of zebra $\operatorname{mussels} \hat{\mathbf{A}}$ in enhancing $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ the clarity of the near-shore water thus

allowing Cladophora to grow at greater depths and colonize a much greater

area; or the possibility that the zebra mussels may, through their feeding and excretions, recycle ${\tt P}$ or make ${\tt P}$ more bioavailable. These are

additional factors which need to be taken in to account by setting $\ensuremath{\mathsf{much}}$

lower current levels for ${\bf \hat{A}}$ P concentrations and loadings at our WWT ${\bf \hat{A}}$ plan

4) Habitat

 \hat{A} \hat{A}

to the near-shore waters of the Lake from Burlington to Toronto as much as

possible from all sources arises from the fact that we have rocky shore

bottoms along this stretch of shore which provide ideal habitat for Cladophora to grow.

5) Area of Concern (AOC) ? request for funding and involvement at Federal/Provincial level

 $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ Given the extent of $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ algal growth problems we have had $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ recently when

climatic conditions \hat{A} are favourable such as those in 2001 and the resulting outcry from Lakeshore residents about the huge odour from decaying algae I would have thought that the Town of Oakville and Halton

Region plus other affected municipalities would have been actively lobbying the Federal and Provincial governments to have the area declared

an AOC in order to obtain funding to carry out a redial action plan (RAP)

prior to consideration of any expansion of STP's in the Region

 $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ The amelioration of local eutrophication problems in "areas of concern "

elsewhere in the Province has been addressed through just such P control

and in my opinion the conditions of the nearshore $% \left(1\right) =0$ from Burlington to Toronto warrants similar "AOC" \mathring{A} attention.

 $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ Murray Charleton from Environment Canada at the recent Halton public

forum on January 29thâ â presented figures showingâ P levels in the

nearshore $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +$

where we had severe problems with Cladophora .

 \hat{A} Do we really want to wait until we encounter the same situation as in the 1970's , when \hat{A} remedial action was \hat{A} taken only \hat{A} at a very \hat{A} late stage

 \hat{A} \hat{A}

 \hat{A} \hat{A} \hat{A} \hat{A} \hat{A} \hat{A} \hat{A} \hat{A} \hat{A} sediment loading) \hat{A} the overall \hat{A} PA loadings will undoubtably increase with urbanization unless

 \hat{A} \hat{A}

6) CONTROL of POINT SOURCES

Increasing P loadings from WWT point sources in Halton/ Oakville will result from increasing volumes of waste to be treated from burgeoning populations. We each excrete approx 0.4g of total P per day. Almost all of this P ends up at our WWT plants.

 \hat{A} \hat{A}

readily bioavailable P (70-80% of total P) . Therefore, the first objective in controlling algal growth in the nearshore waters of the lake

should be to reduce P loadings from WWT plant effluent sources as much as possible.

 $\hat{\text{A}}~\hat{\text{$

the \hat{A} Province at \hat{A} levels \hat{A} permitting \hat{A} 1mg/L of P and a loading of 50Kg

P/day for the proposed expanded Mid-Halton plant is unthinkable.

Of course the Region and staff are well aware of this and have been

taking steps \hat{A} \hat{A} to \hat{A} reduce P concentrations and loadings from all our WWT

plants to well below their respective C of AÂ limits.

However, I do not believe either the Region or the Province has perceived

an urgent need \hat{A} to enact really stringent \hat{A} control on \hat{A} P levels at the

present time. My reason for believing this arises from statements made by

staff at the January 29(superscript: th) meeting regarding the expansion

of \hat{A} the Mid-Halton plant. They \hat{A} indicated that total loadings of P to the

Lake \hat{A} would not go \hat{A} up from present levels \hat{A} but would remain about \hat{A} the same

 $\,$ -- at least that was my impression and parallels similar comments received

in earlier conversations with Region staff \hat{A} . Is the \hat{A} Region really satisfied if \hat{A} WWT effluent \hat{A} P loadings only keep \hat{A} up with expansion in \hat{A} population and be content to possibly reduce P levels further only \hat{A} over

the longer term?.

 \hat{A} It \hat{A} should be kept in mind that \hat{A} the theoretical \hat{A} conversion of P to wet

weight of algal biomass $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ should $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ be multiplied by a factor of $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ approx 500

-- i.e. for every Kg of bioavailable soluble P , $500 \, \mathrm{Kg}$ in wet weight of

algal biomassâ could be produced with no other nutrients requiredâ -- the

only \hat{A} other requirements being \hat{A} adequate sunlight and temperature for algal \hat{A} growth to occur.

In other words \hat{A} up to \hat{A} 1 metric ton of algal biomass could be produced for

every 2Kg of soluble P discharged. With current A loadings of around $25 \, \text{Kg/day}$ of mainly soluble P from the Mid-Halton and SW plants alone A there

is considerable potential for massive algal growth to occur locally under

the right climaticA conditions.

If we were to \hat{A} reduce effluent concentrations at the Mid-Halton and SW to

say $0.15\,\mathrm{mg/L}$ total loadings would decrease to about 9 Kg $\,$ /day or about one

third present levels assuming no increase in connected population/sewage

flow. While one cannot say with certainty that this would eliminate or even reduce the algal problem I believe \hat{A} there is a chance that at some

point if the P input is reduced far enough the $\,$ nearshore Lake water P $\,$

concentrations \hat{A} may through dilution reduce to a level of less than 20 to

30 micrograms per liter.

It is generally considered that a body of water will change from oligotrophic conditions to eutrophic (algal producing) conditions at levels above 20 micrograms per liter of available P.

The present level of P in the open $% \left(1\right) =1$ waters of Lake Ontario are approx. 10 $% \left(1\right) =1$ micrograms/liter

Before any WWT $\,$ plant $\,$ expansion $\,$ I would like as a condition for approval to

see Halton and the Province treat Â P loadings from WWT plants discharging to the nearshore waters of the Lake Ontario in the same way $\frac{1}{2}$

as P loadings from \hat{A} the Milton plant, where \hat{A} there is a maximum \hat{A} P loading

limit designed not to cause eutrophication in the receiving water (Sixteen Mile Creek) .i.e. to P levels below that where eutrophic conditions can occur. It is ironic that the Milton WWT plant cannot be expanded because P loadings to the Sixteen Mile Creek would be exceeded

and yet it appears to be perfectly acceptable to export the sewage collected from urban expansion in the Milton area to an expanded Mid-Halton plant for treatment to exacerbate the P loadings and Cladophora problems in the near shore waters of Lake Ontario.

In Europe WWT plants discharging to sensitive inland lakes the effluent

levels have been reduced \hat{A} to levels of 0.05mg/L of P using biological treatment ---so the technology exists.

With a projected increase in $\,$ population in Oakville of nearly 20% by 2008

I think there is an immediate requirement for drastic remedial action to

be taken since we already have an algal problem at existing P levels .

7) NON- POINT SOURCES:

There is always going to be debate over the relative contribution of P from non-point sources as opposed to point sources. In the absence of sufficient local watershed \hat{A} \hat{A} data $I\hat{A}$ extracted the following from a US study

ofâ 928 non-point source watersheds â on theâ transference of P

from $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ terrestrial to aquatic systems. This $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ study and the figure which \mathbf{I}

have $re\text{-copied}\hat{A}$ as an \hat{A} attachment(Omernik, 1977) \hat{A} was designed to show

the phosphorus loss in runoff as a function of land use in the U.S.

This U.S. survey of 928 non-point source watersheds in the U.S. (Omernik,

1977) shows that P export increased as the proportion of land as forest decreased and as agriculture increased \hat{A} . \hat{A} What is interesting is \hat{A} the importance of forest and range land (or a mix of the two) in controlling

P losses in runoff. The increased \hat{A} P losses from conversion to only 40%

urban use is quite evident. \hat{A} It will be noted that \hat{A} the total P losses per

hectare per year \hat{A} from only 40% conversion of land \hat{A} to urban use exceeded

that $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ from either 50% or $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ 90% agricultural use and $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ is almost double that of

the other range and forest mixes shown in the diagram.

In Halton/Oakville for example only 500 hectares out of some 3000 hectares

is being protected in the OPA 198 development (i.e about 80% urbanization

) and some of that land is on the Oakville moraine. In addition the Ontario Realty Corp. proposes to sell off $300\hat{A}$ out of 445 hectares of mainly

forested land owned on the Oakville moraine to developers.

While extrapolations from the figures shown may $\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}$ not be $\hat{\boldsymbol{a}}$ altogether valid it

would look as if conversion to 80% urbanization probably \hat{A} would more than

double the non-point P losses in grams per hectare per year if we assume

previous land use was primarily agricultural $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right$

compared to forest/range land uses.

The potential for such increased P losses through urbanization within

Halton and the adverse affect this would have on the Lake may not have

been considered in the original HUSP study. Storm water run-off and control of sediment to streams and sub-surface watershed effects would

have been considered in the review but I doubt if theâ potential

OntarioA formed part of the study at that time.

There are offsetting factors which should be mentioned which diminish to some extent the potential contribution of PÂ Â from non-point sources to algal growth.

These are:

Phosphorus in runoff and erosion from the landscape occurs as particulate

phosphate (PP) \hat{A} and dissolved phosphate (DP). Generally PP is the major \hat{A} portion (75-90%) of phosphorus transported in runoff and erosion from

land. The PP primarily consists of sediment and organic matter and contains

both organic and inorganic phosphorus but it should be noted that only

about 20 to 40% of sediment inorganic P is potentially bioavailable according to some researchers.

As mentioned previously in the case of WWT effluents, dissolved P is considered the most available form of P for algal growth (strictly speaking the bioavailable soluble reactive P which is the DP and a portion of the PP)

 $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ I submit that more stringent control of P $% \mathbf{A}$ from both point and non-point

sources is now \hat{A} required in Halton Region and that a phased or controlled

urban expansion be \hat{A} \hat{A} based \hat{A} on \hat{A} being able to maintain \hat{A} P levels below the

threshold where nuisance algae occur in the nearshore water of the Lake.

8) MID-HALTON PLANT.

Biosolids management

Apart from the phosphorus control aspects I have concerns with the biosolids handling and disposal should the plant expansion be built. According to the Oakville Beaver (p4 Nov. 22 ,2002) we \hat{A} are running out of

land for landspreading of biosolids due to urbanization. In 1999,

had 2350 acres ($\,$ I believe this should have been \hat{A} hectares)for spreading

compared to 1200 acres (hectares?) in $2001\hat{A}$ and 769 acres (hectares) as of

October 2002 .Since biosolids now contain a higher total P content (

likely to increase with increasing P $\;$ removal from effluents using Fe or

alum precipitation) there will be pressure to find alternatives or increase the P loadings to existing lands which I believe have something

like a five year rotation for landspreading at the present time. If

agricultural portal for disposal of liquid biosolids is going to be curtailed in the Region through loss of agricultural land from increased

urbanization or from competing agricultural requirements I foresee problems occurring.

 $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ At the present time temporary storage of biosolids $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ is carried out $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ at the

Biosolids Management Centre where there are 10 tanks with a capacity of 80,000 cu metres capacity. In 2001 over 98,000 cu metres of supernatant

from the Biosolids Management Centre (BMC) was trucked to designated WWTP

sewer systems for retreatment. I quote from Halton Region --" due to to

the added stresses that biosolids supernatant may cause the \hat{A} WWTPs , the

return of this material to the plants is on an "as necessary "Â basis only".

Now we are going to have to consider expansion of the biosolids program

to consider $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ options such as incineration, pelletization or what Halton

staff considers the preferred option -alkaline stabilization. All of these

will require dewatering, some more than others . What are the $\!\hat{A}\!$ proposed

plans for dealing \hat{A} with the increased volumes of supernatant, centrifugate

or pressate? Will it be sent it back to the WWTPs for re-processing which

already have difficulty handling the present volumes of \hat{A} biosolids supernatant? What adverse effects do retreatment of these liquids have on

WWT operation?

What are the capital costs for these alternatives to biosolids handling \hat{A} which must be now considered as alternatives to landspreading \hat{A} owing \hat{A} to loss of agricultural land for sludge spreading \hat{A} in

the Region. Also the requirement for increased haulage for further treatment and/or disposal elsewhere. Are these capital costs being allocated to the developers ?

Why are we considering approving expansion of the Mid-Halton STP if there

is not a management system in place for the handling of increased biosolids. These biosolids will also contain high total P (increasingly so, if hopefully, we improve P removal from effluents)Â Do we

propose to pelletize and \hat{A} sell the stabilized product as fertilizer as

suggested in the Beaver (with a high P to N ratio) to $\mbox{whom } \hat{A}$? --to be spread where? .

9) GENERAL REMARKS

The following remarks are primarily addressed to our Regional and Municipal councillors in seeking solutions since we need input from a fourth P to help in providing a solution and that is P for Politicians.

 \hat{A} Councillors Allan Edgar and Kevin Flynn are trying valiantly at their own

expense to draw attention to and educate us about the problems arising

from growth in the Town and Region .They need assistance from other Councillors to persuade the Town and the Region that we need to involve

and seek the assistance of Provincial and Federal Politicians No presentation of facts or further scientific studies or "smart growth"

will really matter if there is no political will to even consider, let alone fund, solutions to the environmental problems being created from

 $\label{lem:provincial mandated population} \mbox{ growth in our Region. The Town} \mbox{ and}$

Region cannot and should not have to ${\tt contend} \hat{\mathsf{A}}$ alone with environmental

problems created by trying to fulfil what in the final analysis has been

Provincial/ Federal mandated urban growth.

Of course remedial action will cost money but I think at the local level $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +\left$

most people would accept increased municipal taxes to protect or improve

the existing \hat{A} environment through more stringent controls. \hat{A} However, I do

not think citizens would readily accept the projected costs of urban growth

and \hat{A} a compounding \hat{A} of our present environmental \hat{A} problems \hat{A} if the figure of

a 47% increase in Regional taxes over the next few years, mentioned at the

Halton meeting , was presented to them.

I think the Town and the Region should be asked (actually challenged) to

publish for public comment those projected non -recoverable costs associated with urban growth development and their effect on municipal

taxes $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ over the next few years $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$. Development charges seem to be weefully

inadequate in recovering even partial costs from developers $\,$. I notice that recently in Halton Hills there were proposed increases ranging from

over 100% to over 700% in development and planning fees and this would bring cost recovery to only 75% (previously 27.5%).

The Town and Region have always said to us that growth costs money but

,to my knowledge, have never said $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ how much the required infrastructure

is going to cost present taxpayers. \hat{A} I think we need to see the projected

near term and long term projections and the cost recovery from developers $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +$

with dollar figures attached as we expand our infrastructure. I suspect

there may be a public outcry and taxpayer revolt $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ if and $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ when they see

these figures.

Thank you for your attention,

Yours sincerely, A D.K. Smith

Duncan Smith ,

26 Park Ave ,

Oakville, L6J 3X8

905 845 8946

[IMAGE]

(Embedded image moved to file: pic25200.pcx)