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1.0 INTRODUCTION

This research report had several objectives:
1) To use the framework of environmental justice to examine literature related to the subject in general and with a specific look to the Toronto situation in particular.
2) To better understand the relationship between the environment and the City’s increasingly diverse communities.
3) To offer recommendations to the City of Toronto concerning actions it can take towards addressing environmental injustices.

This report is organized as follows. Firstly, the concepts of environmental justice, equity, racism and racialization are introduced. Research conducted in the United States and Canada is then compared and contrasted. The subsequent section examines past and present environmental justice concerns within the City of Toronto. This is followed by a section that examines demographic trends in Toronto. In particular, poverty and immigration trends are examined. Social justice and smart growth concepts are then linked to the environmental justice movement. Next, there is a discussion concerning the existence of community groups active in these areas. The report concludes with some recommendations for the City of Toronto in terms of addressing environmental injustices.

2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE & EQUITY

Environmental justice is the principle that all people, regardless of gender, age, race or socioeconomic status, are entitled to equal protection under environmental laws and to participate in environmental decision making in their community (Mennis and Jordan, 2005: 249). Accordingly, environmental injustices occur when a certain minority of the population is forced, through their lack of access to decision-making and policy-making processes, to live with a disproportionate share of environmental ‘bads’ and suffer the related public health problems and quality of life burdens (Agyeman, Bullard & Evans, 2003: 6).

“A fundamental question in environmental justice research concerns environmental equity – whether the spatial distribution of environmental risk is indeed equitable among different racial and socioeconomic groups” (Mennis and Jordan, 2005: 249). There have been many studies that have found statistical evidence both for and against environmental equity. The majority of these studies have focused on the locations of hazardous facilities as a proxy for environmental risk (Mennis and Jordan, 2005: 249).

A correlation has been made between the interrelationship of the process of urban, industrial development and historical settlement patterns among various ethnic groups that underlies currently observed patterns of environmental equity (Mennis and Jordan, 2005: 261). The results from the study conducted by Mennis and Jordan indicate that urban concentration is an important factor in explaining environmental inequity. However, its influence varies form location to location.

In the United States, where environmental justice research has grown rapidly, the poor and visible minorities have been the focus, giving rise to the concept of environmental racism (Buzzelli, M. et al, 2003: 557).
2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL RACISM AND RACIALIZATION

Unlike environmental racism, where there is a direct connection between a purposeful racist intention and racist outcome, environmental racialization arises from agents’ action that systematically link racialization with environmental risks (Teelucksingh, 2001: 64, 287-8). Environmental racialization is where racial meaning is attached to space in order to legitimize having marginalized people disproportionately bear the burden of environmental risks (Teelucksingh, 2001: 64, 287-8).

Bullard, Mohai and Bryant conceive of environmental racism as an extension of institutional racism. These environmental justice theorists identify environmental racism by outcomes, regardless of the agent’s intent. Bullard states that “[e]nvironmental racism refers to any policy, practice or directive that differentially affects or disadvantages (whether intended or unintended) individuals, groups, or communities based on race or colour” (Teelucksingh, 2001: 50-1).

In contrast to the theorists that focus on outcomes and institutional racism, Miles argues that there must be a causal connection between the intentionality and the racist outcome. Institutions cannot be held accountable for the ‘unanticipated outcomes’ of their actions. Similarly, Been argues that “without demonstrating racist intentionality, it is impossible to discount the effects of factors, other than race, that may have influenced the decision to locate hazardous industrial facilities in particular communities, including land prices, proximity to the waste source, and transportation networks” (Teelucksingh, 2001: 53-4).

Racialized spaces are fundamental to how individuals, the state, and institutional practices make sense of and manage ‘race’ and race relations (Teelucksingh, 2001: 29). Spaces that marginalize racialized groups are often not readily apparent and become a way to normalize new and latent forms of racism. Therefore, racialized spaces are tied to systems of power, and help maintain the hegemonic social order (Teelucksingh, 2001: 29). Physically deteriorating places, like ghettos, are natural places for racialized people. “Although Toronto may not exhibit the racial and spatial vestiges of American inner-city style ghettos, nonetheless, Toronto is not free of racialization. Again, normalized racialized spaces may not be readily apparent...” but they do exist (Teelucksingh, 2001: 36).

2.2 CANADIAN CHALLENGES

Canadian and American researchers have made similar conclusions in their studies of environmental justice. “The similarity between the Canadian and U.S. findings supports the idea that similar societal processes are in operation, with disadvantaged groups who live in low-cost housing being subjected to higher potential exposure” (Jerrett, M. et al., 2001: 969). However, there is one significant difference: the recent immigrant variable. “Although it is an imperfect measure of race, there are suggestions that environmental injustice in Canada may not have the same racial dimensions as it does in the U.S.. The 1996 Census of Canada contains the first race variables, and appears to be an integral area for future research” (Jerrett, M. et al., 2001: 969).

The challenge for Canadian environmental justice researchers is to avoid simply borrowing American theoretical and methodological approaches that may be inappropriate to the Canadian context (Teelucksingh, 2001: 4). Teelucksingh addresses
this gap in the environmental justice literature by exploring the significance of race, class, and immigrant status as variables that contribute to people’s different exposures to environmental risks in the City of Toronto (Teelucksingh, 2001: 3). Through her examination of racialized spaces, she demonstrates the need to challenge the dominant thinking that race does not matter in Canadian contexts because most Canadian cities do not have American style racial segregation. In reality, “Canada has a long history of racialization that is manifested in the labour market and rooted in the immigration process ... In particular, skin colour and racism were the basis for categorizing a segment of the labour force as subordinate” (Teelucksingh, 2001: 26-7). Thus, racialization is latent and systematic in Canada (Teelucksingh, 2001: 5). However, Teelucksingh does recognize that the relatively low levels of racial residential segregation that exist in Toronto, when compared to the dominant American model of segregation, make the spatial racialization experienced by many visible minorities, recent immigrants, and low income groups difficult to see (Teelucksingh, 2001: 163). This may explain the reluctance to acknowledge that environmental justice issues exist in Canadian urban areas.

Debbané and Keil have noted that “the term ‘environmental justice’ in the context of urban environments must be defined with this context for each site under study” and have argued against a “universalising use of the term” and instead for a local grounding of its use. They have also insisted on the recognition of the term’s points of reference in a world constructed at various scales of meaning (e.g. policy environments from the local to the global). In comparing environmental justice work in the U.S., South Africa, Namibia and Canada, these authors have pointed out that it is possible to differentiate modes of racialization, spatialization and political regulation in each national/urban context. It is important to keep this in mind for the Toronto case (Debbané and Keil, 2004).

3.0 EXAMINING ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ISSUES IN TORONTO

The City of Toronto has suffered from numerous environmental problems over the years. In this section, we will briefly examine a couple of those cases which have social justice implications; for, these are examples of environmental injustice. These areas include soil contamination, garbage and waste disposal, housing and industrial land use. For a more comprehensive examination of some of these issues within the context of three specific Toronto-area communities (Parkdale, Mid-Scarborough and South Riverdale), please see Cheryl Teelucksingh’s study on environmental injustices: In Somebody’s Backyard: Racialized Space and Environmental Justice in Toronto. A summary of her findings has been provided in the appendix (See Appendix 1).

3.1 SOIL CONTAMINATION

The community of South Riverdale has experienced numerous problems resulting from the contamination of its soil. This community was historically inhabited by poorer residents and, as a result, became the site of many of the city’s industrial facilities. For instance, the Canada Metal Company had been a source of major environmental and health concerns for years, especially regarding lead poisoning. Members of the community grew frustrated by government inaction, and eventually rallied themselves,
arguing that the government would never have tolerated such living conditions in one of Toronto’s wealthier neighbourhoods (Lebute, 1986). The general feeling was that because the community was poorer, industries were allowed to degrade the environment to an extent that would not have been accepted elsewhere.

3.2 WASTE

Proposals for new waste sites, and expansions of existing ones, have often resulted in disputes in the communities where they are (or will be) located. Questions of fairness and equity are often central to conflicts over facility siting decisions.

“This is often the case when actual or proposed hazardous waste facilities are located in low-income or racial minority areas (social equity); or when communities with no economic ties to industries which manufacture or use toxic substances in large quantities are expected to bear the burden of waste disposal (spatial equity); or when industrial neighbourhoods already overburdened with toxic emissions are asked to put up with yet another dump in their midst (cumulative equity); or when past or present decision makers set policies which unnecessarily transfer risk to future generations (intergenerational equity); or when decision-making processes give preference to industrial interests over community or environmental interests (procedural equity)” (Fletcher, 2003: 67).

The City of Toronto has a history of sending its garbage away because it has limited waste site capacity at local landfills. It ships waste long distances to communities that receive little or no economic benefit from it. Instead, these host communities are asked to bear the majority of environmental burdens associated with facilities like landfills and incinerators. Such cases raise spatial equity concerns. There are numerous examples of this, including proposals to ship waste to Kirkland Lake and Michigan (see Appendix 2 for more background information). More recently, there has been concern over the Green Lane landfill in southwestern Ontario. Members of the Oneida Native Reserve have been vocal in their opposition to the placement of this landfill near their community. In each of these instances, the “people exhibited what many would regard as a classic NIMBY response, but their grievances also involved numerous fairness issues that are consistent with the issue of environmental justice” (Fletcher, 2003: 16). In the case of the Green Lane landfill, the fact that the landfill was to be located near a native reserve was significant, and raised social equity concerns.

Similarly, waste incinerators are an important source of air pollution and controversy. This was a big issue in the South Riverdale area of Toronto in the past. In fact, a group of citizens, called Citizens for a Safe Environment, formed out of concern over the City of Toronto’s proposed garbage burning incinerator in their community. Unfortunately, such social equity issues continue to plague poor communities because many heavily-polluting facilities are purposefully located in these areas.

A growing body of evidence supports the hypothesis that hazardous waste and other industrial pollutants disproportionately burden economically marginalized communities (Fletcher, 2003: 11-2). While the economic and other benefits of production, including employment and revenue generation, are distributed broadly across society, the burden of waste is not (Fletcher, 2003: 14). “[T]oxic residuals generated during production processes present many negative consequences for the communities where they are transported, treated, stored, and disposed. These include increased public health and ecological risks from pollution in the environment, threats of accidents such as
spills and explosions, and psychological distress over the perception of risks” (Fletcher, 2003: 14). Thus, the potential exists for serious ramifications to be felt by the Toronto-area communities that experience waste-related environmental injustices.

3.3 HOUSING

There has also been concern about poorly maintained housing in the Toronto region. In particular, the community of South Parkdale has experienced insect infestations, inadequate garbage collection facilities and its housing does not conform with fire and health standards. Similarly, residents of Mid-Scarborough suffered from poorly maintained government-subsidized housing, with cockroach and rat infestation, bad smells, broken windows and poor ventilation. What makes this an environmental justice issue is the fact that these communities have a higher representation of total immigrants, visible minorities and incidents of low income (Teelucksingh, 2001: 187, 213). Teelucksingh argued that environmental risk was associated with health and safety concerns arising from poorly maintained or dangerous housing that disproportionately affected marginalized groups in these communities (Teelucksingh, 2001: 299).

3.4 INDUSTRIAL LAND USE

In addition, there has been some apprehension concerning industrial land use in the Toronto region. High proportions of visible minority populations, recent immigrant populations and low median income populations are located in close proximity to high emission facilities in Toronto (Teelucksingh, 2001: 161,3). In fact, these populations occupy an inverse ‘U’ shape area around the former City of Toronto. The ‘U’ shape of potential environmental racialization includes areas of South Riverdale, East (North) York and mid-Scarborough, areas identified in research studies as sites of environmental injustices and high environmental risk (Teelucksingh, 2001: 163).

The Port Industrial area (of South Riverdale) is the only remaining heavy industrial zone within the City of Toronto. It has a long history of community activism in opposition to toxic pollution emissions. In fact, this led to the closing of some industrial facilities, diminishing the air, water and soil pollution for those residents living nearest to the facilities. However, activism was dominated by white residents and the concern was mainly for these people, not for new immigrants or poorer residents. Ongoing soil contamination issues in this area have concerned often disadvantaged communities in the old industrial quarters of the city, while site specific clean-up processes have replaced a more universal policy. In addition, “defensible science” has tended to replace previous concerns with public health in soil contamination conflicts (Desfor and Keil, 2004).

Similarly, the Junction Triangle area of the city, bounded by Keele, St. Clair and Dundas Streets, has been plagued by environmental justice problems. This disadvantaged neighbourhood was the site of many high polluting factories. In the past, plastics factories have dumped chemicals into the sewage system, leading to health problems in residents, including migraines, fatigue, dizziness, and vomiting. In addition, many complaints were made about the smell of chemicals, glue and paint. Several community groups, including the Junction Anti-Pollution Group, and the Bloor Junction Neighbourhood Coalition were formed in response. For more information, please see the informative video by Deedee Slye, Tales from the Triangle. Activism around the
regeneration of industrial lands has also been connected to campaigns for green work and environmental production (Keil, 1994).

3.5 FOOD AND FOOD SECURITY

Food and food security issues are central to a broader understanding of environmental justice in Toronto. Represented most clearly by the work of the Food Policy Council of the City under the Directorship of Dr. Wayne Roberts, food production, consumption and security issues have been a) important to the overall sustainability of the city and b) have been a major arena of real diversity as gardeners, urban farmers and consumers, increasingly wary of corporate standardization and industrial contamination, have made food a showcase issue of survival in the global city. The complex physical and economic metabolisms of the food industry tie into existing patterns of class, race, gender, and immigration (see inter alia Keil and Boudreau, 2006 on issues of environmentalism and metabolism in Toronto).

As is evident from these case studies, environmental justice issues do exist within the City of Toronto. While not always recognized as such, this does not diminish the seriousness of the implications that arise for residents of these communities. It is important to understand the characteristics of Toronto that make it unique, and, therefore, more vulnerable to instances of environmental injustice.

4.0 TORONTO: DEMOGRAPHICS AND CONCERNS

4.1 POVERTY AND DIVERSITY IN TORONTO

Toronto has long been recognized as one of the best cities in the world due to its rich mixture of residents, safe streets and community services (United Way, 2004: 1). “But there are troubling signs that all is not well with our neighbourhoods. Poverty is rising, and deepening, and the income disparity between rich and poor is widening. Toronto’s population is growing much faster in the inner suburbs yet there has been no commensurate investment in social infrastructure” (United Way, 2004: 1). In particular, concern has been raised regarding the rapid and dramatic rise and intensification in the number of high-poverty neighbourhoods, particularly in North York and Scarborough (United Way, 2004: 2). Thus, not only has poverty increased, but it has become more concentrated. Moreover, there has been a shift in the resident profile of higher poverty neighbourhoods, with poor visible minority and immigrant families making up larger percentages of the total poor family population in these neighbourhoods than twenty years ago (United Way, 2004: 4). These trends are alarming for two reasons. Firstly, the consequences of living in a poor neighbourhood are significant. Secondly, poor neighbourhoods can spiral into further decline, resulting in an increase in crimes and abandonment (United Way, 2004: 1). “And shockingly, Toronto is losing ground faster than any other urban centre in Canada” (United Way, 2004: 1). Fortunately, “[n]eighbourhood decline is not inevitable, and investments in communities do make an enormous difference” (United Way, 2004: 1). For more information on this subject, please see the United Way report Poverty by Postal Code.

While immigration can greatly benefit a city, it can also result in significant problems. In fact, “there are growing signs of tension as the racial, ethnic, religious, and
linguistic diversity of Canadian cities increases” (Carter, 2006: 24). According to a 2003 Statistics Canada report, 43% of all new immigrants to Canada settled in Toronto. “With the higher number of arrivals, there is growing diversity in race, ethnicity, religion, and language. Some immigrants still come from traditional source areas like Britain, continental Europe, and the United States, but most new arrivals now come from countries in Asia, Latin America and Africa. Because of the shift in source areas, many newcomers are ‘visible minorities,’ the term commonly used to describe those who are non-white” (Carter, 2006: 24). In fact, due to this increase in immigration, visible minorities now make up 37% of Toronto’s population (Carter, 2006: 24). This increased diversity is changing the character of Canadian cities (Carter, 2006: 24). “Change always generates a certain amount of tension. The challenge for cities is to accommodate this growing diversity and achieve the successful integration of new arrivals without negative outcomes such as racism, discrimination, development of marginalized people, and racial upheaveals” (Carter, 2006: 24).

4.2 GHETTOS IN CANADA?

We can no longer pretend that Canada does not suffer from discrimination, racialization and social exclusion. Numerous studies indicate that there is a need to be concerned about the spatial concentration of poor, minority groups in Canadian urban areas. “Recent reports... suggest that poverty (or more accurately, low income) is not only growing in Canadian cities but is becoming increasingly concentrated in poor neighbourhoods. Not unsurprisingly, the spatial concentration of visible minorities, Aboriginals and recent immigrants is cited as one of a number of potential factors underpinning the growth of concentrated urban poverty” (Walks and Bourne, 2006: 274). Moreover, researchers have stated that “growing income inequality... increases the odds of poor visible minorities... ending up in the lowest-cost, least-desirable neighbourhoods from which they cannot afford to escape” (Walks and Bourne, 2006: 274). Within these studies, Toronto is often singled out as the city demonstrating the most obvious trends to this regards. One explanation for this is that immigrants prefer to settle in large urban regions, and thus Toronto becomes home to the majority of new immigrants. For example, immigrants constitute 49.4% of Toronto’s population (Good, 2005: 1).

When discussing the existence of poor, urban, minority neighbourhoods, it is inevitable that the concept of the ghetto will be brought up. The definition of a ghetto, as applied in the U.S., is that of “a residential district that both concentrates a particular racial or ethnic group and at the same time contains it, in that a majority of its members are forced to live there due to discrimination on behalf of the host community” (Walks and Bourne, 2006: 276). In particular, there is often discrimination in the housing and labour markets (Walks and Bourne, 2006: 276). Much of the literature on ghettos comes from the U.S., where racial segregation, particularly of the black and Hispanic population, is a major concern. While stark racial segregation like that in the U.S. does not (yet) exist in Canada, there are indications of increasing inequalities in Canadian cities, especially Toronto.

In a recent article, entitled Ghettos in Canada’s Cities? Racial Segregation, Ethnic Enclaves and Poverty Concentration in Canadian Urban Areas, R. Alan Walks and Larry S. Bourne discuss the issue of whether ghettos exist in Canada. While the authors conclude that ghettoization like that in the U.S. does not exist in Canadian cities,
and that a high degree of racial concentration is not necessarily associated with greater
neighbourhood poverty, the authors did find that the four most segregated Canadian
cities, which included Toronto, have higher levels of spatial polarization than the largest
cities in Britain and Australia (Walks and Bourne, 2006: 285 and 294). Furthermore, the
authors found that “the concentration of apartment housing, of visible minorities in
general, and of a high level of racial diversity in particular, do help in accounting for the
neighbourhood patterning of low income” in Canadian urban areas (Walks and Bourne,

Consistent with similar studies, the authors discovered that visible minorities are
clearly concentrated in a small number of urban regions in Canada (Walks and Bourne,
2006: 282). The authors were careful to differentiate between the segregated groups in
Canadian and American cities. Unlike the U.S., there are no black or Hispanic polarized
tracts in any Canadian CMA. Instead, South Asians and Chinese are the most segregated
groups (Walks and Bourne, 2006: 285). The authors argue that Toronto is the CMA with
the largest visible minority population and the greatest proportion of its population in
highly concentrated tracts. Moreover, it is the only city where segregation levels have
increased in recent years (Walks and Bourne, 2006: 295). In fact, the authors state that
“[i]f future trends indicate any movement towards increasing segregation and/or
ghettoization, or alternatively further evidence of newer forms of ethnic enclaves…, it
would seem that Toronto would be the first place to look” (Walks and Bourne, 2006:
295).

David Hulchanski is another academic that has raised the issue of ghettos in
Canada. In a presentation, entitled *Ghettos of the Rich and the Poor: Is This Where
Toronto is Headed?*, Hulchanski argues that Toronto’s neighbourhoods are increasingly
segregated ‘naturally’ by market forces and government social policy on the basis of
esocio-economic status, skin colour, and housing tenure (Hulchanski, 2007). Specifically,
he argues that there is a need to differentiate between an outcast ghetto and an enclave.
According to Peter Marcuse, an outcast ghetto is a ghetto in which ethnicity is combined
with class in a spatially concentrated area with residents who are excluded from the
mainstream of the economic life of the surrounding society. Conversely, an enclave is a
spatially concentrated area in which members of a particular population group congregate
as a means of enhancing their economic, social, political and/or cultural development
(Hulchanski, 2007). Moreover, Hulchanski argues that we must undo the concentration of
apartment housing, of visible minorities, and the growing income inequality and improve
the least-desirable neighbourhoods (Hulchanski, 2007).

Thus, there is plenty of research that focuses on increasing inequalities in
Canadian urban environments. While there is agreement that ghettos do not yet exist in
Canada, there are indications that they are starting to form, and, thus, it is not too late to
reverse the trend. One particularly persuasive strategy for addressing environmental
justice issues is to link them to currently-utilized strategies for improving cities.

5.0 Partnerships with Environmental Justice

5.1 Linking Social Justice to Environmental Justice

An explanation for the success of the environmental justice movement can be
seen in the mutual benefits of a coalition between environmental and social concerns. In
recent years, it has become increasingly apparent that the issue of environmental quality is linked to social justice values such as individual rights, equal opportunities, social justice, human dignity and self-determination.

Environmental justice supporters argue that the victims of environmental inequities will only be afforded the same protection as others when they have access to the decision making and policy-making processes that govern such things as the siting of hazardous waste facilities and polluting industries (Agyeman, J., Bullard, R., Evans, B. 2003: 1, 6).

Therefore, there is a need to frame environmental rights as a significant component of human rights – “new rights and obligations should be incorporated within social norms.” They would involve the recognition of new rights, new bearers of rights and new objects of rights. The 1999 Aarhus Convention, which came into effect on October 30 2001, is unique in being the first to ensure citizens’ rights in the field of the environment. It implies substantive rights (the right to a cleaner environment) and guarantees procedural rights (the right to participate) to European citizens. It states, as the objective, that: “in order to contribute to the protection of the right of every person of present and future generations to live in an environment adequate to his or her health and well-being, each party shall guarantee the rights of access to information, public participation in decision-making and access to justice in environmental matters in accordance with the provisions of this convention” (Agyeman, J., Bullard, R., Evans, B. 2003: 10). The City of Toronto can look at examples such as this for ideas on how to strengthen human rights as well as environmental justice concerns.

It has been increasingly recognized that one of the best ways to protect environmental rights is to uphold the basic civil, human and political rights of the individual. Emerging co-activism on sustainability and environmental justice issues can be found in local fights for just transportation, community food security and sustainable communities and cities. At the local level, there are a growing number of examples of cooperative endeavours between environmental justice groups and the major organizations (Agyeman, J., Bullard, R., Evans, B. 2003: 11, 62).

Ultimately, citizens are the main beneficiaries of sustainable development - economic development and growth, environmental protection and social equity – therefore it is natural that citizens should be consulted, and plan an active role, if not the principal role, in the decision-making process on matters regarding these three main components of their living environment (Agyeman, J., Bullard, R., Evans, B. 2003: 306) (see Appendix 3). Thus, in order for the City of Toronto to provide maximum protection against environmental injustices, it must increase the power and responsibilities of private citizens in terms of coming up with official strategies, as well as implementation and follow-through.

5.2 LINKING SMART GROWTH TO ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

The pursuit of metropolitan regional and neighbourhood equity is, in many ways, an extension of the movement for environmental justice. It seeks to address not only what communities are against but also what they are for: healthy neighbourhoods with convenient access to good schools, affordable housing, parks, and grocery stores; equitable public investments; and access to opportunity. This movement responds to two challenges that poor and marginalized communities and neighbourhoods face as they
seek to improve their quality of life. The first is that the larger patterns of metropolitan development have undermined past neighbourhood-based efforts to remedy concentrated urban poverty, socioeconomic issues, and racial isolation. The second challenge is to find systemic ways to link poverty alleviation to the larger, society-wide patterns of social, economic, and environmental development (Bullard, 2007: x).

Advocates of regional and neighbourhood equity are influential within the smart growth movement; however, they have been critical of both environmental groups and the conventional development industry for their lack of attention and responsiveness to issues of race, class, and poverty. They recognize, though, that public debate about smart growth and the new metropolitan agenda provides a political context to build new allies in the effort to address the unmet needs of poor people, working people, and people of colour in ways that improve the quality of life for everyone (Bullard, 2007: x).

Why should environmental justice advocates care about suburban sprawl, smart growth, or regional equity? The smart growth movement is beginning to influence what happens in communities all across Canada. Many core smart growth principles focus on protecting the environment, using resources wisely, facilitating cooperation between cities and suburbs, and investing in and rebuilding our inner-city older suburbs (Bullard, 2007: 24) (see Appendix 4). Therefore, environmental justice and smart growth advocates share the same interests and concerns.

Smart growth and environmental justice have many compatible goals. Both movements are built around a set of principles that recognize the interconnection between humans and the environment. Both movements also recognize that where we live impacts the quality of our lives and our life opportunities. And the framers of both movements also encourage community and stakeholder collaborations in planning and decision making. Both movements offer opportunities for building coalitions and alliances to break down artificial barriers in housing, employment, education, transportation, land use and zoning, health and safety, and urban investment (Bullard, 2007: 24). More detailed information is provided in the appendix (see Appendix 5).

While Toronto is already incorporating some smart growth principles in its official plans, environmental and social inequality still exist within the City. In order to effectively implement smart growth principles and reverse environmental and social inequality, the City must make greater efforts to link these two movements wherever possible. The potential to incur change is greater when these two movements are joined, as opposed to handled separately.

6.0 TORONTO: MISSING CONNECTIONS

Repeatedly, environmental justice concerns are framed solely as a narrowly defined single issue; for example, as an environmental, a health, an income, a race, or an immigrant problem (Teelucksingh, 2001: 44). In order to further environmental justice research in Toronto, related environmental and social problems must be framed as environmental justice concerns (Teelucksingh, 2001: 44).

On a small scale, multi-issue and multi-racial environmental justice organizations are beginning to emerge in Toronto with the specific mandate of striving for environmental justice. Currently, however, these organizations face the challenge that an environmental justice framework supportive of their efforts to mobilize around
environmental social injustices, including the link between racialization and environmental problems, is not widely recognized in Toronto. Other grassroots organizations exist in Toronto, unaware that they fall within the environmental justice umbrella, creating and challenging social spaces in their efforts to secure healthy and affordable housing, safer and cleaner neighbourhoods, and open and accountable interactions with state bodies and corporations that have the power to affect the local environment (Teelucksingh, 2001: 62). Please see Appendix 6 for a preliminary list of Toronto-based community groups active in environmental justice issues.

7.0 Conclusion

While there has been a general reluctance to accept that environmental injustices and racialization exist in Canada, the amount of research being conducted on this subject has increased in recent years. Specifically, there is increasing evidence that such trends do, unfortunately, exist in Canada, especially in its larger urban areas, like the City of Toronto. No matter how much we prefer to think of ourselves as a multicultural and diverse nation, racism and inequality do exist. Similarly, no matter how much we prefer to think of ourselves as environmentalists, environmental problems do exist in Canadian cities, and disproportionately burden certain segments of the population.

It is important to note that many environmental justice concerns continue to be framed as a single issue, whether it be labeled as an environmental, health, economic, race, or immigrant problem. Not forging links between issues makes it difficult to address problems and to reverse the situation. Smart growth and social justice issues should also be seen as an integrated principle of environmental justice or vice versa.

Increasing poverty levels and greater concentration of marginalized groups have environmental justice implications for the City of Toronto. For instance, industrial facilities are often located in these areas, resulting in health and environmental concerns for these residents. Unfortunately, the people inhabiting these communities do not possess the power, time or resources to seek change. As a result, their concerns are not prioritized by municipal governments. Thus, the groups that suffer the most from environmental injustices, the urban poor, visible minorities and new immigrants, have the least power to change their circumstances. As a result, significant changes must be made in how the City addresses environmental justice issues if we wish to improve the plight of these marginalized groups.

8.0 Recommendations

In order for the City of Toronto to thoroughly address environmental justice issues, we believe that the following actions and realizations are necessary:

1) The City must recognize that inequality, racialization and environmental injustices exist in Toronto.
   a) The perception that Canada is a multicultural society has led to the commonly shared belief that racism is a problem only south of the border. The persistence of this myth has hidden the processes of racialization that exist in Canada (Debbané and Keil, 2004: 218).
b) Similarly, inequality and environmental injustices not only plague the United States, but other countries as well, including Canada.

2) The realization must be made that environmental justice issues do not lend themselves to exclusionary thinking; we can not separate environmental and social justice issues. Therefore, municipal programs must be designed to create synergies between them.
   a) Issues surrounding poverty, health and the environment are particularly susceptible to being linked.
      - For example, community gardens could be developed, which would address these three issues. Youth in poor communities could be taught how to grow their own food in vacant lots. This would also allow them to fulfill volunteer requirements while fostering community engagement and activism.

3) To prevent the formation of ghettos within the City of Toronto, we need to undo the concentration of apartment housing and visible minorities, address the growing income inequality and improve the least-desirable neighbourhoods within the City (Hulchanski, 2007). This would be the most effective way to address both environmental and social injustices. The following are some important suggestions made by leading academics within the field.
   a) “The very first step which must be taken is to create a broader understanding of the importance of healthy neighbourhoods as essential building blocks for achieving a high quality of life and for ensuring Toronto’s long-term health and vitality” (United Way, 2004: 14).
   b) Moreover, “[n]eighbourhoods must move to the top of the public policy agenda, with the goal that no one in our city should be disadvantaged or excluded from the mainstream, based on where they live” (United Way, 2004: 14).
   c) Governments must work with civil society to identify and prioritize at-risk neighbourhoods and communities and those with the potential to change (External Advisory Committee, 2006: xvi).
   d) The government must engage and empower volunteers, non-governmental organizations and communities. “We envisage a central role for communities and neighbourhoods in resolving the worrying concentration of disadvantage…” (External Advisory Committee, 2006: xiv).
   e) “The critical question is what can be done to turn the tide of neighbourhood distress? In countries like Great Britain, neighbourhood revitalization has shot to the top of the public policy agenda. And in the United States, huge new investments in cities, are being carried out, in recognition that strong and healthy neighbourhoods are necessary to the future sustainability and competitiveness of cities” (United Way, 2004: 13). Similar efforts must be made in Toronto.
   f) “Governments at all levels must make a commitment to reverse the spiral of growing neighbourhood distress and disadvantage by delivering improved economic prospects and jobs, safer neighbourhoods, decent and affordable housing, accessible community programs and services, and by fostering a renewed involvement and commitment in community among
residents” (United Way, 2004: 14-5). Please see this report for a more
detailed explanation of how to accomplish these specific tasks.
g) The government’s response must be prompt and comprehensive, aimed at
transforming high-need neighbourhoods. “The consequences of inaction
are grave— for the present, and for the future” (United Way, 2004: 2).
4) There is a need for the City to contact relevant community groups and form
relationships, or, more specifically, partnerships, with them. There are already
many community groups working at the local level that address environmental
justice issues, but have not yet been labeled as such.
a) There is a wealth of knowledge and expertise at the local level that can be
drawn upon. A web of contacts has already been established and should be
utilized by the government to attain maximum potential in reversing
current trends. For a preliminary list of community groups, please see
Appendix 6.
b) “A diversity of groups from civil society must be allowed to bring their
understanding, language, and problem definition to the struggle” of
addressing social and environmental problems (Desfor and Keil, 2004:
168). Thus, the government must increase the power and responsibilities
accorded to these groups.
c) Problem definition should not be limited to technical discussions among
experts. Rather, problem-defining political processes must be open to civic
groups and affirmative actions must be taken to support groups with fewer
resources (Desfor and Keil, 2004: 169). Thus, not only must the
government include these groups in discussions prior to the creation of
new city policies, but it must support weaker groups and provide them
with the means necessary for coming to the table. It must also make efforts
to include as many stakeholders as possible. “By including a variety of
groups in a political process, the fractured, complex, and frequently
contradictory character of environmental problems may be exposed.
Debate among a broad range of interests may be able to focus on the
desirability of social actions. In such a way, a process of identifying
preferred social arrangements may be able to determine which actions
should be taken” (Desfor and Keil, 2004: 169).
5) More research must be conducted on environmental justice issues in Toronto.
a) Case studies from other jurisdictions may provide suggestions on how to
address the situation.
b) Update the “Inventory of Toronto’s Environmental Groups” list. Include a
breakdown of groups by level of jurisdiction (local, provincial, federal,
international), as well as whether government or community-formed and
run.
9.0 APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: TORONTO COMMUNITIES: PARKDALE, MID-SCARBOROUGH AND SOUTH RIVERDALE

Three different Toronto-area communities were examined in depth by Teelucksingh with respect to environmental injustices; Parkdale, Mid-Scarborough and South Riverdale.

Parkdale, in comparison to the Toronto CMA, has lower than average dwelling values, and a higher representation of total immigrant populations, recent immigrant populations and visible minority populations, as well as government transfer payments and incidences of low income for individuals, families and private households (Teelucksingh, 2001: 187). Racism and NIMBYism mark the community (Teelucksingh, 2001: 190). Residents self divide Parkdale into the northern and southern portions. South Parkdale is viewed negatively, due to the greater numbers of people of color and new immigrants, lower incomes, poorer housing stock, higher residential densities, as well as garbage, and other negative social problems, including prostitution, mental illness and crime. Conversely, North Parkdale is described as cleaner, safer, more European, and thus more desirable (Teelucksingh, 2001: 192-3). “Consistent with the dominant distinction between North and South Parkdale is interview participants’ view that there are different environmental risks associated with each area” (Teelucksingh, 2001: 196). While the environmental risks in South Parkdale related mainly to poorly maintained housing and overcrowding, the environmental risks in North Parkdale were associated with land use concerns (NIMBYism) and environmental aesthetics (Teelucksingh, 2001: 290).

Mid-Scarborough, when compared to the entire Toronto CMA, has higher population proportions of: total immigrants, total visible minorities, government transfer payments, incidents of low income, and rental occupancy (Teelucksingh, 2001: 213). Residents identified pollution from traffic and nearby industry as environmental problems relevant to the Mid-Scarborough area (Teelucksingh, 2001: 219). Residents closest to the industries are predominately racialized people living in low income and run down apartment buildings (Teelucksingh, 2001: 221). High density, high rise apartment buildings, managed by the Toronto Community Housing Company (TCHC) are located along the main thoroughfares, while newer condominium housing is located away from older residential areas (Teelucksingh, 2001: 215). There are numerous problems associated with the poorly maintained government subsidized housing, including cockroach and rat infestation, bad smells, broken windows, and poor ventilation (Teelucksingh, 2001: 223).

South Riverdale, when compared to the entire Toronto CMA, has higher proportions of total immigrant populations, total visible minority populations, government transfer payments, and incidents of low income among individuals, families and private households (Teelucksingh, 2001: 236, 238). The Port Industrial Area (located on the extreme southern portion of South Riverdale) is the only remaining heavy industrial zone within the city limits (Teelucksingh, 2001: 240). Older and poorly maintained houses are particularly concentrated in the southern portions of the community close to the industrial facilities. In addition to having to deal with the
environmental risks associated with industry, many marginalized residents are also encountering subsistence environmental problems, such as dilapidated housing, asbestos, restricted access to educational and community resources, and vermin (Teelucksingh, 2001: 248).

After examining these three communities in depth, Teelucksingh concluded that instances of environmental injustices and environmental racialization do exist, particularly in Mid-Scarborough and South Riverdale. Environmental risk was associated with the presence of industrial facilities (including emissions and impact zones) as well as health and safety concerns that disproportionately affect marginalized groups due to poorly maintained or dangerous housing (Teelucksingh, 2001: 299).

APPENDIX 2: THE MOVEMENT OF WASTE FROM TORONTO TO KIRKLAND LAKE AND MICHIGAN

Throughout the 1990s, Toronto was plagued by a municipal garbage crisis. Population growth and the projected 2002 closure of the Keele Valley landfill pushed the city to search for a new landfill “preferably with a location geographically distant from the population and the development pressures of the city itself” (Fletcher, 2003: 27). The Adams Mine, an abandoned quarry 600 kilometers north, was listed as a preferred site. Advantages included the fact that the site was already excavated and had a long industrial history. Moreover, the region was in need of new employment opportunities. “The predictable NIMBY response also appeared more likely in urban and suburban communities of Metropolitan Toronto than in a remote rural locality. In fact, several possible landfill sites in and around Toronto had by then failed due to citizen protests” (Fletcher, 2003: 27).

By the mid-1990s, Kirkland Lake was the favoured site for a private-sector landfill. While residents were originally in favour of the plan due to a negotiated deal which would guarantee municipal revenues in the form of a levy on tipping fees, by 2000, public sentiment had eroded. A number of equity or justice concerns were raised. For instance, many residents stated that garbage should be disposed of where it is created (spatial equity); it is unfair that future generations of local residents would have to maintain the facility (intergenerational equity); and that no local referendum had been held on the matter (procedural equity) (Fletcher, 2003: 31). Despite numerous protests, Toronto Council voted to approve the Kirkland Lake proposal in October 2000. But only a few days later, a five-year contract was signed between the City of Toronto and a Florida-based company that owned a landfill in Sumpter Township, Michigan (Fletcher, 2003: 32). The decision to ship Toronto garbage to Michigan “created a decidedly negative response south of the border” (Fletcher, 2003: 32). It was argued that the Ontario government had traded an intra-provincial spatial equity problem for a cross-border and international spatial equity problem with Michigan (Fletcher, 2003: 33).
APPENDIX 3: LINKING SOCIAL JUSTICE AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

By acknowledging the central role of citizens as the ultimate providers and consumers of policies, and by ensuring that citizens are well informed and aware of their civic responsibilities, a balance may be struck between the costs and benefits of economic development and growth, environmental protection and social equity (Agyeman, J., Bullard, R., Evans, B. 2003: 306).

![Diagram showing the relationship between Economic development and growth, Environmental protection, and Social Equity](image)

Figure 14.1: A model of Environmental Justice for Central and Eastern Europe (Agyeman, J., Bullard, R., Evans, B. 2003: 307).

In Central and Eastern Europe, the concept of environmental justice incorporates all these elements and enables citizens to play this central role through the practices of good governance. The underlying assumption is that citizens are the only actors involved in the transition or development process who know what degree of economic growth, environmental protection and social equity is desired and the price they are willing to pay for achieving it (Agyeman, J., Bullard, R., Evans, B. 2003: 307).

APPENDIX 4: SMART GROWTH A

Smart growth policies offer opportunities to address a range of problems, including environmentally degraded land, polluted air, traffic congestion, loss of green space, concentrated poverty, urban disinvestments, housing abandonment, bank and insurance redlining, and growing social and economic polarization (Bullard, 2007: 24).

The smart growth and environmental justice movements have a lot in common. Both movements have set out clear goals of addressing urban quality of life issues, including the protection of the environment, using resources wisely, ensuring cooperation
between cities and suburbs, brownfields cleanup and reuse, open space and farmland preservation, transportation efficiency, affordable housing, expanded employment opportunities, and investing in the rebuilding of communities. Both movements allow for community collaborations in planning and decision making, and provide opportunities for building coalitions and alliances among diverse stakeholders (Bullard, 2007: 43).

The strategies that should be pursued to provide access to opportunity differ greatly among rich, middle-class, and poor cities, because their experiences or racial and class sorting differ greatly. Poor cities must overcome their fear of displacement and recognize that their volatile resistance to the influx of middle-income residents through infill is vastly out of proportion to the actual threat posed. Poor city communities should refocus on the ultimate goal of access to opportunities and resources. By refocusing their strategies, low-income communities of colour and social justice advocates will recognize that attracting middle-income residents and businesses is a logical next step to continue the civil rights movement’s goal of true access to opportunities (Bullard, 2007: 43).

Smart growth is most often viewed as a way to save open space, reduce infrastructure costs, or place more emphasis on the needs of the pedestrian. But if smart growth is to flourish, it needs to be applied to the tangled issues apparent where people of different races and classes live, work, and go to school. When people begin to understand the implications of sprawl, they begin to understand the connection between larger regional issues and their day-to-day lives. For example, they understand that the economy of the region is critical to the well-being of their neighbourhoods (Bullard, 2007: 119).

**APPENDIX 5: SMART GROWTH B**

Several strategies exist for building multiracial regional coalitions to reform fiscal systems, coordinate land use planning, and improve regional governance; issues that cannot be addressed adequately at the local level alone. Communities face significant obstacles in attempting to create more livable, racially integrated, and fiscally equitable regions, but these hurdles can be overcome. It is a matter of convincing people who see no stake in regional reform that they do in fact have a stake in how metropolitan regions are organized and managed. The effective presentation of demographic data through maps and other means can make an enormous difference in helping people understand what is at stake for the places they care about most (Bullard, 2007: 328).

Regional fiscal equity programs have several benefits. First, they allow tax base-poor places to compete on a level playing field with their more affluent neighbourhoods. Without such policies, many central cities, inner suburbs, and outlying small towns – places with aging infrastructure, industrial pollution, and high levels of poverty - are often forced to tax themselves at a much higher rate than their better-off neighbours to compensate for high costs and relatively meager tax bases. Likewise, many fast-growing bedroom suburbs struggle to provide the public services needed to accommodate their largely residential growth. Meanwhile, the most affluent suburbs - places offering expensive new homes and plentiful commercial development- are able to rely on their significant tax bases to offer high-quality public services at relatively low rates (Bullard, 2007: 328).

Reducing inequalities among communities helps address the ongoing challenges faced by communities of colour, diminishing the effects of pockets of concentrated poverty in isolated municipalities. Policies promoting fiscal equity also help to make a
region operate more efficiently by reducing the incentives for local governments to engage in costly competition for a tax base – competition that, for the most part, simply shifts a given amount of regional tax base from place to place (Bullard, 2007: 328).

For the majority of suburbs, a fiscal equity program is a win-win scenario. And for those communities that pay into the program more than they receive, there is a silver lining: those places will feel less pressure to develop tax base-rich commercial and industrial projects to maintain a low-tax, high-services environment (Bullard, 2007: 328).

Effective regional efforts strike a balance by allowing local control over issues best addressed by local governments, while promoting cooperation on larger issues affecting the entire region, such as highway and sewer investments, affordable housing, transit, land use planning, air and water quality, and economic development. A regional authority may also be the appropriate venue for services such as transit, water, and sewer systems – services where economies of scale can provide significant cost savings (Bullard, 2007: 337).

**APPENDIX 6: LIST OF COMMUNITY GROUPS**

**Inventory of Toronto’s Environmental Groups**
March 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Groups</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Centre for Pollution Prevention - government formed</td>
<td>215 Spadina Avenue, Suite 134 Toronto, M5T 2C7 ph: 416-979-3534</td>
<td>A non-government, environmental organization that encourages actions that avoid or minimize the creation of pollutants and inspires actions that foster a healthier environment and a sustainable society. C2P2’s core business is the transfer of P2 information and serves as a catalyst for behavioural change. C2P2 enriches the knowledge of others so that they can include pollution prevention and sustainable consumption and production practices in everyday decision-making. Activities span several service areas. Past Project: Municipal Management Tool for Integrated Plant Health Care and Pesticide Reduction Under the direction of a small municipal steering group coordinated by Environment Canada - Ontario Region, C2P2 has been tasked with developing a 'how to' guide for municipalities. The guide will raise issues confronting municipalities as they embark on pesticide reduction initiatives. The guide will include tools and techniques for assessing a municipality’s...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
state of readiness for pesticide reduction as well as implementation strategies. The tool is being reviewed by the steering committee and municipal parks managers.

Current Project:
P2 Technical Guidance Manual for Municipal Wastewater Effluent
Refined the guidance manual for Environment Canada on Municipal Wastewater Effluents. Environment Canada is considering issuing a P2 plan notice under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act (CEPA 1999) with respect to Municipal Wastewater Effluents (MWE) as a first step in a control program. A guidance manual is needed to help direct the efforts of communities to address the notice. The guidance manual explains what a P2 plan is, what is expected in response to a CEPA P2 plan notice, and P2 activities for consideration in developing a P2 plan.

| Citizens’ Environment Watch | Citizens’ Environment Watch (CEW) is a non-profit organization dedicated to environmental education, monitoring and identifying environmental quality concerns in communities across Ontario. CEW brings accessible, relevant and exciting hands-on learning experiences to citizens of all ages. | 2 Sussex Avenue
Toronto, M5S 1J5
**ph: 416-978-4144** |
| The Clean Air Foundation | The Clean Air Foundation is a not-for-profit organization dedicated to developing, implementing and managing public engagement programs and strategic initiatives that lead to a measurable improvement in air quality. Their approach is based on forming successful partnerships. They forge relationships with companies and governments, to create programs that produce measurable results. They are entrepreneurs at the core, hustling to ensure their partners get a good return on their investment. For their government partners, it means creating measurable improvements in air quality and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. For their corporate partners, it means delivering branded programs that engage the public. | 1216 Yonge Street,
Suite 201
Toronto, M4T 1W1
**ph: 416-922-9038** |
| The Coalition for a Green Economy | The Coalition for a Green Economy: | 44 Park Hill Road
Toronto, M6C 3N1 |
- helps individuals, companies, community groups, business associations, and government agencies find ways to improve their environmental performance.

- offers educational and training programs to increase the environmental knowledge and effectiveness of entrepreneurs and managers in all sectors of the economy.

- provides a setting for ideas and opportunities to meet the needs of business efficiency, social justice, public health, and environmental stewardship.

- undertakes research and task forces to explore green innovations that respond to pressing public problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community AIR (Airport Impact Review)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>- community formed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community AIR is focused on stopping the Island Airport expansion and restoring the 200 acres of polluted land to public recreation space, beach and natural areas. They believe good air quality is a right. They care about making our city's waterfront a clean, green, quiet and safe place for all Torontonians and tourists to enjoy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their members are Toronto residents, business people, health professionals, recreational boaters, park users, environmentalists, naturalists, bird lovers and members of the arts community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>47B Harbour Square PO Box 81057</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toronto, M5J 2R0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ph: 416-366-3690</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earth Angels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>- government formed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created in 1992, Earth Angels (formerly Tree Life) took root when a group of concerned educators and parents identified a need for unique action-based environmental programs in Ontario schools. Programs were needed that actually dealt with air and water pollution, declining ecosystems, treeless schoolyards, and climate change. Proactive &quot;hands on&quot; programs were required to teach the students about the issues, and have them physically tackle the problem. Earth Angels created these programs and through them students have re-treed 700 schoolyards, revitalized 8 streams, and incorporated electricity conservation into their lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Angels is now providing the Bio-Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Defence Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Probe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Voters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Saver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Toronto Green Community - community formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Environment Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution Probe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouge Valley Naturalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Action On Garbage And The Environment (RAGE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Smart Commute Association of Black Creek | An advocate for improved transit service and other transportation management enhancements and infrastructure programs that will benefit the community overall, such as:  
- improved transit: increased frequency, more routes and better service  
- network of cycling paths  
They actively promote the use of sustainable modes of transportation within the region, such as transit, ride-sharing, cycling and walking.  
Most importantly, they work with individual member organizations to put in place transportation management solutions for their direct benefit.  
They have a continually expanding group of formal programs and services to draw on, including:  
Black Creek Carpool: a web-based matching service to help commuters find a carpool partner, thereby reducing the number of single-occupant trips.  
Guaranteed Ride Home: a service which ensures that employees who car/vanpool, take transit, bike or walk to work can get home in an emergency. | 4700 Keele Street  
William Small Center, Room 120  
North York, M3J 1P3  
**ph:** 416-650-8059 |
| Task Force to Bring Back the Don - government formed | The Task Force to Bring Back the Don is a citizens' group sponsored by the City of Toronto that works to "bring back" a clean, green and accessible Don River watershed. | |
| Toronto Atmospheric Fund - government formed | Helping Toronto become a sustainable city.  
Toronto City Council established the Toronto Atmospheric Fund (TAF) in 1991 to finance local initiatives to combat global warming and improve air quality in Toronto. | 75 Elizabeth Street  
Toronto, M5G 1P4  
**ph:** 416-392-0271 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>University of Toronto’s Environmental Resource Network (UTERN) - community formed</strong></th>
<th>UTERN is the University of Toronto's Environmental Resource Network, an umbrella organization and the meeting point for everyone in the university community concerned about the health of their environment. UTERN is two years old, but this year after successfully securing a 50-cent levy from all undergraduate students, it has taken new proportions. UTERN now manages more than twenty thousand dollars, which is almost entirely available to fund student-run, environmental projects at U of T. As a network, they also want to help groups promote events and projects that positively affect the University's environment.</th>
<th>33 Willcocks Street Room 2016A, Earth Sciences Centre Toronto, M5S 3B3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young Environmental Professionals</strong></td>
<td>YEP Toronto aims to provide a forum for networking with peers and professionals in a social setting, while expanding contacts, finding employment, and getting involved with community events.</td>
<td>ph: 416-111-1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zerofootprint</strong></td>
<td>Zerofootprint provides information, products, and services for the global network of consumers and businesses who wish to reduce their environmental impacts.</td>
<td>862 Richmond Street West, Suite 302 Toronto, M6J 1C9 ph: 416-365-7557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Social Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Bread Not Circuses</strong></th>
<th>This group staged press conferences at the entrance to tent city to highlight the disparity that exists in Toronto not only between poverty and wealth but between contaminated communities and clean ones.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Council of Canadians</strong></td>
<td>Founded in 1985, The Council of Canadians is Canada's pre-eminent citizens' watchdog organization, comprised of over 100,000 members and more than 70 Chapters across the country. Strictly non-partisan, the Council lobbies Members of Parliament, conducts research, and runs national campaigns aimed at putting some of the country's most important issues into the spotlight: safeguarding social programs,</td>
<td>210-116 Spadina Avenue Toronto, M5V 2K6 ph: 416-979-5554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Jewish Nature Centre of Canada/ Torat HaTeva | Through fun and multi-sensory learning, the Jewish Nature Centre of Canada, Torat HaTeva, provides vibrant and meaningful Jewish educational experiences that:

- promote ecological awareness
- build community ties
- encourage action towards global responsibility and stewardship (Tikkun Olam)
- provides models for spiritually and ecologically sustainable Jewish living.

They have an office in Toronto and run their programs in synagogues, schools, camps and field centres. | 516 Glencairin Avenue
Toronto, M6B 1Z1
ph: 647-293-7256 |

| OPIRG York - community formed | A student-funded, student-directed organization mandated to do popular education and advocacy around social justice and environmentalism. They are committed to making links between issues including anti-racism, economic justice, the environment, Native rights, sexuality and women.

Their primary mode of action is through their Working Groups. Working Groups are collectives of people who come together to mobilize around specific issues. OPIRG provides skills, training and resources for research projects, organizing, public education and activism. | 4700 Keele Street, York University C449 Student Centre (4th floor)
North York, M3J 1P3
ph: 416-736-5724 |

| Parkdale Ward 19 Citizens Assembly Group | The objective of this group is to make elected officials and government agencies in the electoral ward more immediately accountable to the diverse needs and voices of Parkdale stakeholders. It attempted to challenge dominate decision making processes and to address inequalities in the community. |  |

| Riverdale Immigrant Women's Centre | Riverdale Immigrant Women's Centre is committed to supporting Chinese speaking and South Asian women in taking greater control of their lives. RIWC provides culturally specific settlement and counseling support services with | ph: (416) 465-6021 |
the use of community determined strategies, which are developed and delivered by immigrant women.

RIWC is a multilingual agency that offers integrated programs from four different locations. They deliver services to women, seniors and youth in Cantonese, Manderin, Hindi, Urdu, Punjabi, Tamil, Gujarati, Katchi, Bengali, and Swahili.
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