

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS

PROPONENT: J.M. SCHNEIDER INC.
**PROPOSAL NAME: J.M. SCHNEIDER INC. – HOG
PROCESSING PLANT**
CLASS OF DEVELOPMENT: CLASS 1
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT: MEAT PROCESSING PLANT
CLIENT FILE NO: 4178.00

OVERVIEW:

A proposal dated May 29, 1996, was received from J.M. Schneider Inc. on May 30, 1996, for the construction and operation of a hog carcass processing facility in the City of Winnipeg. A staged licencing approach was requested. The development involves the receipt of chilled hog carcasses and the custom cutting, packaging, and shipping of the cut meat. Initial production is planned at 25,000 carcasses per week with a projected doubling of output in the future.

This proposal was advertised in the Winnipeg Free Press on June 5, 1996, and was placed in the Main; Centennial Public Library; and Mb. Eco-Network public registries. The proposal was sent to the Technical Advisory Committee on June 3, 1996. The public and TAC comment closing date was June 19, 1996.

A Stage 1 Licence No. 2202 S1 was issued on June 21, 1996, for the construction only of the development.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

1. Alice Chambers
No affiliation identified.
Pinawa, Manitoba

Ms. Chambers was concerned that the advertisement had been placed in a mid-week edition of the paper and that the response time was shortened to two weeks.

The Director has the discretion to place the advertisement in any edition of a paper and to request any time period of response as deemed appropriate. In this instance, given the nature of the proposal, the staged licencing approach, and the need for construction activities to be approved with a minimum of delay, the above conditions were implemented. The Director replied to Ms. Chambers correspondence.

Ms. Chambers was concerned regarding the lack of information that was included in the initial proposal submission. She wished for more information on plant plans; number of hogs processed; amount and source of water used; amount, quality and disposition of effluent; composition of emissions; amount of traffic; number and type

of jobs created; economic sustainability of the plant; social effects on the neighbourhood; etc

A set of environmental guidelines and a copy of Ms. Chambers' concerns were forwarded to the proponent to assist them in the preparation of a complete Environmental Impact Statement to support the development. This report dated J.M. Schneider Inc. Summary
Page 2 of 4

October 31, 1996, was received and placed in the public registries. The relevant concerns expressed were and are addressed in this report and by Licence No. 2202 S1 and 2202 S2.

Glen Koroluk
No affiliation identified.
Winnipeg, Manitoba

Mr. Koroluk was concerned that the development appeared to be fast-tracked and that the normal environmental review process was not adhered to.

The Director has the discretion to establish any time period of response as deemed appropriate. In this instance, given the nature of the proposal, the staged licencing approach, and the need for construction activities to be approved with a minimum of delay, a suitable time frame period was implemented. . The Director replied to Mr. Koroluk's correspondence.

Mr. Koroluk was concerned about the lack of information in the initial proposal submission. Specifically, the identification and quantification of pollutants released into the water and their socio-economic implications if needed; the environmental management practices to be implemented by the proponent regarding any contaminants and regarding water use conservation; how the proposal was addressing items contained in published documents *Applying Manitoba's Water Policies* and *Applying Manitoba's Capital Region Policies*; and whether the WRAP Act was applicable to this development.

A set of environmental guidelines and a copy of Mr. Koroluk's concerns were forwarded to the proponent to assist them in the preparation of a complete Environmental Impact Statement to support the development. This report dated October 31, 1996, was received and placed in the public registries. The relevant concerns expressed were and are addressed in this report and by Licence No. 2202 S1 and 2202 S2. All relevant legislation applies to this development, including those relevant sections of the WRAP Act.

No other comments were received from the public.

COMMENTS FROM THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

- 1. Manitoba Environment – Air Quality Management** – wish that the initial proposal be more detailed and provide information on the plant processing steps; address the potential for odour and noise emission and give location and distances from the plant to the nearest residences, hospitals, community centres, etc.

The Environmental Impact Statement dated October 31, 1996, and Licence Nos. 2202 S1 and 2202 S2 address relevant concerns expressed.

J.M. Schneider Inc. Summary
Page 3 of 4

- 2. Manitoba Highways & Transportation – Planning and Design** – has no specific concerns with regard to this development.

No response necessary.

- 3. Manitoba Urban Affairs** – has no comment with regard to this development as the proposal is consistent with Plan Winnipeg and the intent of the policies contained within the Capital Region Strategy.

No response necessary.

- 4. Environment Canada – Canadian Environment Review Agency** – has no specific concerns with regard to this development.

No response necessary.

- 5. Manitoba Environment – Water Quality Management** – expressed concerns about no pre-treatment of wastewater prior to discharge to the City of Winnipeg sewage treatment system and are concerned about hog feces and blood being discharged with the wastewater. They are also concerned as to whether the proponent will pay sewer charges and if there is a metered wastewater discharge.

There is no killing or rendering occurring at this facility at this time and therefore the waste water discharges do not contain any of these materials. The proponent will pay sewer fees and the wastewater discharge is metered.

- 6. Manitoba Natural Resources – Policy Coordination Branch** – initially had no specific concerns with regard to this development. They subsequently submitted concerns regarding plant discharges into the combined sewer system will be high in BOD and un-ionized ammonia with potential detrimental effects to aquatic life in the Red River. They also suggested that a groundwater monitoring program be initiated by the proponent to ensure adequate quality of water for food processing.

As no killing operations are occurring, discharges will not be high in BOD or un-ionized ammonia. The City of Winnipeg is planning the establishment of a storm water management pond to be established in this area to accept and control excess amounts of surface water accumulation and prevent or minimize the combined sewer outfall of untreated water to the Red River. The proponent is responsible to meet all of the City of Winnipeg Sewer By-law restrictions and limits. The proponent has an in-house groundwater monitoring program to ensure process water quality.

7. Manitoba Environment – Winnipeg Region Operations – has no specific concerns with regard to this development.

No response necessary.

J.M. Schneider Inc. Summary
Page 4 of 4

No other comments were received from the TAC.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Public hearings were not requested.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

A Stage 1 Licence No. 2202 S1 was issued on June 21, 1996. A draft Stage 2 Licence is attached for the Director's consideration.

Responsibility for enforcement of the Licence should remain with the Approvals Branch until the facility is operational.

PREPARED BY:

Richard Johns
Municipal & Industrial Approvals
April 1, 1997

Telephone: (204) 945-7023
Facsimile: (204) 945-5229
E-mail: rjohns@mb.sypatico.ca