

## **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS**

**PROPOSER:** Town of Ste. Rose du Lac  
**PROPOSAL NAME:** Water Treatment Plant Upgrade – Residuals Disposal

**CLASS OF DEVELOPMENT:** One  
**TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:** Waste Disposal - Water Treatment Plants (Wastewater)  
**CLIENT FILE NO.:** 4576.00

### **OVERVIEW:**

The Proposal was received on November 30, 2000. It was dated July 7, 2000. The advertisement of the proposal was as follows:

“A Proposal has been filed by Cochrane Engineering Ltd. on behalf of the Town of Ste. Rose du Lac for the upgrading of the Town’s water treatment plant. The existing cold lime water treatment process would be replaced by a nanofiltration process. Effluent from the upgraded plant would continue to be discharged to the Turtle River. The effluent would very slightly increase hardness, iron and total dissolved solids in the river. The plant upgrading is scheduled to be constructed in the spring of 2001.”

The Proposal was advertised in the Dauphin Herald on Tuesday, December 19, 2000. It was placed in the Main, Centennial and Dauphin Public Library public registries. The Proposal was distributed to TAC members on December 12, 2000. The closing date for comments from members of the public and TAC members was January 17, 2001.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

No public comments were received.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE:**

**Manitoba Conservation – Park-West Region** The proposal deals adequately with residual disposal from the plant. During winter months there may be a public safety concern as snowmobilers may encounter hazardous conditions in the vicinity of the discharge. Adequate warnings may be required.

Disposition:

This comment can be addressed with a licence condition requiring appropriate signage in the vicinity of the discharge location.

**Manitoba Conservation – Policy Coordination** The reach of the Turtle River immediately adjacent and downstream from the proposed residual water discharge is a critical spawning area for walleye stocks from Dauphin Lake. All reasonable safeguards and conditions should be included in the operational licence to ensure that the existing and future water quality of the river will not be impacted in a detrimental manner.

Disposition:

This comment can be addressed in licence conditions. Water quality monitoring will be required through licence conditions.

**Historic Resources Branch** No concerns.

**Highway Planning Branch** No objections.

**Medical Officer of Health – Parkland Region** There does not appear to be any potential for a negative impact on human health. The proposed plan to take annual samples of the residuals leaving the plant and of the river upstream and downstream to assess water quality is supported.

**Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency** The application of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act with respect to this project will not likely be required. (Environment Canada indicated an interest in participating in the provincial assessment of the proposal.)

**Department of Fisheries and Oceans** No fish or fish habitat concerns under the habitat provisions of the Fisheries Act. Environment Canada will comment on issues dealing with contaminants, including the deposition of deleterious substances, under the pollution provisions of the Fisheries Act.

**Environment Canada (Environmental Protection)** EC has an interest in the project under section 36(3) of the Fisheries Act, and wishes to participate in the provincial review. This is based on concerns about potential impacts of the treatment plant residue on fish and other aquatic species in the Turtle River. There is not sufficient information to substantiate the conclusions on pages 16 and 17 that “In the context of available dilution, the discharge should pose no environmental challenges” or that there will be “no measurable impact on river quality, let alone any impact on the aquatic resources or downstream interests, even at minimal flows.” From Table 5.1, several parameters in the residue will be considerably higher than background river levels

(calcium, hardness, iron, magnesium, sulfate, TDS and TOC). As a result, concentrations of these substances would be expected to be elevated in the outfall area. The table also presumably predicts receiving water quality after complete mixing, which can be misleading, since mixing may not occur for a considerable distance downstream, particularly at low flows. (This would also depend on outfall design.) The report also does not address other possible parameters of concern, such as suspended solids, turbidity, colour and anti-scaling agents. The Fisheries Act does not recognize mixing zones, and requires deposits to fish bearing waters to be non-deleterious at the point of discharge. Therefore, a more thorough assessment should be provided of the potential impacts of the treatment plant residue on fish and other aquatic species, including the undiluted effluent and the river in the immediate vicinity of the outfall and downstream areas. It would also be helpful to include appropriate references for conclusions reached. An assessment should be made of possible cumulative effects on the Turtle River as a result of other developments or discharges in the area. Depending on the assessment results, appropriate mitigation measures or alternate disposal methods may need to be considered to avoid potential Fisheries Act violations or adverse environmental impacts.

**Disposition:**

These comments were forwarded to the Applicant's consultants on January 26, 2001. Additional information to address the comments was requested.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:**

The Applicant's consultants provided comments on the Environment Canada concerns in a letter of February 1, 2001. This information was forwarded to Environment Canada for review. Environment Canada responded on February 14, 2001, indicating that information respecting the impact of the plant residuals on aquatic life in the Turtle River remained unsatisfactory. A monitoring program was suggested if additional information was unavailable. Since no additional information on aquatic impacts is available, a monitoring program is appropriate to address the remaining Environment Canada concerns.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

As no public concerns were identified, a public hearing is not recommended.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

All comments received on the Proposal can be addressed as licence conditions. Therefore, it is recommended that the Development be licensed under The Environment Act subject to the limits, terms and conditions as described on the attached Draft Environment Act Licence. It is further recommended that enforcement of the Licence be assigned to the Park-West Region.

PREPARED BY:

Bruce Webb

Environmental Approvals - Environmental Land Use Approvals

March 1, 2001

Tel: (204) 945-7021

Fax: (204) 945-5229

E-mail: [bwebb@gov.mb.ca](mailto:bwebb@gov.mb.ca)