

## **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS**

**PROPONENT:** City of Winnipeg – Winnipeg Hydro  
**PROPOSAL NAME:** Pointe du Bois Water Treatment Plant Upgrade  
**CLASS OF DEVELOPMENT:** One  
**TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:** Waste Disposal - Water Treatment Plants  
(Wastewater)  
**CLIENT FILE NO.:** 4610.00

### **OVERVIEW:**

The Proposal was received on March 9, 2001. It was dated February 23, 2001. The advertisement of the proposal was as follows:

“A Proposal has been filed by Wardrop Engineering on behalf of Winnipeg Hydro for the construction and operation of upgraded water treatment equipment for the community of Pointe du Bois. The new water treatment facilities would consist of a package coagulation/filtration plant, along with some storage for treated water. The existing chlorination and distribution systems would continue to be used with minor modifications. A small amount of backwash water and treatment plant residuals would be discharged into the Winnipeg River. Installation of the new equipment is scheduled for the spring of 2001.”

The Proposal was advertised in the Lac du Bonnet Leader on Monday, March 26, 2001. It was placed in the Main, Centennial and Bibliotheque Allard (St. Georges) public registries. The Proposal was distributed to TAC members on March 19, 2001. The closing date for comments from members of the public and TAC members was April 19, 2001.

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

No written public comments were received. Ted Ferens of the Whiteshell District Association reviewed the Proposal and suggested verbally that the Proponent ensure that provisions be made to prevent the movement of spilled diesel fuel from nearby storage tanks to the water treatment plant facility. This suggestion can be addressed as a licence condition.

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

**Water Quality Management** - No mention is made of the accumulative effects of polyaluminum chloride (PAC) on organisms in receiving waters and sediment. The proposal identifies that effluent will not be continuous, but discharged in intervals. These intervals will have a greater concentration of PAC than the estimated average. Since

information regarding the environmental implications of PAC is sparse, it is recommended that the proponent not be allowed to use PAC as a coagulant, and investigate other coagulants. Chlorinated water must not be directed towards the Winnipeg River.

...2

Disposition:

The Proponent's consultant was asked to consider an alternate coagulant, or to provide documentation concerning the impacts of PAC. As this comment was received after the draft licence was circulated, it was agreed with the consultant to resolve this matter after the finalization of the licence. The choice of a coagulant does not affect the treatment process. A review of the process diagram for the proposed facility indicates that superchlorinated backwash water would not be discharged to the Winnipeg River. Maximum concentrations of chlorine in the backwash water would be a fraction of the chlorine level in the treated plant water, so no special provisions are needed to limit the discharge of chlorinated effluent from the plant.

**Sustainable Resource Management** - Wastewater from the water treatment plant process is to be discharged directly to the Winnipeg River. Although the average daily discharge is small relative to the flow of the river the actual pattern of discharge is not described. Insufficient information is provided to determine whether this discharge would be detrimental to the fisheries resource of the river. Has the proponent considered discharge of the wastewater through the Pointe du Bois sewage system?

Disposition:

The Proposal provides only a daily average wastewater flow rate. Typically, backwashing is done once daily, for a period of perhaps one hour. This would generate a wastewater flow of 3.1 l/s. As average Winnipeg River flow is 845 m<sup>3</sup>/s, an instantaneous dilution of 273,000:1 would be obtained. Discharge of process wastewater into the sewage system was considered and rejected due to the high hydraulic loading and weak wastewater loading imposed by the water treatment plant effluent.

**Historic Resources Branch** - No concerns.

**Highway Planning Branch** - No concerns.

**Community Planning Services** - No concerns.

**Provincial Planning Services** - No concerns.

**Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency** - The application of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act with respect to this project will not be required. Health Canada, Environment Canada and Natural Resources Canada would be able to provide

specialist advice if requested. (No federal departments provided comments on the proposal or indicated an interest in participating in the provincial assessment of the proposal.)

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

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

...3

**RECOMMENDATION:**

No comments received on the Proposal required additional information. 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 Eastern Region.

**PREPARED BY:**

Bruce Webb  
Environmental Approvals  
Environmental Land Use Approvals  
April 26, 2001 (updated May 8, 2001)

Tel: (204) 945-7021  
Fax: (204) 945-5229  
E-mail: bwebb@gov.mb.ca