SUMMARY OF COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS

PROPOSED BY: Terry L. Rothenbuehler

PROPOSAL NAME: Schweitzer Mauduit Canada Inc.

CLASS OF DEVELOPMENT: CLASS 1

TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT: Manufacturing

CLIENT FILE NO: 4676.00

OVERVIEW:
A proposal has been filed by Mr. Ron Giercke of MESH Technologies Inc. on behalf of Mr. Terry Rothenbeuhler of Schweitzer Mauduit Canada Inc. for the construction and operation of a manufacturing development located at the NE ¼ 17-6-4 WPM excepting thereout: Plan 27621 MLTO, and the Sly 209 feet perp of the Wly 209 feet perp; and at Lots 1, 2, and 3 Plan 27621 MLTO in the NE ¼ 17-6-4 WPM, near Carman in the Rural Municipality of Dufferin. The development involves the mechanical processing of flax straw to produce fibre which is to be exported and used in the production of paper. Production processes involve the mechanical extraction (decortication) of the outer fibre from the straw creating a mixture called tow which is comprised principally of linen fibre mixed with some shive (the inner core material). This tow is baled and exported. The remaining core material is contained and sold as agricultural bedding or soil enhancer. There is an air emission control device to treat emissions from the decortication process. There is a potential for emissions of particulate matter and noise. Initial operation is 24 hours per day, 5 days per week. Proposed operation is 24 hours per day, 7 days per week within 2-4 years. The facility will not operate for 2 months per year on average due to maintenance and poor weather conditions.

The Department provided the Technical Advisory Committee with information on the Proposal and made public notification in the Carman Valley Leader. The following summarizes the responses:

RELEVANT COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC
One citizen, represented by Selby & Jones, Barristers and Solicitors, submitted concerns regarding the traffic flow, the dust, the noise, the fire safety, and the loss in property value related to the development.

The comments were forwarded to the proponent for response. The responses were sent to the commentor. The citizen still has concerns regarding the development.

Disposition: Those concerns raised which are environmentally related have been addressed in the Draft licence.

RELEVANT COMMENTS FROM THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

1. Manitoba Culture, Heritage & Tourism – Historic Resources – has no concerns.

No response necessary.

Disposition: No action needed.

   *No response necessary.*

   Disposition: No action needed.

3. **Manitoba Industry, Trade and Mines – Petroleum Branch** – has no comments or concerns.

   *No response necessary.*

   Disposition: No action needed.

4. **Environment Canada – Canadian Environment Review Agency** – responded that the application of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* with respect to this project will not be required.

   *No response necessary.*

   Disposition: No action needed.

5. **Manitoba Conservation – Policy Coordination Branch** – forwarded the following comments:

   a) any flax shive returned to soil be incorporated into the soil as soon as possible;
   b) it would be helpful to estimate the reduction in greenhouse gases due to processing of the flax straw rather than burning in the fields; and
   c) are there other residences within 5 km of the proposed plant

   *The comments were forwarded to the proponent for response. The responses were sent to the commentor. The member, although still wishing information regarding item b) and c) above, was satisfied with the responses and had no further concerns.*

   Disposition: No further action needed.

6. **Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs – Community Planning Services** – recommend that the proponent obtain a Conditional Use approval from the Rural Municipality of Dufferin.

   *No response necessary.*

   Disposition: No action needed.

7. **Manitoba Conservation – Environmental Operations Division – Red River Region** – has the following comments:

   a) no concerns;
   b) Schweitzer Mauduit has been operating at this location as a mobile operation;
   c) PSDS must be registered with the Regional office; and
   d) they wish to review the Draft Licence.

   *No response necessary.*

   Disposition: No action needed.
8. **Manitoba Agriculture – Soils and Crops - Soil Resource Section** – did not respond.

   *No response necessary.*

   Disposition: No action needed.

9. **Manitoba Highways and Transportation - Highway Planning and Design** – has no objections as the proposal is located away from the provincial highway system.

   *No response necessary.*

   Disposition: No action needed.

10. **Manitoba Health - Public Health - Environmental Unit** – is concerned with:

    a) adequate protection against fires; and
    b) rodent control to minimize risk to workers as well as neighbouring homes.

    *The comments were forwarded to the proponent for response. The responses were sent to the commentor. The member was satisfied with the responses.*

    Disposition: No further action needed.

11. **Manitoba Labour - Workplace Safety and Health Division** – did not respond.

    *No response necessary.*

    Disposition: No action needed.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

Public hearings were not requested nor convened.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

A Licence considering the above relevant concerns as well as those of the Approvals Branch be prepared and issued. Responsibility for enforcement of the Licence may be transferred to the Region upon the facility being completed and operated to the satisfaction of the Approvals Branch.

**PREPARED BY:**

Richard Johns
Municipal, Industrial & Hazardous Waste Approvals
October 23, 2001

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