SUMMARY OF COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS

PROPOONENT: Inovatech Egg Products Inc.
PROPOSAL NAME: Inovatech Egg Products Inc.
CLASS OF DEVELOPMENT: CLASS 1
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT: Food Processing Plant
CLIENT FILE NO: 4902.00

OVERVIEW:

A proposal was filed January 29, 2003, by Dr. Dinko Tuhtar of BOMA Environmental & Safety Inc., on behalf of Inovatech Egg Products Inc. for the continued operation of a plant to process eggs located at 70 Irene Street in the City of Winnipeg.

This facility processes fresh eggs into dry egg whites; frozen and liquid whole eggs and yolks; dried whole eggs and yolks; lysozyme; and egg shells. Defective eggs are dehydrated and sold as animal food. There is a potential for emissions of particulate matter, noise and odour. Normal operation is 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.

The Department provided the Technical Advisory Committee with information on the Proposal and made public notification in the Winnipeg Free Press. The closing date for comments was March 17, 2003. The following summarizes the responses:

RELEVANT COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

No public comments were received.

RELEVANT COMMENTS FROM THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

1. **Manitoba Culture, Heritage & Citizenship - Historical Resources Branch** - did not comment.
   
   *No response necessary.*
   
   Disposition: No action needed.

2. **Manitoba Industry, Trade and Mines - Petroleum Branch** - did not comment.
   
   *No response necessary.*
   
   Disposition: No action needed.

   
   *No response necessary.*
   
   Disposition: No action needed.
4. **Manitoba Agriculture & Food** - has no concerns.

   *No response necessary.*

   Disposition: No action needed.

5. **Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs** - did not comment.

   *No response necessary.*

   Disposition: No action needed.

6. **Manitoba Conservation - Sustainable Resource Management Branch** - has the following comments:

   1) More details on the air pollution equipment on the egg white dryer are needed.

      *The proponent provided additional information.*

      Disposition: The commentor was satisfied with the response.

   2) Emission rates were said to be estimated using an engineering approach and a mass balance calculation. How does this estimated emission rate compare with 1g/s?

      *The proponent provided additional information.*

      Disposition: The commentor was satisfied with the response.

   3) Background concentrations should be the maximum 1-hour and 24-hour averages.

      *The proponent acknowledged the point.*

      Disposition: The commentor was satisfied with the response.

   4) The odour nuisance clause should be included in the Licence.

      *The odour nuisance clause will be included.*

      Disposition: No further action needed.

   5) Is any information available on PM10 and PM2.5 for this facility?

      *The proponent provided there was none.*

      Disposition: The commentor was satisfied with the response.

7. **Canadian Environment Assessment Agency** - comment that the application of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* with respect to this project will not be required.

   *No response necessary.*

   Disposition: No further action needed.
8. **Manitoba Transportation and Government Services - Highway Planning and Design** - has no concerns regarding this development.

   *No response necessary.*

   Disposition: No action needed.

9. **Manitoba Health - Public Health Branch - Environmental Health Unit - Winnipeg Regional Health Authority** - responded that there were no apparent areas of concern.

   *No response necessary.*

   Disposition: No action needed.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

There were no requests for public hearings.

**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 should be transferred to the Region.

PREPARED BY:

Richard Johns
Municipal & Industrial Approvals
May 29, 2003

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