

## **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS**

**PROPONENT:** Rural Municipality of Victoria Beach  
**PROPOSAL NAME:** Rural Municipality of Victoria Beach Water Treatment Plant

**CLASS OF DEVELOPMENT:** One  
**TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:** Waste Disposal - Water Treatment Plants (Wastewater)

**CLIENT FILE NO.:** 5204.00

### **OVERVIEW:**

The Proposal was received on May 19, 2006. It was dated May 10, 2006. The advertisement of the proposal was as follows:

“A Proposal has been filed by Stantec Consulting Ltd. on behalf of the Rural Municipality of Victoria Beach for the disposal of wastewater from a new water treatment plant at Victoria Beach. The proposed plant is a package installation that would provide flocculation and coagulation followed by chlorination and pH adjustment. The wastewater streams produced by the plant would include clarifier sludge, which would be settled and disposed of in an existing offsite wastewater treatment lagoon, filter backwash water, which would be settled and discharged to Lake Winnipeg, and filtered water produced immediately after filter backwashing, which would be discharged to Lake Winnipeg. Current demand for treated water is approximately 27 litres per second, and the plant would have a capacity of 40 litres per second, accommodating the anticipated demand in 20 years. Construction of the proposed plant is projected to be completed by May, 2007. Operation of the plant would occur from mid May to mid October each year.”

The Proposal was advertised in the Victoria Beach Herald on Friday, August 11, 2006. It was placed in the Main, Eco-Network, Winnipeg Public Library and Selkirk-St. Andrews Regional Library public registries. The Proposal was distributed to TAC members on July 31, 2006. The closing date for comments from members of the public and TAC members was September 5, 2006.

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

**Joan and John Merton:** As property owners and permanent residents in the Municipality of Victoria Beach, we wish to formally voice our objection to the proposal for the new water plant.

When we purchased the property at 11 Anderson Bay in 1999, we drilled a well because water is only available from the end of May until the first week of October. While we do have a water hook up on our property we use our own water exclusively and are definitely not reliant on the municipal water. We also own the adjacent lot and are expected to pay the surcharge for that lot as well.

We have always just paid the water fee each year because \$85.00 a year is not a huge sum. However with two properties, our contribution to this new water plant will be probably in the neighbourhood of \$8000.00. We do not think we should have to pay that sum of money so that property owners, mostly inside the gated community can have water for about 4 months of the year. Water is not supplied in the winter to anyone. Most of these cottage owners use their cottage for two weeks in the summer and then rent the building for up to \$1000.00 a week for the rest of the summer.

We do not understand why we should have to pay for the cost of infrastructure that we will not benefit from. We have spoken to other property owners who have wells and they feel the same way. We realize that our objection is not on environmental grounds but we wish to have our objection on record. We also accept the fact that the summer people need clean water and do not have an objection to that, we just don't understand why we should have to pay for it.

Disposition:

This comment concerns financing for the project. A copy of the comments was provided to the proponent for information.

**Terry and Dianne Boyce:** This letter represents a number of concerns that my wife, myself, and various other local cottage property owners have expressed this summer about the proposed water plant. The concerns are regarding discharge water quality, air quality, traffic, and noise pollution.

Initially this letter was in response to the "Notice of Environment Act Proposal" that appeared on Page 5 of the August 11, 2006 edition of the V.B. Herald. As there are "other issues" about the plant that are not specifically related to the "water discharge items", we will deal with them further along in this letter.

Water Plant Wastewater Streams Concerns:

- Clarify sludge issues: How much sludge is produced?  
How is it to be disposed of?  
How often will it need to be removed from the plant?  
How much odour is created by this material and the removal process?  
What will be the ensuing air and noise pollution from the disposal process?  
Will there be any other pollution to the area (ground or water) should an accidental spillage occur?

What plans are in place to handle an accidental discharge to the environment?

- Fltrd bkwsch water: This water is to be settled, then discharged via the backwash process to Lake Winnipeg. We are concerned with a possible build up of discharge materials in and around the pumphouse and our recreational use area(s). The lake is already sorely polluted, will we be adding to the problem?  
How exactly will the water be discharged in to the lake and how will this impact water quality in the area(s) around the pumphouse beaches.  
Will this water pose a source of contamination via concentrated salts, minerals, etc, to the lake?  
Where will the discharge outlet be located?  
Do we have a guarantee to not further pollute the lake?

#### Other Issues and Proposals:

- Traffic to the Pumphouse: Currently there are municipal vehicles, fire trucks, service vehicles and water hauling business trucks accessing the pumphouse area.. The current noise, exhaust and road dust pollution that is created by all these vehicles is sometimes excessive. Once the plant construction is started the traffic flow will be greatly increased and will add to the noise, air, and dust pollution we are currently experiencing. The current water hauling business (Larry Ateah Truck & Trailer) makes daily trips (sometimes 7-8 per day) which is sometimes annoying for many in the area. What happens when more people start using the new pumphouse to get pottable water? How will the traffic be regulated in the area? We can anticipate more cistern systems to be installed in the future and likely an increase in water hauling traffic as a result. Perhaps an alternate route of travel, one that will be more direct to the pumphouse and impact less negatively on people along 8<sup>th</sup> Ave., could and should be considered.

#### Proposed New Pumphouse Access Route:

Many people on 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue that we have spoken to throughout the summer are rather unhappy with the traffic on this street. The many service vehicles are of concern. People would like to see less traffic. Current and expected future traffic flow to the pumphouse area for water has been mentioned regularly. This is a very real concern for many.

We would like to propose a new route to the pumphouse to be considered for both the construction phase as well as for future general access. This access road could also be used as an alternate route for commercial and emergency vehicles. Both proposed new route(s) would provide access via McCawley Road.

There are only approximately 8-10 cottages along this McCawley route versus the approximate 115-120 cottages along 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue route. Fewer people along McCawley Road will experience some increase in traffic flow which would probably be tolerable. Currently, vehicles have to travel approximately 1.6 km or 1 mile down 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue (all gravel) from the gate of VB to the pump house. As

you can see in the attached maps, the new route(s) in yellow proposed will mean the development of a .78 km or .3 km extension of the gravel road along McCawley Rd. West. All service vehicles, emergency vehicles and water hauling businesses could use this route. The road could be gated where appropriate. The new route(s) would provide faster and safer access to the pump house as Hwy 504 is paved and would allow for 70 kph vs 20 kph. This would be especially beneficial for fire emergency vehicles as it will also allow an alternate access route to the North and East areas of RMVB.

We would very much appreciate if these concerns and proposals are given consideration by all members of the council ASAP. Would you please try to do this prior to the September 20<sup>th</sup> council meeting? We would also appreciate a written response that effectively addresses each of the concerns and proposals presented in this letter ASAP. Thank you.

Disposition: Additional information was requested to address the comments relating to the wastewater from the water treatment plant. Comments relating to traffic and access were forwarded to the proponent for information.

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

**Manitoba Conservation – Sustainable Resource Management** No concerns.

**Manitoba Water Stewardship** The Water Quality Management Section is concerned with any discharges that have the potential to impact the aquatic environment and/or restrict present and future uses of the water. Based on the information provided by the proponent, it is difficult to evaluate the potential impact of the discharges on Lake Winnipeg. It would be helpful to have estimates of the total volume of 1) the filter backwash and 2) the filter-to-waste water discharged into Lake Winnipeg over the period of one year. For each of the two wastewater streams, water quality data for TSS, TDS, pH, alkalinity, and hardness would be helpful. Ideally, the proponent would estimate the maximum, minimum and average concentrations of these parameters expected within the wastewater.

It is also recommended that the license require the proponent to actively participate in any future watershed based management study, plan/or nutrient reduction program, approved by the Director, for Lake Winnipeg.

There is a bait block fishery in proximity to the proposed location but it is unclear how active the fishery is at this time. Intake pipe screening requirements for juvenile fish and shoreline stabilization in addition to any other fish habitat issues related to this proposal must be referred to DFO.

- The discharge waste stream quality could be included with the proposal.

- Sections VIII) b and IX) b suggest that there will be no significant impacts from the proposed effluent discharge. It is unclear whether the consultant is proposing any monitoring methods to ensure the above.
- Locations of the raw water intake and the effluent discharge are very important and should be identified clearly. These locations should be such that treated water quality is not compromised.
- The consultant has noted that Victoria Beach does not have a Water Rights License but the proponent will be submitting an application for one.

Disposition:

Additional information was requested to address several of these comments. The remaining comments can be addressed through licence conditions.

**Historic Resources Branch**

No concerns.

**Community Planning Services Branch**

No concerns or objections.

**Medical Officer of Health – North Eastman RHA**

I have reviewed the proposal.

I encourage and support the idea; however I had a few comments:

- (1) Will the operator be trained and certified?
- (2) What plan is in place for cleaning up the system upon start up at the beginning of the season to ensure the distribution of safe and portable water?

Disposition: The first comment can be addressed through a licence condition. Additional information was requested to address the second comment.

**Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency**

I have undertaken a survey of federal departments with respect to determining interest in the project noted. I can confirm that the project information that was provided has been reviewed by all federal departments with a potential interest. I am enclosing copies of the relevant responses for your file.

Based on the responses to the federal survey, I have not yet been able to determine whether the application of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act will be required for this project. DFO requires a description of anticipated effects on aquatic species at risk, e.g. Lake Winnipeg Physa and silver chubb before it can determine whether an environmental assessment (EA) under the CEAA will be required. Please ask the proponent to forward this information directly to DFO for review.

In addition, Transport Canada indicated that it requires an Application for an Approval under the Navigable Waters Protection Act before it can determine whether an EA is required under the CEAA. The proponent should contact the Prairie and Northern Region office of Transport Canada at (780) 495-3701 for a copy of the Application and further advice.

Please note that both DFO and Transport Canada possess specialist knowledge that may assist in the provincial review. Please include DFO in the provincial process as requested.

Environment Canada raised a number of issues in its August 28, 2006 letter to Ms. Tracey Braun. A copy of this letter is attached for your convenience.

Finally, Health Canada indicated that specific health related advice is available from that department on request.

**Environment Canada** Environment Canada (EC) received a copy of the above proposed project on August 9, 2006 from the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency for review. EC would like to participate in the provincial review of the proposed project consistent with the intent of Clause 59 of the expired and Clause 61 of the proposed new Canada – Manitoba Agreement on Environmental Assessment Cooperation. Environment Canada has reviewed the above project description proposed by RM of Victoria Beach for the construction of a water treatment plant. EC provides the following comment:

EC has concerns with the direct disposal of water treatment plant residues into surface waters, though supports the use of settling tank for the removal of sludge and other solids. However, the report did not indicate how it will monitor the supernatant before discharge. It only stated holding time of a minimum of three hours without actually indicating how long the filter-backwash will be held in the settling tanks before discharge. EC is also concerned that the rinse-to-waste stream though not chlorinated will be discharged directly to Lake Winnipeg via the existing culvert at the shoreline, because it is anticipated that it will also contain some amounts of TSS.

The report section vi, also notes that “effluent quality can be monitored from the end of the culvert to confirm that the proper settling is achieved.” The report merely said that it “can” be monitored without stating that it “will” be monitored. The proponent should indicate clearly whether the effluent will be monitored or not.

The proposed potential monitoring location does not give the proponent much control to re-treat the effluent, should it not be properly treated. EC suggests that the proponent institute a monitoring program that will allow the effluent quality to be monitored before discharge into the culvert/Lake Winnipeg. With the nutrient loading of Lake Winnipeg being an issue, it is important that the discharge water not contribute any more substances into the Lake.

EC notes that there is no discussion of short term, long term and cumulative aspects of discharge into Lake Winnipeg, for example, in the context of any overall water quality of Lake Winnipeg.

The proponent should also be aware that, the Fisheries Act does not recognize mixing zones, and requires deposits to fish-bearing waters to be non-deleterious at the point of discharge.

If flushing of water lines and other areas of the distribution system with chlorinated water is to be done prior to commissioning of the system, the chlorinated water should not be directed to surface waters unless the residual chlorine is non-detectable. Chlorine is toxic to fish and other aquatic species at very low concentrations.

Disposition:

Many of these comments can be addressed as licence conditions.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:** Additional information to address the comments received was requested on October 11, 2006. A response to the request dated November 29, 2006 was received on November 30, 2006. This response is attached.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

As no public requests for a hearing were filed, a public hearing is not recommended.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Comments received on the Proposal have been addressed in the additional information, or can be addressed through licence conditions. 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 Interlake Region.

PREPARED BY:

---

Bruce Webb, P. Eng.

Environmental Assessment and Licensing – Environmental Land Use Section

October 10, 2006 Updated December 6, 2006

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