

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

PROPONENT: Municipality of Glenboro-South Cypress
PROPOSAL NAME: Glenboro Wastewater Treatment Lagoon Upgrade
CLASS OF DEVELOPMENT: 2
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT: Wastewater Treatment Lagoon
CLIENT FILE NO.: 178.30

OVERVIEW

The proposal was received on December 2, 2019. It was dated November 29, 2019. The advertisement of the proposal was as follows:

“The Municipality of Glenboro-South Cypress has filed a proposal for upgrading the primary cell of the existing lagoon with aeration equipment, raising up the perimeter of the existing primary cell berm, and constructing two Submerged Attached Growth Reactor cells, an aeration building, two baffle curtains in the existing primary lagoon cell, an alum dosing system, and potentially a UV disinfection system on portions of NW 10-7-14 WPM. The existing secondary cell will be decommissioned. The treated effluent will be continuously discharged into the Assiniboine River using an outfall via an approximately 6 km long buried forcemain. The forcemain piping will be located within the following municipal road right-of-ways: SE 16-7-14 WPM, NE 16-7-14 WPM, SE 21-7-14 WPM, NE 21-7-14 WPM, SE 28-7-14 WPM, NE 28-7-14 WPM, and NW 28-7-14 WPM.”

The proposal was advertised in the Baldur-Glenboro Gazette on April 16, 2020. It was placed in the public registry at www.gov.mb.ca/sd/eal/registries/178.30glenborosouthcypress/index.html

The proposal was distributed to Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members on April 20, 2020.

The closing date for comments from members of the public was May 14, 2020 and for TAC members was May 20, 2020.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Lynne and Allan Bartram

We own land that is along the path the waste water will be piped by. What measures are going to be taken if the pipe bursts, if that happens it will contaminate the water we use for drinking and our animals, as our well is not far from the road. And if you move it one mile west it would go down a blind road and no one lives along it. There is five families that live along the road you want to put the pipe down.

Disposition:

The pipeline route appears to have been chosen for accessibility for construction. Even though it is a developed road allowance, there are species concerns, which would be greater along an undeveloped road allowance. The likelihood of forcemain leaks is very low, and the effluent would meet surface discharge criteria.

COMMENTS FROM THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) responses are summarized in Table 1 below. Substantive comments and their dispositions follow the table. TAC comments are provided in full in the public registries.

Table 1 Glenboro Wastewater Treatment Lagoon Upgrade
Technical Advisory Committee Comments

No	Technical Advisory Committee Member	Response Provided
1	Manitoba Conservation and Climate	
	Environmental Approvals:	
	Water Power Licensing program	No concerns
	Air Quality Management	No response
	Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Branch	May 5, 2020
	Office of Drinking Water	No concerns
	Waste Diversion and Recycling program	No comments
	Drainage and Water Use Licensing Branch:	No concerns
	Climate Change and Clean Technology	No response
	Parks and Protected Spaces Branch	No comments/concerns
2	Manitoba Agriculture and Resource Development	
	Wildlife and Fisheries Branch (wildlife)	May 5, 2020
	Wildlife and Fisheries Branch (fisheries)	No response
	Forestry Branch	No concerns
	Lands Branch	No response
	Regional Land Manager / Integrated Resource Management Team	No response
	Water Branch:	
	Water Quality Management Section	May 21, 2020
	Groundwater Management Section	No response
	Mines program	No response
	Petroleum program	No response
3	Manitoba Sport, Culture, and Heritage – Historic Resources Branch	May 5, 2020
4	Manitoba Municipal Relations:	
	Community and Regional Planning Branch	No concerns
	Inspection and Technical Services Branch	April 21, 2020
5	Manitoba Infrastructure – Highway Planning and Design Branch, Environmental Services	May 12, 2020
6	Manitoba Health, Seniors and Active Living – Environmental Health Unit	No response
7	Impact Assessment Agency of Canada	No response

Conservation and Climate – Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Branch

What data was used to support the statement that the volume of truck hauled loading was determined to be insignificant?

Disposition:

Additional information was requested to address this comment.

Agriculture and Resource Management – Wildlife and Fisheries Branch (Wildlife)

We request clarification on what side of Road 81W the force main will follow. Appendix A appears to show it following the east side of the road allowance, while the text suggest that it is adjacent to SE-21-007-14W1 (west of road).

Regardless of which side of the right of way the force main is placed on, the proposed project is routed across patches of hairy-prairie clover, listed as Threatened under the Endangered Species and Ecosystems Act. This species occurs within the road right of way, and impacts are not mitigated by limiting activity to within the previously disturbed ditch area. There is also a risk to disturbing or destroying prairie skink, listed as Endangered under The Endangered Species and Ecosystems Act and the federal Species At Risk Act, as this species has been observed immediately east of the right of way. Potential conflicts occur along Road 81W, within an ~100 metre stretch between SE-21-007-14W1 and SW-22-007-14W1, directly east of the golf course.

We request that directional boring be used within this ~100 metre stretch of right of way to prevent negative impacts to species protected under The Endangered Species and Ecosystems Act and Species at Risk Act. We appreciate that the proponent will “install force main via plow method or directional drilling to reduce soil disturbance as compared to excavating” to limit ground and vegetation disturbance across the project as a whole, however these species may still be impacted by the plow method. The Wildlife and Fisheries Branch should be contacted for more information, and an adequate mitigation plan should be developed for this portion of the route.

Disposition:

These comments were provided to the project consultant, and contact with the branch was suggested. These comments were addressed in additional information discussed below.

Agriculture and Resource Management – Water Management Branch, Water Quality Management

- The following effluent standards must be applied to the Village of Glenboro wastewater treatment lagoon as per the Manitoba Water Quality Standards, Objectives and Guidelines Regulation (196/2011):
 - BOD5 25 mg/L,
 - TSS 25 mg/L,
 - Fecal Coliforms or *Escherichia coli* 200 organisms / 100mL,
 - <1 mg/L Total Phosphorous.
- The proposal indicates an estimated 20 year discharge expected from Glenboro Lagoon is approximately 300 m³/day or 0.00347 m³/sec (pdf page 25). It is requested that the proponent provide the anticipated effluent characteristics in table format provided below

for the development of a site specific total ammonia limit for a continuously discharging facility.

Month	Maximum Day Flow (m ³ /S)	Maximum Weekly Average Flow (m ³ /S)	Maximum Monthly Average Flow (m ³ /S)	Maximum Day Total Ammonia as N (mg/L)	Maximum Weekly Average Total Ammonia as N (mg/L)	Maximum Monthly Average Total Ammonia as N (mg/L)
January						
February						
March						
April						
May						
June						
July						
August						
September						
October						
November						
December						

- 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. Therefore it is 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.

Disposition:

Some of these comments can be addressed through licence conditions. Additional information was requested concerning ammonia.

Sport, Culture, and Heritage – Historic Resources Branch

The Archaeological Assessment Services Unit (AASU) has finished its review of the Glenboro Wastewater Treatment Lagoon (File 178.30) for heritage resources.

We do not have concerns regarding the construction of the lagoons in NW-10-7-14-W1, however, we do have heritage concerns regarding the construction of the 6 km force main pipeline. The current proposed route passes through areas with intact sand dunes, as well as intersecting with the Assiniboine River valley. There are numerous archaeological sites in the immediate area, including documented fur trade forts, Precontact Indigenous settlements, historic cart trails, and human burials.

The proposal indicates that the plans for the pipeline, the maintenance pad, and the outflow have not been finalized. We request that when you have received these plans (including any temporary work spaces required), that you forward the footprint to the Historic Resource Branch so that we can conduct a review of the development against heritage resources. As the current plans stand, we will require a heritage resource impact assessment (HRIA) for the 6 km force main pipeline.

Under Section 12(2) of The Heritage Resources Act, if the Minister of Sport, Culture and Heritage has reason to believe that heritage resources or human remains are known, or thought likely to be present, on lands that are to be developed, then the owner/developer is required to conduct at his/her own expense, a heritage resource impact assessment (HRIA) and mitigation, if necessary, prior to the project's start.

The developer must contract a qualified archaeological consultant to conduct a Heritage Resources Impact assessment (HRIA) of the proposed development location, in order to identify and assess any heritage resources that may be negatively impacted by development. If desirable, the Branch will work with the developer/land owners and its consultant to draw up terms of reference for this project.

Disposition:

These comments were provided to the consultant for information and follow-up. They can also be addressed through a licence condition.

Municipal Relations – Inspection and Technical Services

The ITSM recommends that:

- the applicant obtain the required building and occupancy permits from the authority having jurisdiction for any new buildings and the alteration, reconstruction, demolition, removal, relocation, and occupancy of all existing buildings, and
- an emergency plan be filed and approved by the local fire department prior to occupancy in accordance with the Manitoba Fire Code.

Disposition:

These comments were provided to the consultant for information, and can be addressed in a licence condition.

Manitoba Infrastructure – Highway Planning and Design Branch, Environmental Services Section

The proposed project does not appear to encroach into the 38.1m (125 feet) control area along PTH 2. If a need should arise that work(s) will occur within the PTH 2 control area, the proponent should be informed that, under the Transportation Infrastructure Act, any new, modified or relocated access connection onto a PTH will require a permit from Manitoba Infrastructure. A permit may also be required for:

- a. Any construction (above or below ground level) within 38.1 m (125 ft);
- b. Any plantings within 15.2 m (50 ft) from the edge of the right of way of PTH 2.
- c. Discharge of water or other liquid materials into the ditch PTH 2.

Permit applications (online or by mail) and requirement information can be obtained at the following link: <https://www.gov.mb.ca/mit/hpd/permits.html>

2. The proposed pipeline to be installed along the Road Allowance and heading north crossing under PTH 2 Right-of-Way, will require a permission/agreement from MI for the work within the PTH 2 Right-of-way.

Permission/agreement applications (online or by mail) and requirement information for utilities within Manitoba Infrastructure Right-of-Way can be obtained at the following link: <https://www.gov.mb.ca/mit/hpd/utilities.html>

Should you have any questions regarding the comments above, please contact Brian Hickman, Regional Planning Technologist at Brian.Hickman@gov.mb.ca

Disposition:

This information was provided to the consultant.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Additional information was requested to address Technical Advisory Committee comments on June 1, 2020. A response dated June 21, 2020 was received on June 22, 2020. The request and response are posted on the public registry. The response allows remaining items to be addressed through licence conditions.

PUBLIC HEARING

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

CROWN-INDIGENOUS CONSULTATION

The Government of Manitoba recognizes it has a duty to consult in a meaningful way with Indigenous communities when any proposed provincial law, regulation, decision or action may infringe upon or adversely affect the exercise of the Indigenous rights of that community.

The proposal involves the upgrading of an existing wastewater treatment lagoon at the same site, with improved treatment. As resource use would not be affected, Crown-Indigenous consultation would not be required for the project.

RECOMMENDATION

Comments received have been addressed through additional information, by providing information to the proponent and 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. Administration of the licence should be assigned to the western region of the Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Branch.

Prepared by:

Bruce Webb, P. Eng.
Senior Environmental Engineer
Land Use, Waste Management and Energy Section
for Industrial and Wastewater Section

October 18, 2021

Telephone: 204-945-7021

E-mail: Bruce.Webb@gov.mb.ca