

Public Comments -
Town of Beausejour Water Supply
System

Part 1 (29 pages)

No.	Name	Email Date
1	Robert Borsa	04-Jul-20
2	Kelsey Kanatan Wavey	04-Jul-20
3	Marielle Audet	04-Jul-20
4	Lindy Clubb	04-Jul-20
5	Hayden c-wood	04-Jul-20
6	Jessica Clems	04-Jul-20
7	Dave Crabb	04-Jul-20
8	Michael Anderson	04-Jul-20
9	Dan Swain	05-Jul-20
10	Max Dupas	05-Jul-20
11	Stephen Johnston	05-Jul-20
12	Cathe and Ed Bond	04-Jul-20
13	Keris Goulet	05-Jul-20
14	Ashley Wolfe	05-Jul-20
15	Liana Bonikowsky	05-Jul-20
16	Mae Gobel	05-Jul-20
17	Sheri Charles	05-Jul-20
18	Shania Joyal	06-Jul-20
19	Pat Palanuk	06-Jul-20
20	Dusty Molinski	06-Jul-20
21	Emily Jane King	07-Jul-20
22	Ross Humble	07-Jul-20
23	Tristen Foy	08-Jul-20
24	Chelsea Pastula	10-Jul-20
25	Jimmy James	13-Jul-20
26	Scott Maxwell	13-Jul-20
27	Jack Kowalchuk	13-Jul-20
28	Jean and Frank Stobbe	14-Jul-20
29	Brian Begal	14-Jul-20
30	Dave Dupuis	15-Jul-20
31	Janice Brolly and Robert Wood	17-Jul-20
32	Laurel McArthur	18-Jul-20
33	Debra Kelly	19-Jul-20
34	Al Tymko	22-Jul-20
35	Kirk Dyson and Connie Wenzoski	22-Jul-20
36	Ken Nelson	22-Jul-20
37	Henry and Ellen Kliewer	23-Jul-20
38	RM of Brokenhead	23-Jul-20
39	Michael Murray	23-Jul-20
40	Sue Murray	23-Jul-20

41	Sean Michaels	24-Jul-20
42	Samantha Braun	24-Jul-20
43	Philip Spevack	24-Jul-20
44	Rachelle Angott	24-Jul-20
45	E. Pip	25-Jul-20 (Detailed Comments in Part 2)
46	Donna and Tony Teunis	25-Jul-20
47	Brian and Neila Ryall	25-Jul-20
48	Sandra Cote	25-Jul-20
49	Claudette Badiou	30-Jul-20

Beausejour Water Supply System – Public Comments

I am a concerned citizen who lives on the banks of the Brokenhead River. I have two questions:

Will there be an official environmental impact study done that will be accessible to the public?

What is your definition of water concentrate in layman's terms? Is it actual sewage that has been ground down to a stream of fluid that has no solid component?

As you can imagine, I am very concerned with the environmental impact of such a proposal if it has any impact on ecosystems that it is being emptied into. I would very much like to see an official study done so the public is fully informed. Especially those that could be directly impacted such as myself. I fish from the Brokenhead, swim in the river, canoe down its pristine banks. I STRONGLY OBJECT to any effluent that flows into this river. If this is not the case then I would like to learn more about the process and its impacts to same.

Robert Borsa

I am a young Cree artist from Winnipeg currently living on the unceded territories of the Musqueam people, colonially known as Vancouver.

I'm writing to let you know I was appalled to see the city of Beausejour is planning to build a pipeline feeding wastewater into the Brokenhead River.

Please advocate for proper research before this is done. The river you may be complicit in harming is healthy and strong. Water is life, and you must listen to the original caretakers of the land and their concerns AT THE VERY LEAST. What can you say to the next seven generations about what your actions were to protect this river?

I urge you to hold a public meeting for questions and concerns, and hold a proper study of the environmental impacts of building this pipeline and disposing of waste in this manner.

Ekosi.

Kelsey Kanatan Wavey

ps. land back

I used to work and play in the Beauséjour area and sometimes go back there for vacation. I don't want to see the beautiful nature there being abused and destroyed like so many other places in Canada these days. There must be a more safe and useful way to dispose of the water treatment plant outputs. Honestly, the habit of washing away human waste with water is unsustainable and wasteful. So many areas are loosing their rich top soils to chemical agricultural fertilization. Solutions must be investigated, there are already many scientists like mycoremediologists, permaculture and soil scientists that have successfully developed processes that are at once efficient and sustainable. Please open the conversation with more stake holders than just city officials. They are not your subject matter experts. Start with the local rural and First Nations community, the David Suzuki Foundation, Paul Stamitz... Please see the attached sign for more ideas. Now more than ever, we need to break off from our old habits of speedy and cheap solutions.

Thank you for your kind consideration!

Marielle Audet

I just read an announcement for proposals for lagoon releases from the town of Beausejour into the river, to accomodate their new treatment facility.

My understanding from past research (Kotak et al) is that the river is rising in phosphorus levels every year, due to human and agricultural use.

Will the released water be free of phosphates, nitrogen, and anything else that might contribute to its water quality decline, or ultimately Lake Winnipeg's?

I'm assuming Beausejour has the standard 3 cell lagoon system for sewage treatment, unlike the Village of Dunnottar, which seems to be leading the way for examples of how a community can look after its closest body of water. Perhaps they should talk.

We're all in this together!

Lindy Clubb

I am one of the many concerned citizens who oppose directing the flow of waste water of any sort into the broken head river and demand that an alternative option is found immediately. Many people used the broken head river as a source of summer recreation and the water is in near pristine condition. I don't understand how in a time where the government claims to be "environmentally conscious" this asinine idea was even considered.

Hayden c-wood

(Attached newspaper advertisement of proposal and online bulletin)

I've been seeing this online? Is this true? How do we stop? Are wanting us to stop it? Or are we supposed to come to you to help stop it?

Jessica Clems

You were instrumental in helping me end bad sewage management in our development on East Lake Winnipeg. We had a large number of illegal sewage systems on a lakefront development. All properties are now in compliance with containment. We have an effective black water containment bylaw thanks to your help.

I am opposed to more sources of sewage coming into the lake and waterways and feel it is time Manitoba modernize and be more mindful of ending new sources of effluent runoff where possible. It is more expensive but we have to be accountable for our actions. We need to stop making our waters sick and nobody will spend the money on nutrient control and elimination of medications and drugs so let's recycle that waste. There has to be way it can be processed and remain within the RM and be disposed of in a manner it is never directly emptying into any waterway.

Burying or inland runoff methods should be employed until we can treat the sewage to be clean Healthy water that is being disposed of.

This is not acceptable. Guidelines should be updated to cause existing system to be eliminating the drugs and chemicals from reaching our waterways in the near future. The amount of Coliforms should be reduced. Please do not allow this to continue.

Dave Crabb

I have reviewed the documentation in Public Registry File 6059.00.

Regarding the proposed discharge of concentrate into the Brokenhead River, I would be grateful if you would please advise whether there are other point source liquid discharges into the Brokenhead River, and if so, the nature of each discharge and the licensee/permittee who/which is authorized to make the discharge.

Regards,
Michael Anderson

My name is Dan Swain and I am an actor and storyteller currently living on the unceded territories of the Musqueam people, colonially known as Vancouver.

I'm writing to let you know I was absolutely appalled to see the city of Beausejour is planning to build a pipeline feeding wastewater into the Brokenhead River.

Please advocate for proper research before this is done. The river you may be complicit in harming is healthy and strong. Water is life, and you must listen to the original caretakers of the land and their concerns AT THE VERY LEAST. What can you say to the next seven generations about what your actions were to protect this river?

I urge you Bruce, please hold a public meeting for questions and concerns, and hold a proper study of the environmental impacts of building this pipeline and disposing of waste in this manner. The aquatic life and mammals alone will suffer. Do we need to aid global disruption and destruction of the environment any further? Come on Bruce, these are people, OUR LAND PROTECTORS.

The people of this community do not drink wastewater, they drink water, we do not need any more water boiling advisories or any more intentional dismissal towards these communities. We are aware of these actions and you are too. Do the right thing Bruce.

Thank you for understanding,

Dan Swain

ps. land back

I am writing you to express my displeasure to hear that the town of beausejour wants to dump millions of gallons of waste water into the brokenhead river just a couple miles north of where I live. I live on the brokenhead river.

The brokenhead river is a place where people fish, swim, tube, boat etc. I am extremely displeased to hear of this proposal. Dumping that much waste water into the river could affect far more than the municipality of beausejour. With springfield upstream and brokenhead downstream. I don't feel as though this is a smart solution. Please don't bring change to a normal ecosystem just so people in beausejour can have softened water so they can waste more water. How about teaching people to conserve water instead of creating more waste? I will be publicly sharing this information with all my family and online contacts. Didn't beausejour just spend millions of dollars on the lagoon north of town?

-Max Dupas

Hi, to who ever this concerns but there is news arriving that there will be all the waste water from the water treatment plant being dumped into the river just upstream from where I live.

I do not approve of this happening as this river is constantly flooded with tubers and brings a lot of tourism to Beausejour area. Not to mention that the campground where many families spend a lot of time in the water. This is blatant disregard for any respect for this river as the old law stated that you

could not even have a gas powered motor but now it's ok to dump millions of tons of water into the river where many spend a lot of hours swimming and having great memories.

I have a feeling my e mail will be disregarded and things will go in as planned. So I'm saying when this does start happening I would like for you to be there when it starts dumping into the river with a cup and fill it with the water from the pipe and I want to see you personally drink the whole cup. Don't cower in the shadows and claim it safe to line your pockets. Everyone in my community on the river does not approve and if need be I will go to all the houses along the river and get all the signatures for this project to stop.

I hope to hear back from you to see if you will actually listen to the community or do what's in best interests for yourself. I know I have personally worked in many water treatment plants and I would never say dumping it in a river that mostly on a dry year barely flows as is and your dilution is the solution is full of _____. This is not safe and whoever approved this should be there drinking the water with you. Literally there is two massive campgrounds down stream and you think well I don't spend no time there, send it. Your not Larry the Enticer Where what you do only hurts yourself it's going to hurt the whole community.

Please re consider what you are doing, or are you part of the disease that allows a healthy river die for the interests of yourself. This is going to be devastating. Like can't you see that lake Winnipeg is already in horrible shape and you think well let's keep shoving it full of literal _____. I won't even swim In that lake because it causes such a bad rash. Stop this nonsense and realize the problem you are contributing to. Please actually think of what you are doing

Stephen Johnstone

As a resident on the Brokenhead River, the idea of DUMPING anything into this precious river is an environmental nightmare.

A few issues to be aware of:

- 1) Turtles, geese, kingfishers, snails, otter, deer, beavers, fish, and salamanders are only a few species that survive in this area because of this river.
- 2) Tubing, kayaking, fishing, swimming, cross country skiing , snow machine enthusiasts all frequent this area with total respect and minimal environmental impact on the area.
- 3) The water levels can fluctuate 4 to 5 feet during the summer which can leave stagnant water issues.....now add chemical PERFECT....
- 4) Manganese Greensand** which is proposed to be a part of the filtration system, is commonly used to remove ARSENIC....adding that to the water that flows to Lake Winnipeg now adds a great challenge to clean an existing algae problem due WPG treatment plant leak issue.

Secondly the potential discharge could contain a high level of iron and hydrogen sulfide (rotten egg odor) now add to issues to the residents living by the river.

When treating the by product of hydrogen sulfidecommonly used chemical is chlorine AKA BLEACH

Thirdly another potential risk using Greensand is the discharge of potassium permanganate (KMnO₄) and because several residents cook with flowing river water and drink local well water, this could lead to liver damage and consequences for animals.

KMnO₄ also causes skin irritation which would affect the tubing and swimming in the area.

5) The river already sustains agriculture runoff along from fields and farms like manure, fertilizer and weed killers.

6) Numerous green house owners utilize the water to irrigate their plants and vegetables which would reduce their yield.

Also could negate their "organic" designation due to water testing results.

7) The local golf courses resources the river for irrigation and adding chemicals to the water with cause specific browning issues to the greens.

8) The provincial government (Rivers & Streams) had recently allowed a privately owned RV park to partially damn the river with mechanically placed boulders and rock which now restricts the natural flow of the river and has in dry years created water issues. If you add chemicals to the river this becomes a bigger issue as evaporations leaves increased chemicals residue or potentially vapours.

The only benefit of the DUMPING of the waste water in the Brokenhead River is a significant cost saving to the town residents versus the cost of an alternative solutions.

Is the river's future health and the natural beauty it brings to the area not worth any other option available?

FRIENDS OF THE BROKENHEAD RIVER

Cathe Bond

Ed Bond

I strongly disagree with this plan and I believe there should be environmental studies done and impact for the area indicated in the proposal. There should be a public meeting regarding this issue.

Yours truly, Keris Goulet

As a member of the Brokenhead community, I am completely opposed to this pipeline, and urge local companies and governments to find an alternative. We are on Treaty 1 Territory, and this water source is traditionally used for fishing and ceremonies. Stop contaminating the clean water we have left!

Ashley Wolfe

This is an outrageous proposal from just even an environmental stance! There needs to be a public forum to address this matter. Anything less than that is a failure to the best interests of this entire community.

I trust you will do the right thing and provide that forum.

Thank you.

Liana Bonikowsky

I am a very concerned home owner who lives in the Barelands Condo Corp. in the Brokenhead River Park. I am astonished that with all the pollutants in our water systems that this is something being considered and am completely opposed to this.

How can I help to make sure this Pipeline does not happen?

Have a great day
Mae Gobel

I have a few questions that people have brought to my attention regarding this issue.

1. What exactly is the definition of Waste Water Concentrate?
2. What effect does this have on fish, wildlife, and humans?

A lot of people use the water at their seasonal sights and permanent residence, to water their gardens or possibly filter for drinking water.

3. What if there is a leak or line breakage? Will this cause sewer water to deposit into the river? Or other harmful chemicals?

4. Not related to this issue but a lot of questions in regards to the damn put up at Brokenhead Campground. Who authorized this and how were they allowed to block the fish from going upstream. There have been many people who have flipped off their tubes going over this. I understand we are all aware of the dangers while tubing but this is a lot more dangerous than getting off and crossing the golf course road, at least there is signs to stay away from the culverts. Also do you know who to contact in regards to getting more information on this matter.

I personally do not agree with the choice of the township to do this and a lot of people are not aware of this issue either.

Thank you for your quick response,

Sheri Charles

I have recently read the proposal for the pipeline to dispose of an estimated 50 million Gallons per year of waste water concentrate from the New water treatment plant in beausejour.

I have reviewed this plan and am in approval of the water plant itself but would like to see a better safer option to dispose of the waste.

The community is a very beautiful place and brokenhead river attracts many tourists throughout the year. The site chosen to construct the pipeline is well known for its fishing grounds, and water attractions like water tubing and kyacking. And a campground beach is just 200 meters downriver. Imagine how this will effect the economy of the area of brokenhead river. Would you want to go swimming in a river where 50 million gallons of waste concentrate is disposed of every year? Would you want your wife and children to swim in that water? Would you want to eat a fish caught from a river knowing that that the water has been contaminated by we ate concentrate? I know I certainly wouldn't.

I ask that you look into safer and better options for disposal of the water waste. Many other communities have found better and safer ways and we should be following their lead. I ask that you open A public meeting for the whole community and not just those who love in the town of beausejour. I ask that there be a proper environmental impact study done to better understand the risks of the Pipeline.

I also asking you remember brokenhead river is situated on treaty 1 territory and the Homeland of the Metis nation. I request that you consult the first Nations communities in the area. The river Is healthy and Is traditionally used for fishing and ceremonies. Stop contaminating the clean water we have left.

Thank you,

Shania Joyal

I'm writing to object to the plan to dump waste water concentrate into the Brokenhead River.

This river is the only one in the Beausejour area and provides recreational activities to many seasonal campers, the people of Beausejour and visitors to the area.

There should be a public meeting to discuss concerns, and a proper environmental impact study should be done. If an impact study has already been undertaken, please provide me with a copy.

Pat Palanuk

I have read the Environment Act Proposal for the Town of Beausejour Water Supply System. From this proposal, I do have concern in regards to the location of the concentrate discharge pipe at the Brokenhead River.

The location shown in the proposal is an area of high recreational activity on the Brokenhead River. Perhaps the highest with canoeists, kayakers, tubers and swimmers. I was personally in the river at that location with my sons this June.

There is a retaining dam 500 m downstream of the proposed discharge pipe location. During periods of low flow and high temperatures, such as through the summer months when recreational activity and water contact are highest, my concern is accumulation of concentrate discharge in the section of river between the discharge pipe and the retaining dam beyond what has been predicted in the proposal. Further to this concern is the eventual discharge of that same water when river levels rise, as downstream of the dam is more area of recreational activity.

My personal opinion is that the discharge pipe should be beyond this area of high recreational activity and that no matter where the pipe discharges, all efforts are made to limit negative impacts to the river and its users.

Sincerely,

Dusty Molinski

I understand that the Town of Beausejour wants to build a pipeline to the Brokenhead river in order to dispose an estimated 50 million gallons per year of waste water concentrate from the new water treatment plant. I am certainly not opposed to the water treatment plant - but I do believe there must be a better, safer option to dispose of the waste. The Brokenhead river is too important to lose for many reasons, including as a fishing resource and as a tourist attraction so vital to the local economy.

I implore you to hold a public meeting for people to voice their serious concerns about this issue. I hope an Environmental Impact Study will be guaranteed.

Thank you for your time in reading this. I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Emily Jane King

Stop the pipe line that going to dump sewage into the river

Ross Humble

Hello there.

I'm contacting you to express my solidarity with the community of Beausejour and RM of Brokenhead in their concern over the proposed water treatment plant which would dump exorbitant amounts of raw human waste into the Brokenhead River which itself runs straight into Lake Winnipeg. This community is not opposed to a Treatment Plant, they want a better and safer option to dispose of the waste which doesn't risk losing the use of the water for recreation, tourism, fishing, etc. There is also great concern for how this will affect the local environment and how this will affect the health of Lake Winnipeg which is already in an environmental crisis.

This community deserves a public meeting for people of the RM of Brokenhead and Town of Beausejour to be able to express their concerns and ask questions.

Thank you for your time.

Tristen Foy

I live on the Brokenhead River off of highway 44 north of BJ. I just became aware of a water treatment pipeline planned for MY BACK YARD.

Thank you for consulting residents of the RM of Brokenhead and making us aware directly and allowing us to express any concern, although plans for building are said to commence 2020/2021.

So kind to have our water safety considered over the Town of Beausejour.

Do you know where I get my water? Yes I drink, bath, and clean with water from the Brokenhead.

I'm absolutely against the idea of a pipeline running DIRECTLY BESIDE MY HOME so the residents of Beausejour are free for their wastewater to leak into my water source.

My neighbours and I deserve a formal consultation. My neighbours and I deserve a formal environmental impact assessment based on newly obtained data. My neighbours and I deserve a direct explanation in plain language. Brokenhead Ojibway First Nations people deserve to have their concerns expressed and shared, not just addressed in the proposal that they are the closest to the project.

There are better solutions to sneakily moving forward with a wastewater pipeline.

Sincerely,

Chelsea Pastula

The Province of Manitoba must stop using Lake Winnipeg as a dumping ground for all of its water plant and sewer systems. Lake Winnipeg is already max'd out in terms of chemicals and sewage being flushed into the lake. Ever since the construction of the Grand Rapids dam in the 1960s, Lake Winnipeg has seen increasing degradation to its health and ecosystems. Lake Winnipeg has been home to the greatest commercial pickerel fishery in the world. Today, the pickerel fishery on Lake Winnipeg is on the verge of collapse according to many fisheries biologists. So far, nobody and no governments of any stripe or government level wants to acknowledge the harms they are causing Lake Winnipeg. All of the biased reports of governments and their entities claim they are not harming Lake Winnipeg. So why is it dying? All polluters claim they have installed mitigation measures so it's ok to dump. When is enough is enough? The City of Winnipeg is not going to address the issue of raw sewage being dumped into Lake Winnipeg until 2045. The algae blooms on Lake Winnipeg are so thick that commercial fishers can hardly pull their nets out of the water; and when they do, there is no fish in the nets. The algae dies in the fall and all winter the fishers nets are full of brown sludge. For people living in southern Manitoba; out of sight out of mind is allowing governments to get away with continued pollution of Lake Winnipeg. The Beausejour water plant discharge is no different; out of sight out of mind; it's only a little bit of effluent; we have mitigated the effects, etc., etc..

The proposed new Lake St Martin Outlet channel is going to add even more chemicals to Lake Winnipeg. Floods wash all the lands in southern Manitoba and all the millions of tons of farm chemicals

end up in Lake Winnipeg. The new channel at Lake St Martin will result in direct dumping into the north basin of the lake at a faster rate than through the Red River system. The north basin of the lake will become just as polluted as the south basin. Children can still swim in north basin communities but not in the south basin due to skin rashes. So, I oppose any more dumping into Lake Winnipeg by new developments like the Beausejour water plant.

I suggest building bacteria eating systems must be installed for all waste disposal instead dumping everything into Lake Winnipeg.

Jimmy James

We heard this weekend about the towns plans to dump contaminated water from a water treatment plant.

We are quite concerned about the effects to the river and the fish and turtles in the area.

We also are concerned that we will loose access to the river between the bridges.

This area has been used for years for tubers and kayakers to access the river.

The Brokenhead River between the proposed dump site and the north end of Great Woods Park is the most populated part of the river and sees heavy use all summer .In this area there's Brokenhead River Park ,Bush Park The Golf course Great Woods Campground and a lot of homes and cottages. Dumping water contaminated with chemicals will definitely effect the usability of the river. Why have the people in this area not been told about these plans?

My understanding is that these plans were only discussed with the residents of Beausejour.

The flow of this river changes drastically in July the flow all but stops on years with little rain and in the winter the river freezes to the bottom just north of the bridges. Under these conditions the parts per billion will definitely go up.

What controls will be in place to protect the swimmers? Will the public have access to the test results on a regular basis? We have been told there are protected crayfish in this part of the river.

We feel it would be better for the health of the river and the dissipation of the chemicals and the minerals from this discharge to dump north of Great Woods in a less populated area.

As you see we have a lot of questions about the safety of this plan.

Please hold an information session for the campers and residents in the area.

We do understand the need to do this but are concerned about the river and our investment in the area.

This is a beautiful area an we want it to stay that way.

Please keep us informed on this matter.

Thank you

Scott Maxwell

LET'S GO GREEN!

Our water is an extremely valuable and vital resource!

This precious resource should be properly cared for and properly managed as water is important to all residents and to the future of our children and grandchildren in our community area ..

The system to process the water chosen by the consultants and approved by the Town of Beausejour Council is reverse osmosis. Is this the correct system to use in the proposed water treatment plant? The water treatment plant will draw from the aquifer every 24 hours (42 litres /second) which is over 3 million litres. Of the water drawn from the aquifer, the reverse osmosis system will treat 36 litres / second as drinkable water. The balance of 6 litres / second of untreated wastewater concentrate will flow by pipeline directly into the Brokenhead River. In 24 hours that is approximately 518,400 litres of untreated wastewater concentrate. In one year that is approximately 189,216,000 litres or 41,622,525 gallons of untreated wastewater concentrate dumped into the Brokenhead River. In the lifetime (50 + years) of the operation of the new water treatment plant that is an extremely significant amount of untreated wastewater concentrate dumped into the Brokenhead River, approximately + 2,081,126,250 billion gallons.

I do not oppose the construction of a water treatment plant, as a new water treatment plant is necessary. I am concerned about the untreated wastewater concentrate being discharged by a pipeline directly into the Brokenhead River. This 2.8 kilometre pipeline to the river is proposed to be installed along the north side of PTH 44.

Presently the Brokenhead River is a major spawning bed for the survival of the Lake Winnipeg fishery and home to many aquatic species and protected aquatic species. Many residents live along the river. The Brokenhead River is extremely important to the overall economy of agriculture, recreation, residential and tourism. There are campgrounds, golf courses, and beach property that will be at risk.

There is a rock dam at the beach which may stop or hinder the flow of water to Lake Winnipeg. It is important that a proper water processing system is installed in the water treatment plant in order that the water in the river is safely maintained for fish, fish habitat, aquatic species, migratory birds, wildlife and to all residents. Instead of reverse osmosis, what are the other options?

The following are my concerns:

- Practice water conservation! Untreated wastewater concentrate should not be directly disposed of into the Brokenhead River. Are there other treatment options available that do not involve water wastage? Because of the concerns on climate change, water conservation is now being practiced in other areas. It is important to realize and recognize that there is the possibility that climate change can cause depletion of the water aquifer. This is already happening in other areas of the world and in North America, eg, the Ogallala aquifer(Great Plains) in the USA, We should not be throwing water away! Let's GO Green! I believe there is "let's go green" funding available from the federal, provincial governments, and agencies to look into "go green" initiatives in setting up a safe water processing

system that will protect the environment and provide for water conservation. Has other systems been checked out by the consultant and the Manitoba Water Services Board? I believe not!

- There are many RM residents who live in the surrounding areas of the town who draw water from the same aquifer. What will be the impact of the water treatment plant to the wells of these residents? Will their wells be short of water? If wells go dry who is responsible? What assurances are there for these municipal residents and at what cost? In 50 years there will be significant population growth and development in the community area which will increase water demands. In the past some area wells went dry when gravel was quarried south of town.

- Agriculture is a major industry in our community area. Agriculture is always changing. Climate change will bring about a greater demand for the water from the aquifer to be used for agricultural purposes for the growing of crops and vegetables, for livestock, and for processing. It will become a reality that field irrigation systems will be set up in the near future to grow vegetables commercially.

- The mouth of the pipeline for the untreated wastewater concentrate to enter into the Brokenhead River, is in the same area where many people fish, launch water crafts, or do other recreational water activities. There is a public beach just north of the proposed outlet. What is the health risk to the residents and the people who come into that area? I believe the untreated wastewater concentrate is a health risk.

- The water levels throughout the Brokenhead have many low lying water areas. Where the outlet is to be placed, the river quite often is very low lying. Occasionally the river bottom exposes itself and very slow movement or no movement of the water occurs. When this happens, the 114,034 gallons of untreated wastewater dumped daily will have a serious effect on the ecology of the river.

- In my opinion a proper public hearing with residents and community area residents was not held. This hearing should have been held when the previous town council initially discussed the water treatment plant proposal. Input, concerns, and public feedback should have been addressed before the plans were drawn and finalized. The public hearing that was held in March 2020 was "just selling the plan" that focused on the borrowing bylaw of tax dollars to repay for the construction of the water treatment plant. Prior to the hearing, the consultant Stantec and the Manitoba Water Services Branch did not have the courtesy to appear in person before the RM of Brokenhead Council to present the proposal. All that was received was a letter requesting permission to drill two wells in the RM. They should have been more considerate since the water being drawn for the water treatment plant and the untreated wastewater concentrate being disposed into the Brokenhead River is in the RM of Brokenhead..

- It is important to note once the untreated wastewater concentrate is dumped in the river, it flows towards Lake Winnipeg. The Brokenhead River passes through the RM of St. Clements and the Brokenhead First Nation community. Have these local governing authorities been contacted and properly advised of this disposal flowing through their community areas? I believe they were not. I believe the indigenous community have the right to be contacted prior to the proposal being registered. It is important as this untreated wastewater concentrate will affect

their residents. According to environmental legislation it is the law and mandatory the indigenous community should have been contacted for their comments and concerns prior to the proposal. It is important the traditional knowledge and relationships are maintained, safe guarded and practiced in the community.

- I am truly disappointed with the consultant, Stantec and the Manitoba Water Services Branch. In my belief, they were very inconsiderate of the overall community area and unprofessional with their work. They were only concerned about fulfilling the requirements and needs of water for the Town of Beausejour. Nothing else mattered to them! In their opinion an environmental impact study was not necessary. At the hearing on March 19th, environmental approval for the licence was considered to be a trivial matter. This approval was to be done internally by various governmental agencies only. There was no thought of putting it out on the public registry. They believed the Town of Beausejour public hearing on March 19th was adequate. After being contacted and advised by the public registry, the proposal was advertised in the June 25th Clipper Weekly newspaper. The close date being July 25, 2020. The wording has been modified. There is no mention of the word "reverse osmosis" in the advertisement. It appears that membrane filtration and manganese greensand filtration are the systems to be used in the processing. The lack of information is misleading for the public, and leaves little time to research and respond?

- The RM of Brokenhead passed an environmental policy on March 10, 2020. It outlines an environmental impact study should be carried out as this is a major community development that will affect the municipality. In closing I strongly recommend that an environmental impact study be carried out and a public meeting be held with all residents to be properly informed, express comments and allowed to ask questions. The ecology information contained in the submission on the disposal of the untreated wastewater concentrate into the Brokenhead River is just "words" to satisfy the criteria. Did the consultants do a proper study or just make assumptions based on old data? This river is forever and more important to the entire community area and the Town of Beausejour. It should not become the dumping grounds for the untreated wastewater concentrate or to satisfy or reduce the costs of construction for the water treatment plant.

- Finally, I spent my youth growing up along the Brokenhead River in the Dencross area. The entire river ran through our property. I spent many hours observing its natural beauty and the variety of river life that offered shelter and food to the abundance of fish and wildlife. As a Manitoba conservation officer for 38 years I did many patrols on the Brokenhead from Trans Canada Highway to Lake Winnipeg. I was always there to follow up on a river complaint and took whatever action was appropriate to protect the river. Many river residents are very passionate, concerned and abiding. They love that river as much as I do. The Brokenhead River is important to the future needs of our children and grandchildren and to the growth and development of our municipality and the Town of Beausejour. Let's go green!

Jack Kowalchuk
RM of Brokenhead Resident

The Residence and nearby communities who live on the Brokenhead River are voicing their concerns that the Water Treatment Plant which made plans for building a pipeline to dump additional waste/toxic materials will be harmful to the surrounding area as it is used for several recreational activities such as; kayaking/tubing, swimming, and fishing. Additionally it is home to many plantlife and animals.

With such short notice the residence, visitors, and neighbors find that it is extremely ridiculous for the Rural Municipality of Beausejour to have gone ahead with this proposal without the input of the surrounding communities.

We personally request that the construction of this project be cancelled as we have family who use the river on a regular basis.

Jean and Frank Stobbe

hi bruce,my name is brian and I'm a seasonal camper at greatwoods park. as you might know we rely on the brokenhead river for summer recreation. the brokenhead river is full of life and is very clean. is there no other solution? in this day and age of environmental concern,i dont know why this idea of dumping treated effluent into a river system is still being seriously considered. has anyone considered the significant economic impact to the town if the two campgrounds empty out due to a unusable river? our plan is to retire at greatwoods during the summer and have our children and grandchildren enjoy the beauty of our park and the clean river system that runs through it. this action puts that plan on shaky ground...please re consider this pipeline project and find a different solution to this problem...thanks

sincerely, brian begal

We on the river are very surprised by this recent news. There has been high water since the rock levels at the Brokenhead campground have been raised in the last 2 years. The flow of water has been partiall...

Thanks Dave Dupuis

We are residents of the RM of Brokenhead and live year-round on the Brokenhead River (approx. 150 meters downstream from the proposed disposal site).

We are not against the proposed new Water Treatment Plant but are opposed to the disposal of the waste concentrate into the River until either:

a) a proper Environmental Impact Study is done at the proposed disposal site location, and that river water levels will not be a problem - even in the winter.

b) a different disposal site is selected (i.e. lagoon).

c) a more environmentally greener option for disposal is selected (preferred method).

While the proposed disposal site may be the cheapest and most direct route, it may not be the best.

The Brokenhead River is one of the main tourist attractions for the area and is important to the local economy. The site chosen for the discharge pipeline is a fishing spot as well as a popular launch area for recreational users such as kayakers and tubers.

The Brokenhead River does not run through the Town of Beausejour as it says in the proposal. It runs in the RM of Brokenhead.

While the proposal's Aerial Survey mentions a greenhouse, campground and golf course, it does not mention that it is a well-populated area with many year-round homes and cottages both north and south of Hwy 44, as well as 2 beaches downstream (one being only 200 meters from this proposed discharge site), and that there is also a rock dam approximately 300 meters downstream. The dam is maintained/repared every 2-3 years.

Our concern is that the flow rate data/testing, on which they are basing their assumptions, isn't from anywhere near the proposed site for the disposal pipeline ... and that the dam wasn't considered at all.

It stands to reason that if the dam impedes the flow of the river, particularly during low water levels, it would certainly impede the dispersement of the concentrate. There is also the freezing over of the river and the dam in the winter to consider, which calls attention to the **3-year minimum summer only** flow data provided, as well as the statement that "parameters that resulted in the most stringent guidelines have been **assumed**."

How can any data be correctly used for assumptions if that data was taken miles away from the actual site which is influenced by a dam?

There are residents who already have problems when the ice dams threaten to flood properties in the spring, and the addition of +100,000 gallons daily to the river upstream of the dam could increase the chance of major damages. When the river freezes over in the winter where will the waste water concentrate go? Will it spread out into neighbouring property? Will the whole area south of the dam become nothing more than a basin for this waste water concentrate to accumulate?

We believe there should be proper data and assessment done first.

Most of the Impact Assessment is focused on the site and draw of the groundwater. We see very little data in regards to the concentrates effect on the aquatic ecosystem to cover species interaction. Chemistry changes can affect the entire food chain (plants, fish and wildlife) and there doesn't appear to be testing to include other contaminates like pesticides, medications, etc.

There may already be signs that the water quality is affecting the fish (due to runoff, etc.) as we see bent minnows in children's buckets and adding more contaminants to the river doesn't seem like a good idea.

Without a proper Impact Study there can be negative effects on fish and wildlife, beach and campground closures, restrictions on recreational water use and damage to homeowner properties.

We are concerned that there have been no meetings for the residents of the RM, in which the river does run through, to address their questions and concerns. The only notices were "Town of Beausejour Public Notices" and only referred to the Water Treatment Plant for properties within the borders of the town.

There was no mention of the pipeline running almost 3 km outside the town to dispose of the waste water concentrate. The residents of the RM have only found out about this from your Public Registry Notice published June 25 and have many unanswered questions.

Has the Town looked at other ways to dispose of this waste?

Are there greener options (such as a winding marsh) and are there funds available to help with the cost?

Will there be a proper Impact Study done first?

Can this have a negative affect on fish and wildlife?

Will there be compensation to homeowners if properties are flooded?

Is there a potential for disaster as their data seems incomplete/incorrect?

We also believe that they do have a Duty to Consult. The proposed project (specifically the disposal of waste concentrate into the river) does involve the Brokenhead Indian Reserve since the river runs directly through the reserve on it's way to Lake Winnipeg.

Regards

Janice Brolly and Robert Wood

I would like to express my concern over the proposed water treatment upgrade to the Beausejour water treatment facility that will pump into the Brokenhead River. The Brokenhead River is a well loved recreational river for fishing, swimming, kayaking, tubing, etc. Pumping concentrate into this river is an unacceptable and lazy way of upgrading this system and there needs to be further opportunity for feedback from locals impacted by this. Protecting our rivers especially such a slow flowing river should be of utmost importance. As a young adult who loves and will be living on this river (for a very long time) I am disgusted that this is being considered an option when there are many better environmentally friendly ways to go about it without involving the river. Please leave this little river alone and out of these water treatment plans.

Thanks,

Laurel McArthur

I am apposed to the disposal of water waste from the new treatment plant into the Brokenhead River. I grew up swimming in it and continue to with my children and grandchildren. Please don't pollute it.

Sincerely

Debra Kelly

As a former chair of the Brokenhead Restoration Committee I would like to take this opportunity to express some concerns regarding the dumping of the water residue from the proposed water treatment project for the Town of Beausejour into the Brokenhead River.

For your information the Brokenhead River Restoration Committee was formed in order to establish a plan to restore the water quality of the river to as close as possible to its original state. The committee included representation from DFO, PFRA, Manitoba Conservation, Manitoba Fisheries, R.M. of Springfield, R.M. of St. Clements, R.M. of Lac Du Bonnet, LGD of Reynolds, Town of Beausejour and Brokenhead First Nations.

The committee met on a regular basis and approved a Brokenhead River Watershed Study. From this study the committee approved and completed a number of projects. To name a few, we completed a number of fish spawning beds, a modified fish ladder, riparian projects along the river and relocated winter cattle feeding on the river as well as cattle watering in the river. These projects in my opinion had a major effect on improving the water quality of the river as well as improving the habitat for fish and waterfowl.

In light of what I shared above I am concerned about what effect the dumping of the residual water from the Town Of Beausejour project would have on the goals the Brokenhead Restoration Committee had for the river? If this is the case then in my opinion it seems counter productive to have one jurisdiction work in direct opposition to what another jurisdiction is trying to achieve? You would think that team work would be the way to go?

Al Tymko

We write to you today to express our concerns relating to the proposed Water Treatment Plant in the Town of Beausejour. Our concerns do not lie with the project itself as a whole, but rather, the estimated 15% backwash and concentrate water that the system will produce and then be discharged into the Brokenhead River.

While we support the growth of the town and the region, we feel the concerns of the backwash water have not been properly addressed. Our home is situated immediately downstream, within 100 metres of the proposed discharge site and many residents within the area feel that the Town has failed to carry out their due diligence in consulting and informing the stakeholders of the RM with regards to this site. As we are stakeholders in the project, we feel very left out of the process and call on the Town to properly hold an information session on the project, specifically the backwash discharge site.

Having reviewed the documents package for the file, we do not see any in-depth mention of the possible environmental impacts from this backwash water entering into the river, not to mention the effects the increasing water levels into the river will have on erosion (given there is a dam very close downstream) and detrimental consequence on naturally occurring ice formation during the winter months. Our home is very near to the proposed discharge site and we are concerned about this as we are active users of the river for swimming, fishing in the summer, and a skating rink, and snowmobiling in the winter, just to name a few. What's of an even greater concern is the fact that our children and grandchildren are active users of the river for these purposes and as parents/grandparents no longer

feel comfortable having them use the river for these recreational activities should the project proceed without proper disclosure of information and consultation.

As such, we call upon both the Town and the Province to make available this information to all stakeholders of the project (not just town residents, but RM and river residents too) and to hold public information and consultation sessions so every resident without internet access can see first-hand the impacts of the project. We support the growth of the Town and RM but feel it should be done openly and transparently, which to date, has not occurred.

Should you wish to discuss this further, you may contact us at the telephone numbers below.

Sincerely,

Kirk Dyson & Connie Wenzoski

Thank you for the opportunity to share comments related to the Beausejour Water Supply Project. I am writing as a long time cottage owner. We have had property fronting the Brokenhead river just north of Highway 44 for decades.

I would like to express my opposition to this project. In particular, I oppose using the Brokenhead river to divert waste water runoff into Lake Winnipeg from a new Water treatment plant until a complete and full environmental impact assessment is undertaken.

Such a study should encompass the entire Brokenhead ecosystem from the Sandilands Provincial Forest to Lake Winnipeg. This study must also include the potential impact to wildlife and fisheries on Lake Winnipeg. Additionally, it must review and address wildlife and bird population such as the geese who use the Brokenhead river as a nesting place and part of their habitat.

It should also consult the people who use the river as a playground for swimming, rafting and general enjoyment. The proposed site of the pipeline is at a very important access point to the river.

This alone merits closer study for safety of small watercraft and certainly people of all ages who use the river extensively. This gathering point for people has been in place for decades and should be respected and enhanced not impacted by the proposal and its pipeline. While some might consider this area as underutilized, I and many others would contend that this informal gathering place is an important part of the local economy and a tourist point of interest, not the start point of a pipeline.

The study should also assess the dam on the Brokenhead just North of Highway 44 and the fact that in the summer months the water can get so low that parts of the river bed are dry and in some winters the dam is frozen over completely.

Again, my points are a call to action to undertake a much broader study to assess these and other important social, ecological and economic impacts of such a project. My fear is that the informal use of the river as a meeting and gathering space has been ignored in this hasty review. Such haste often results in solving one issue but causing many more.

Finally, there are numerous homes and farms as well as the Brokenhead Ojibway Nation who occupy much land along this river who must be part of ongoing and meaningful consultation.

Thank you for your consideration and I hope that more discussion and research will take place before potentially destroying a very important gathering place while also greatly impacting many others.

Ken Nelson

We are writing to express concern regarding the Notice of Environment Act Proposal for the construction of a wastewater pipeline into the Brokenhead River that we will be negatively impacted should this proceed. We are retired and have a seasonal lot in the Brokenhead River Campground on the rivers edge where we primarily reside and support the local economy May 1 through September 30. The proposed pipeline discharge will be only a very short distance up river from us and the campground beach.

We appreciate the need for the wastewater plant our only concern is the location of the pipeline in the area of river enjoyed by residents and tourists for fishing, kayaking and tubing. If lagoons are not an option our hope is an alternative discharge location that wouldn't impact the enjoyment of this part of the river could be determined. Perhaps downriver from the golf course and Great woods campground.

Thank you.

Mr. & Mrs. Henry Kliewer

This letter is on behalf of the Council of Rural Municipality of Brokenhead with regards to the Environment Act proposal for the Town of Beausejour water supply system.

The Council has concerns with the discharge water that will be drained to the Brokenhead River. We have had many residents whom live on the Brokenhead that are concerned about the health and safety of the River. On July 14, 2020, many residents had attended to express their concerns and were seeking more information on this project. Council received a lot of information and questions which Council was in no position to answer, therefore we would like to request that an open house information night be held so that all of their questions and concerns can be addressed. Council felt that this would put our ratepayers at ease by being more informed about the project.

Council believe the health and welfare of the Brokenhead River is the main focus of this open house. We would ask that Manitoba Conservation and Climate take serious consideration in having this information session. We would be more than happy to host this event if necessary, and we look forward to a positive response.

Sue Sutherland

CAO

Regarding the above file myself and my family live on the Brokenhead River just north of where the proposed concentrate pipeline will flow into the river I have serious concerns over what contaminants or toxins will be in this discharge and am completely against this. I am not against the treatment plant in The Town of Beausejour but want further studies and a public meeting between both Beausejour and Brokenhead communities as we are all affected.

Michael Murray

I have concerns regarding the above file, as I live on the Brokenhead River north of proposed concentrate pipeline flow into our river. I am not convinced that there is no impact with regard to water quality, or, to present ecosystem, but would like to see more studies and a public meeting between Beausejour and Brokenhead communities.

I have no opposition to the new treatment works, but do believe we should try to find a better way to dispose of the concentrate, in order to protect The Brokenhead River and everything that depends on it.

Sue Murray

We live about a mile from where the new wells were drilled.

I had a concern a few months back.

I am on our local citizens on patrol. I was concerned with the unsecured wells. I made a report to the RM of Brokenhead on the Friday.

I heard nothing till the following Monday.

I was called by the RCMP and I was told I should not be messing with a municipal water source and it is punishable by a fine. That is the reward I got for being concerned?

Furthermore when the wells were being pumped for 72 hours this winter the water backed up a long distance down the municipal ditches.(almost to our home) creating an unexpected hazard to life long local residents snowmobiling.

Again, my concerns went on ignored.

Now you want to pump unknown amounts of water in the dead of winter into the Brokenhead River? What about in summer? How will this affect recreational activities?

How is this pipe line going to be run there? Do you know the history of how many underground lines run in the ditch leading up to the Brokenhead River. There are a lot more lines than you realize.

Is there a cheaper simpler option for the town of Beausejour residents?

I caught my first fish in the Brokenhead River.

Will you be supervising this project? If not, who will?

Will the Brokenhead will be the same condition as Lake Winnipeg?

What is happening with the silica sand issue by Vivian?

Sean Michaels

Lifelong resident of Beausejour/Brokenhead

I'm writing in regards to the Environment Act Proposal as presented for the Town of Beausejour Water Treatment Plant upgrade. While I completely support the implementation of upgrades to the town's water supply, including having a reverse osmosis system for those in town on a municipal system, I have some serious issues with the proposed method of disposing of the concentrate flushed from the RO membranes directly into the Brokenhead River. As you know (and is outlined in the proposal itself), the Brokenhead is a major tributary feeding into Lake Winnipeg. As such, the ecology of Lake Winnipeg as an aquatic system is constantly impacted by the ongoing practices in, and adjacent-to, its tributaries like agricultural run off, wastewater treatment and changes to flow and riparian management throughout its watershed.

While there seemed to be some confusion by those concerned with the proposed direct flushing into the river that there was some sort of sewage waste being dumped into the river, that is not an issue here, given the nature of the project and how the membrane system works and "waste" is essentially minerals and concentrates of the existing chemistry from the wells drilled and ground water. I am an ecologist, so going through the specs on our groundwater here in the submitted report, confirmed that we are lucky around here, and our groundwater is fairly clean of metals that can cause major ecological issues. As an ecologist, and resident (who lives on the river with my kids catching crayfish, kayaking and swimming here too), seeing the proposal delineates the iron-heavy greensand filtrate routed to the lagoon was responsible project management too.

However, there also seems to be confusion (or absolute omission) of the ecological impacts of pouring 5L a second of highly concentrated, high TDS and conductivity water directly into a natural waterbody that has periods of very low water flow, and even obstructions to flow that were not present when the proposal was prepared. There is a "dam" that has been added to in Spring 2020 across from the trailer campground mentioned in the report, and would undoubtedly freeze completely over winter now, essentially blocking any flow-dilution of the proposed filtrate going into the river for months at a time. This may be pointing out the obvious, but at low flow and then stopped completely, the salt inputs in that basin upstream of the dam will have impacts on the water chemistry and thereby shifting or eliminating algae and zooplankton species and impacting the food chain at least locally, if not throughout the tributary as that concentrated pool distributes after thawing and flushing down stream.

As I said, I'm an ecologist, and am confused by the lack of ecological impact assessment in the report relating to anything riparian. Even the trees and animals listed make no sense for this project as it relates to draining concentrate into the river. The species listed are Boreal and not relevant to the Brokenhead riparian forest (basically the whole tree list is the wrong biome, or at least barely squeaking

into it where we are), nor does it include any stream bank vegetation? No aquatic vegetation? No invertebrate assessments? No reptile or amphibian surveys given this river is known for its unique and abundant mix of turtles and frogs? No inclusion of algae and zooplankton that are all demonstrably impacted by changes in water chemistry throughout ecological literature. Yet a blanket list of fish was included? Likewise, why is there a year of flow data missing for what could be the lowest water levels out of the whole listed period (by personal observation given I live on the river)?

The only mention of assessment of flow and concentrates I could see in the document related to the allowable limits for changing the river water chemistry, is as it relates to tolerances for greenhouse irrigation. Which, despite unsupported statements that it would have no effect on the river system, it states on pg 26 TDS and conductivity after mixing (based on average flows and lowest 7 day average in 3 or 10 year periods, again missing a key year of very low water which would impact those values if available, vs actual real-time concentrations) would be too high for allowing discharge upstream of the greenhouse in the area, but given the pipe outlets would be just the other side of the greenhouse, it fits the allowable specifications.

If the proposed mode of disposal can alter water chemistry (and be too much salt essentially to yield healthy plants) in a greenhouse, it would follow that the inputs are going to have a biological consequence to the aquatic system. That much is common sense and ecologically relevant, even with the omission of any sort of scientific baseline on the existing river species and their relative sensitivities to changes in their aquatic environment in the submitted report. Those metrics, again to reiterate, are completely absent in this Impact Assessment.

In addition, page 34 identifies that the proponents of the project are to carry out long term monitoring of impacts on the river, but there is no baseline to determine those changes from? Ecological common sense also follows that by the time changes are seen in indicators like fish and amphibians, or even changes in the stream flora, it is often too late to reroute the cause or have timely changes to a management plan that will legitimately mitigate negative impacts. I don't understand how this report was professionally prepared missing such relevant information, when the rest of the report seems so complete and thorough.

The document contains only a couple of unsupported single line statements that pg 30: "impacts to fisheries and fish habitat are considered minor" and on the following page 31: "the results were analyzed and the impacts on wildlife habitat are considered negligible" ... both of which are true for the construction of the plant and pipelines in the terrestrial system, but there is absolutely nothing for no supporting documentation or scientific assessment whatsoever for the intended changes in river water chemistry? Why is that?

How and why is the project not having a public review to address these very important issues? It states on page 18 that there was a public consultation, yet those who watch such announcements didn't see a public posting as is typical of the review process in such projects?

We know there is an inherent issue in watershed management, or we could call it a literal blind spot, that because we can't see anything in the water, that it's fine. If that was truly the case, then the people of Beausejour and all of us pulling groundwater would be drinking it unfiltered and straight out of a pump. We know that's not how it works, yet somehow we don't afford our rivers and streams the same level of ecological and biological stewardship. In this case though, we can easily do just that by

incorporating another "disposal" method and have the town adopt a fantastic new water treatment and source facility, while still maintaining the ecological and ethical integrity of how we treat our river here.

I propose that the town, (with municipality and provincial partnership, possibly even federal given we all have a role and responsibility to steward clean water), construct a filtering wetland to run the filtrate through before running into the Brokenhead. A constructed and simple wetland which uses native vegetation to bind and sequester those minerals and salts from the RO membrane filters. It's not reinventing anything, it is the same process that natural marshes and fens have served to filter our lakes and rivers for millennia and given us the benefit of more fresh water here than afforded to other geographic locations. I have volunteered and set up water stewardship projects in Winnipeg as part of mitigating drainage issues and constructed wetlands, and would be more than willing to do the same here, at no cost to anyone. Oak Hammock Interpretive center has a similar system, although theirs is part of their sewage treatment too. For here, we could just run the water through a constructed fen or a glorified long enough ditch and be done; High solute water in one end, clean PH balanced and innocuous water out the other. It would then be arguably cleaner than any field run off.

We just need to not put this straight in the river. I know that's what is normally done here, and elsewhere, but that doesn't mean we have to blindly follow that when we know every shift in a more ecologically responsible direction adds up. We have a beautiful opportunity to amend this project, and inexpensively shift what could be negatively impacting our natural watershed, and instead improving it by not only adding more carbon sequestering biomass to our little spot in the world, but adding to the diversity and habitat safe-havens for wetland species that have struggled as many wetlands have been drained for other development. Catching this and adding a marsh (or more accurately fen) to this project in its planning stages would be a true ecological blessing for the town and a real showcase for how our levels of government can work together and exemplify resource stewardship at its best. I can think of multiple grants that may be available to negate any cost in this too, and again, I would be completely on board with doing the vegetation consulting and landscape project management at no cost... we just don't need to mess with the chemistry of the river.

Clearly, there are many fantastic parts to the project, and the town needs upgrades to continue to grow and support the people in it, and RO is a great way to provide amazing quality water to those in town, but going forward as-is without accurate or complete environmental assessment, public review, or including better and inexpensive strategies to route the membrane concentrate through, isn't something as a mum, resident, or professionally as an ecologist, I can support and I ask for review on this.

Thanks so much for your time and consideration in this,

Sam Braun

As a long time Brokenhead Park cottage owner, I am severely concerned about the plan to pour Beausejour effluent into our river, especially up -stream from our cottages and the beach where children swim, swallowing water.

I have caught, cooked and eaten the fish with my children, now with my grandchildren.

If the planners of the operation are willing to drink the output of your "purification process", that might help to ease my concerns, especially if they survive!

And Lake Winnipeg does NOT need more pollution!

I support Ken Nelson's comments 100%.

Please advise and update!

Phil Spevack

As a resident of the RM of Brokenhead, I would like to share a few concerns pertaining to the Town of Beausejour Water Treatment Plant Upgrade Environment Act Proposal.

1. The proposal does not address the recreational value of the proposed discharge location of the concentrate to the Brokenhead River. The proposed discharge location (the point where groundwater naturally flows into the River) is a popular kayak and tubing launch point and is just upstream of the seasonal campground. The proposal does not evaluate the chemistry of the concentrate from a recreational water quality perspective, though Health Canada and the Manitoba Water Quality Guidelines & Standards provide support for such assessment.
2. The water chemistry modelling was based on the results of 4 grab samples collected over the course of the 72-hour pump test on the West Production Well, whereas aquifer conditions are known to be dynamic; therefore, the size of the data set is inadequate to meet a standard validity criterion and should be considered limited. Due to potential of unknown risks based on this limited data set, please consider ongoing monitoring of a wide set of analytical parameters. That said, I also noted that the certificate of analysis from ALS Laboratories, is only in draft form.
3. The geochemical assessment recommends ongoing monitoring of the water quality in the area to identify trends of increasing nitrate levels and to take preemptive measures, such as public education and awareness, and recommending the sealing of abandoned water wells. The report author also notes that while Health Canada does not set a limit for Ammonia in treated water, it is also an important consideration for the treatment process. (pg.63). Given that the geochemical study indicates that elevated concentrations of Nitrate were detected (above the MAC at Provincial Station G05SA011), and that the cause 'is suspected (to be) that the bedrock in that area is relatively shallow with a thinner protective layer', and the predicted concentration of Total ammonia in the membrane concentrate is close to the discharge limit (0.6 mg/L where the limit is 0.78 mg/L), I feel this potential impact warrants further assessment and additional controls to be considered in the license.
4. The report did not include a discussion of how temperature of the effluent will be controlled to 19.1 deg C in the final effluent discharged to the Brokenhead River to meet the site-specific discharge criteria for Ammonia.

5. The proposal does not provide adequate discussion of the modelling approach, and how the results may be applied to assessing the quality of the membrane concentrate water.
 - The report indicates that the aquifer chemistry is stable and consistent with historical raw water monitoring results, and has the isotope spectrum consistent with 'geologically young water', however, there is no analysis of tracer molecules that may be present due to the surface water impacts of agriculture in the recharge zone included in water chemistry analytical report to fully assess the quality of the water. It is recognized, as referenced above, that there are areas of reduced protection from surface water quality impacts in specific areas of the recharge zone. Furthermore, the geochemical study notes that the presence of private wells of unknown condition and quarries/ gravel pits in the area present concern for GUDI conditions, and that ongoing monitoring to observe potential surface water-groundwater interactions under long term pumping conditions including isotopic analysis, will be of interest in managing this project over time. This aspect was not specifically addressed in the proposal.
 - Given that the proponent is required to engage with the EA Branch in advance of applying a modelling approach to evaluating environmental effects, I recognize that more detailed information explaining the modelling approach may have been submitted through that process and is simply not available through the public registry.

6. The proposal does not adequately address the impacts to the river ecosystem.
 - Section 5.6 indicates that the proponent will 'provide data for the assessment of impacts to fish species'. Given that water quality is but one of many habitat components, I would like to also understand the projected impacts to fish habitat related to discharge flow rates, temperature, and the specific controls to prevent destruction of habitat during the installation and maintenance of the discharge pipe.
 - The proposal lacks any baseline assessment of the measurable habitat components of the Brokenhead River such as habitat suitability or species diversity indices to support ongoing monitoring.
 - The proposal did not include any assessment of impacts to species at risk.

Lastly, treatment of the membrane concentrate has not been considered. If there are reasons why further treatment of the membrane concentrate is not feasible or practical, I feel the public would appreciate the benefit of that understanding. It's my opinion that the proponent fell short of exploring concentrate recycling opportunities (such as irrigation supply) or treatment options such as an ion exchange process or an engineered wetland. An engineered wetland in the area of the proposed pipeline may be a reasonable solution to ensure aesthetic quality of the effluent discharged and ensure that water quality issues that may not have been identified through the (limited) sampling and modelling study have opportunity to be treated.

I would like the Town of Beausejour to address these issues and give further consideration to long term monitoring of GUDI conditions, private well management, the treatment of the membrane concentrate as well as its discharge location.

Thank you kindly for hearing my concerns.

Best Regards,
Mrs. Rachelle Angott B.Sc. CEP

E. Pip Comments – see separate document (49 pages, 1.7 kB)

Dear Mr. Webb:

In response to Notice of Environment Act Proposal-Town of Beausejour-Beausejour Water Supply System-File: 6059.00, we would like to express our concerns. Living west of the proposed site to release concentrate treated water, we seek assurance that it won't adversely affect our pleasure of the Brokenhead River.

It is our opinion that an Environmental Impact Study is needed.

Comparison projects and how other waters have been impacted, is information we would like to see as well.

An informed and educated decision is vital to the future of this fun, beautiful, and above all, healthy River.

Thank you for this opportunity to voice our worries.

We look forward to your response:

Donna and Tony Teunis

We wish to register our objection to a specific section of this proposal.

To have treated sewage water discharged at the proposed point Brokenhead River will seriously impact the recreation areas that are immediately downstream from the discharge point. There are over 400 campsites at Brokenhead River park & Great Woods park. The majority of these sites are rented on a seasonal basis. In addition there are many cottages along the river near the Rivers Edge golf course. Most of these seasonal residents make use of the river as a source of recreation & water sports, such as swimming, canoeing, kayaking & fishing. That means a conservative estimate of the number of people depending on a clean river for recreation is 1000 or more. This number does not include the many people who live elsewhere that make use of the river on weekends.

We strongly encourage Manitoba conservation to require that the discharge point for the treated water be north of both campgrounds & the golf course.

Thank you
Brian & Neila Ryall

As a lifelong resident of eastern Manitoba, I'm reaching out in concern about the potential for harm to the Brokenhead River ecosystem regarding the proposed pipeline discharging waste water into the Brokenhead River.

My concerns stem from matters brought forth by local residents of the RM of Brokenhead and, in particular, resident and ecologist, Samantha Braun. Some of the potential impacts relate to: water chemistry, algae, sensitive organisms, the food chain, Lake Winnipeg, recreational use, and the existing dam (impeding the flow and disbursement of the waste water). I also have concerns about changes in hydrology, affecting marshes.

Ms. Braun has voiced some sound solutions such as constructing a wetland *or fen* to filter the waste water before it enters the river, which will not only improve water quality, but give back to nature by restoring a slice of habitat for wetland species. In addition, if a marsh reconstruction goes ahead, I propose taking it a step further, *if deemed safe and the design allows*, by implementing a modest public trail system along the new marsh for wildlife viewing, as this type of public attraction is limited around Beausejour. This could be an opportunity to enrich the area and educate residents and visitors by means of interpretive signage about the water supply system, marsh restoration, and our native flora and fauna.

I devote particular attention to wildlife within the region and have been participating in citizen science projects for a number of years, such as the Manitoba Nocturnal Owl Survey (with two routes in the vicinity of the Brokenhead River), Canadian Nightjar Survey, and more. I also regularly submit data to the "Go Wild Manitoba" project (https://residents.gov.mb.ca/apps/go_wild.html). In the Beausejour area of the river I have observed basking Painted Turtles, Bald Eagles and Osprey catching fish, and have detected at least three types of owls during surveys (plus several other species). In addition, the **species at risk** I have observed in this area include Common Snapping Turtle, Northern Leopard Frog, Rusty Blackbird, Barn Swallow, Bank Swallow, and Red-headed Woodpecker. Data from the Atlas of the Breeding Birds of Manitoba shows us that other bird **species at risk** have also been detected in the local region: Least Bittern, Yellow Rail, Eastern Whip-poor-will, Common Nighthawk, Evening Grosbeak, Canada Warbler, and Eastern Wood-Pewee.

Constructing the water supply upgrade *responsibly* can provide a beneficial multi-purpose use for the land, prevent (potentially irreversible) ecological damage, and save on future costs of repairing any damage. A healthy environment is priceless therefore we cannot afford to be complacent.

Many thanks for your attention to this issue.

Sincerely,

Sandra Coté

Mr. Webb, I would like the river area to stay the same as it is beautiful, with turtles fish and a nice flow. The only think I am against is the tubers or kayakers, that come out to enjoy the river and leave their garbage in the river, along the river banks and where they launch into the river. There should be a garbage can so these people could put their garbage in the garbage can instead of the river.

My husband and I kayak the river and each time I pick garbage up from theses idiots who litter

We do not need a pipeline or water treatment plant to destroy more of our land and environment . for greed

Claudette Badiou

