

## **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS**

**PROPONENT:** Rural Municipality of Grey  
**NAME OF DEVELOPMENT:** Haywood Wastewater Treatment Lagoon  
**CLASS OF DEVELOPMENT:** Two  
**TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:** Wastewater Treatment Lagoon  
**CLIENT FILE NO.:** 4794.00

### **OVERVIEW:**

The Proposal was received on May 9, 2002. It was dated April 30, 2002. The advertisement of the proposal was as follows:

“A Proposal has been filed by Cochrane Engineering Ltd. on behalf of the Rural Municipality of Grey for the construction and operation of a wastewater treatment lagoon for the community of Haywood. The lagoon would be located in NW 22-8-6W, approximately 1 km northwest of the community. It would provide wastewater treatment and storage capability, and would be discharged after June 15 and before November 1 each year. It is proposed to discharge the lagoon to the Upper Elm Creek Channel, which passes immediately north of the lagoon site. Construction of the project is proposed in the fall of 2002, with operation starting by the winter of 2002.”

The Proposal was advertised in the Carman Valley Leader and in the Treherne Times, both on Monday, May 27, 2002. It was placed in the Main, Centennial, and Portage la Prairie City Library public registries, and in the office of the Rural Municipality of Grey. The Proposal was distributed to TAC members on May 17, 2002. The closing date for comments from members of the public and TAC members was June 21, 2002.

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

**Elliot Wach** I have heard nasty things about the present Haywood lagoon where a very large area surrounding the lagoon and its discharge route have contaminated many people's wells. They say that groundwater drains mainly east and south from Haywood and although that sounds "safe" for our location, still makes us nervous for possible contamination.

The Elm Creek Channel, as I understand it, becomes the drainage ditch along PTH #2 along its easterly path to Elm Creek. With the present drainage of the ditches along some of the intersecting roads to PTH #2, there is a possibility of the lagoon discharge escaping the "channel" and running north such as along Mile 30 W (ours) to our property. Under normal spring runoff conditions, the water levels at the highway are only a foot or two lower than our house's crawlspace, by survey. We've had flooding of our crawlspace for

each of the past 2 or 3 years because of it (but not this year because of the dryer winter) . I think you'll find that the Elm Creek Channel flows through a few people's yards, too.

The seepage values you provided are not a concern - it's the regular discharge and the annual "dump" that worries us.

Why would anyone build a lagoon NW of creatures requiring breathable air?

Disposition:

Concerns about the timing of discharges from the project can be addressed as a standard licence condition.

**Michelle S. Dheilly** I am writing this letter to protest the proposed wastewater treatment lagoon for the community of Haywood, Manitoba. I am opposed to this proposal for several reasons. Firstly, the Upper Elm Creek Channel flows directly in front of my yard and often overflows onto my property. This occurs regularly every spring. As a result, my garden and entire yard will be affected by this untreated wastewater. Secondly, well water in the area would be greatly influenced. Any livestock would be sure to suffer from such unhealthy water. Thirdly, local business, for example a golf course, would see a decline in attendance if this proposal were to pass.

This proposal would be much better received if the wastewater would be treated in any form before being discharged into the local waterways. The wastewater should be filtered before being ejected from the lagoon to ensure a proper level of cleanliness. Phosphates, salt, feces and urine should all be removed in whole or in part from the wastewater released.

The Upper Elm Creek Channel follows along the No. 2 Highway from Haywood to Elm Creek but also flows onto much private property along the way. All these individuals would be greatly affected by this proposal. A petition is currently being circulated to protest this proposal. Your views on this subject are of great interest to me and a reply would be greatly appreciated.

Disposition:

Standard licence conditions can address the concerns about the timing of releases and the quality of the treated effluent. There are no wells near the lagoon, and wells downstream along the discharge route are unlikely to be directly affected by releases.

**Robert Labossiere** Our family lives on section SW 30-8-5. Our land and yard is right along the Elm Creek Channel. We have concerns about the proposed Haywood Lagoon. I believe the Engineers report is not complete and can be argued as there is no mention of the Elm Creek Channel condition, which is silted and has poor run off and causing flooding in our yard even after a summer rain. The water table is higher than the report states. These are but a few of our concerns. We have lived 59 years on this land.

Disposition:

This concern can be addressed by licence conditions regarding the timing of releases.

**Lucy Dheilly** Please accept this e-mail as my **opposition** of the Haywood Wastewater Treatment Lagoon being pumped in the Upper Elm Creek Channel.

I am opposed to this idea for various reasons:

- location of the lagoon
- soil contamination
- seepage into my well water
- odor & stench
- effects on cattle and on their supply of water
- soil erosion
- long term effects

I am sure that has to be an alternative to this proposal.

Disposition:

These concerns are addressed in the design guidelines for lagoons.

**Petition (17 names)** We, the undersigned, are opposed to the R.M. of Grey discharging the wastewater of the lagoon for the community of Haywood into the Upper Elm Creek Channel.

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

**Manitoba Conservation – Sustainable Resource Management** It is stated in the proposal that “it is unlikely that the effluent will ever reach the La Salle River due to the long distance and the sandy soils.” This raises concerns for groundwater contamination through seepage along the effluent discharge route. The proponent should investigate whether any local wells in the area may be affected by effluent being discharged to the proposed drainage route. Spring discharges should not occur until after June 15. The proponent should be required to actively participate in any future watershed management study, plan/or nutrient reduction program, approved by the Director, for Elm Creek Channel, La Salle River, Red River and associated waterways and watersheds.

Disposition:

No private wells are located near the discharge route in the first several kilometres. The comments concerning the timing of discharges and participation in future studies and nutrient reduction programs can be addressed through licence conditions.

**Manitoba Conservation - Environmental Approvals** The plans for the proposed facility show truck dumping facilities, but septage is not discussed in the

Proposal. Additional information should be obtained to indicate whether an allowance has been made for septage in the design, and if so, whether septage is considered for the community only, or also from the surrounding area. Information is also needed concerning discharge from home water softening systems – as community water is now obtained from a regional water supply system, home water softeners are not necessary.

Disposition:

Additional information was requested to address these items.

**Historic Resources Branch**

No concerns.

**Highway Planning and Design Branch** An agreement with the Department to place a sewerline adjacent to and/or across PTH 2 right-of-way is required. All affected ditches, slopes and disturbed areas within our right-of-way will be restored to an acceptable condition. It is assumed that the additional flow into the Elm Creek Channel that parallels PTH 2 will not impact the hydraulic capacity of the existing culverts. Any increased capacity that may be required is the responsibility of the applicant.

Disposition:

These comments were forwarded to the Proponent's consultant for information.

**Medical Officer of Health – Central Region**

Health concerns with this proposal is the adequate control of odors and fencing for safety reasons. Support proceeding with this proposal as the individual septic fields have contributed towards groundwater contamination for the village.

Disposition:

Odor is discussed in the Proposal. The lagoon was sited to comply with setback requirements for odor. Fencing is included in the design of the lagoon.

**Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency** Western Economic Diversification has provided notification that an environmental assessment under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act will be required. PFRA will conduct the assessment on behalf of WED. Environment Canada and Health Canada have offered to provide specialist advice. (No federal agencies indicated a desire to participate in the provincial review of the project.)

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:**

Additional information addressing TAC comments was requested from the Proponent's consultants on July 5, 2002. The response of July 9, 2002 is attached. The design accommodates septage from the community, but not from the surrounding rural area.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

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

**RECOMMENDATION:**

All comments received on the Proposal have been addressed in the additional information or can be addressed as licence conditions. Therefore, it is recommended that the Development be licensed under The Environment Act subject to the limits, terms and conditions as described on the attached Draft Environment Act Licence. It is further recommended that enforcement of the Licence be assigned to Environmental Approvals until construction is completed. Once the facility is commissioned, enforcement should be assigned to the Red River Region.

PREPARED BY:

---

Bruce Webb, P. Eng.  
Environmental Approvals - Environmental Land Use Approvals  
(for Municipal and Industrial Approvals)  
July 22, 2002

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