

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS
SITE SELECTION PRELIMINARY REPORT AND PROPOSAL FILED FOR
DEVELOPING THE R.M OF TACHE WASTE DISPOSAL GROUND

PROPONENT: RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF TACHÉ

PROPOSAL NAME: RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF TACHÉ
Class 1 Waste Disposal Ground

CLASS OF DEVELOPMENT: CLASS 2

TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT: Waste Scrap – Solid Waste Management Facility

CLIENT FILE NO: 4252.00

BACKGROUND

A Preliminary Site Evaluation Report of the proposed waste management facility for the R.M of Taché dated May 21, 1998 was submitted to Manitoba Environment by Dillon Consulting Ltd. for a review and evaluation of the suitability of the site for the development of a waste disposal facility.

The report was circulated to members of the Waste Disposal Technical Advisory Committee for comments.

The following comments were received:

1. Department of Natural Resources

If monitoring wells are to be installed, two is insufficient. Three wells should be installed initially to obtain information on the direction of groundwater flow. Based on this information, a monitoring network consisting of one upgradient well and a minimum of three downgradient wells would be necessary.

Should water retention ponds be constructed on the site, the use of these ponds by avian species should be limited if possible.

2. Community Economic Development Services

The final four sites that have been selected for further consideration, namely "O", "C", "E", "A2", all occur in the area that is zoned "AG80" AGRICULTURAL GENERAL ZONE in the R.M of Taché Zoning By-law. Garbage Disposal sites are allowed as a conditional use on sites with a minimum size area of 40 acres and a size width of 200 ft. Establishment of the site, therefore, would require a public meeting and a decision by Council based on a conditional use application.

Two of the above noted sites, namely “A2” and “E” occur within 2 miles (south) of the Village of Lorette and approximately ½ mile (east) of the settlement centre of Dufresne respectively.

With respect to site “E”.

Dufresne is not experiencing significant residential development at this time. In any case, expansion of the centre would occur to the south of P.T.H. 1.

3. Department of Urban Affairs

Manitoba Department of Urban Affairs assumes that potential impacts related to air or water quality, (surface and ground source) will be addressed through mitigative measures as a condition of environmental licencing of the operation.

4. Water Quality Management

Clarification is needed on the following:

- a) What is the buffer distance between the old facility, operating under permit number 1-013 V, and the proposed new one?
- b) How are any present or future impacts from the old facility going to be detected or differentiated from impacts from the new facility?
- c) There is need to follow through with the design criteria set forth in the Conyette Guidelines, i.e, Section 2.7. More information is needed with regard to site specific hydraulic conductivity, transmissivity, and storage coefficients of the limestone aquifer.

5. Historic Resources Branch

There are no concerns with regard to this project’s potential to impact heritage resources.

6. Department of Highways

There are no transportation related concerns with this proposal assuming Site A2 is the final decision.

7. Department of Health

No additional health concerns

8. Environmental Operations – Winnipeg Region

- a) Recirculation of Leachate is not a good option. Removal and treatment should be considered.
- b) The leachate collection/monitoring system should be more adequately described. A sump should be installed at cell bottom to facilitate leachate removal.
- c) If future plans are to install a compost area and a household hazardous waste collection depot, conditions under which this can be done should be well defined.
- d) Site A2 is located adjacent to the existing Lorette Waste Disposal Ground and it is believed that the consultant has installed groundwater monitoring wells at the existing site. The monitoring data should be assessed to determine what impact the existing site has on the groundwater. The information will be useful in developing or refining the final design criteria for the proposed site.
- e) The compost area should be lined with impermeable material to control runoff.
- f) The household hazardous waste depot should be a properly designed structure.

9. Department of Agriculture

No comments received by July 7, 1998.

10. Department of Labour

No comments received by July 7, 1998.

11. Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism

No comments received by July 7, 1998.

12. Department of Rural Development

The Department is not clear on what the preferred option is. It is assumed that Site A2 next to the existing site near Lorette is preferred.

DISPOSITION OF COMMENTS FROM TAC MEMBERS

The comments from TAC members were forwarded to the Consultant Dillon Consulting Ltd. for attention and a response when filing a proposal for the development of the waste disposal ground.

OVERVIEW:

- Date of receipt of Proposal – August 4, 1998
- Date of Proposal – July 30, 1998

- Brief Description of Proposal

The construction of a Class 1 Waste Disposal Ground in the Rural Municipality of Taché on lands described as portions of river lots 19, 20, and 21, Parish of Lorette, Plan 4196 WLTO. The proposed waste management facility will incorporate a landfill area, a waste transfer/drop-off area, a recyclables collection area, clean wood/chipper stockpile, an oil/filters recycling depot, a pesticide container site, a maintenance/attendant building, an entry area for future weigh scale, future compost area, future household hazardous waste collection depot, cover stockpile areas and buffer zone/land.

- Names of newspapers in which Proposal advertised
 - Steinbach Carillon –Monday, August 31, 1998

- Public Registry Locations
 - Main Registry
 - Centennial Public Library
 - Manitoba Eco-Network

- Closing date for Public Comments
September 30, 1998

- Date when Proposal was sent to TAC and closing date for response from TAC
August 24, 1998, and September 30, 1998 respectively.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Rolande Chernichan

Is opposed to Site A2 for the development of a waste disposal ground.

She also has concerns regarding the siting process which is described as flawed, negligent and unsatisfactory based on the following:

1. The citizen's liaison committee was provided with erroneous, insufficient and outdated information.
2. The initial and progressive screening processes were flawed from the outset.
3. Many recommendations and concerns expressed by the committee have not been incorporated in the report prepared by the Consultant.
4. Test drilling for hydrogeotechnical investigation was conducted half mile away from the extreme boundary of the waste disposal site.
5. The waste disposal site is located in close proximity to over a dozen residences. There is therefore a concern regarding the protection of the aquifer from which the residents obtain their water supply.
6. The existing landfill attracts a large bird population, and there are no bird control measures in the operational plan for the new landfill.

7. Awaiting notification of a Public Hearing by Manitoba Environment so that the above concerns can be addressed more thoroughly.

Petition Received from 115 (approx) Residents

A petition signed by 115 (approx) residents opposing the use of Site A2 for the development of a waste disposal ground was presented to the Council of the R.M of Taché at a meeting on April 21st 1998. A copy of this petition was mailed to Manitoba Environment.

Arlene Alexis and Doug Paton

Opposed to the location of the waste disposal ground at Site A2 for the following reasons:

- increase in traffic volumes;
- deterioration of roadways used for transporting wastes;
- safety of the public using the roads;
- depreciation of property value; and
- increased presence of pests and rodents.

Ms Dianne Wright

Member of the Citizen's Liaison Committee

Opposed to construction of the waste disposal ground on the basis of the following:

- recommendations made by the Citizen's committee have not been included in the proposal filed by the Consultant;
- the waste disposal ground may have a negative impact on the water of the drainage systems in the surrounding area;
- the Lorette and Landmark lagoon facilities have not been designed, or have the capacity to treat leachate; and
- drilling operations to determine the subsoil hydrogeotechnical conditions of the landfill site have been conducted at a distance of approximately one-half of a mile from the landfill site.

Requests that an assessment of the proposed development be made under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act before a Licence is issued and funds are released for the Development.

Ms Wright has also indicated that when a Public Hearing is held for this Development, she would like to make a presentation to the Clean Environment Commission.

Ben Van Osch

Is opposed to the development on the basis of the following:

- the facility is within 600 metres of his residence;
- the largest number of residences is within 2km from the proposed site for the Development;
- the Youville canal runs alongside the proposed development; and
- the Consultant's report indicates that the Development should be located more than 500 metres from a water supply well and his neighbour's well is within this distance.

DISPOSITION OF COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

The comments were forwarded to the Consultant for resolution and a response. The Consultant has provided information to Manitoba Environment indicating how the Public concerns were addressed.

COMMENTS FROM THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

Department of Natural Resources

- The site presents a very low risk of groundwater quality impacts;
- The groundwater monitoring program presented in the Consultant's report does not appear to be well-designed;
- The monitoring system does not appear likely to yield any useful information; and
- Measures should be taken to ensure that area is not used as a roosting or feeding site and that stormwater retention ponds in the Development should be made inaccessible to birds.

Environmental Operations

Department of Environment

- A regular program for leachate removal should be established. A maximum leachate head should be specified and included in the licence;
- Due to odour concern, recirculation of leachate is not recommended;
- Potential leachate treatment facility in the municipality should be identified;
- The proposed monitoring and removal system for leachate appears inadequate;
- A sump type of arrangement should be designed and constructed for each cell;
- Runoff that has been in contact with any waste shall be considered as leachate and disposed of as leachate;
- Discharge of liquid from the storm water retention pond shall be subjected to the Director's approval;

- The proposal indicated that the base of the disposal cell is to be remoulded/proof rolled (Figure 5-9) rather than “removed and recompacted” as proposed for the exterior face of the cell;
- The proposed compost area should be lined with impermeable material and measure to control runoff from this area should be in place;
- Natural Resources or Water Quality Section should be asked to assess the adequacy of the proposed design factor of 1:25 year storm frequency for the stormwater retention pond;
- Additional bedrock monitoring wells are required, a minimum total of three downgradient and one upgradient would be necessary;
- Two more monitoring well in the clay layer should also be installed, one in the southwest portion of the property, the other at the eastern boundary of the site;
- Background groundwater information to be established as per the requirements of the Class 1 Sitting Guidelines;
- When the analyses results (Section 6, Page 10 to 12) of well 98-02B and 98-04B are compared, certain chemical parameters are significantly different, i.e., alkalinity, conductivity, hardness, magnesium, sodium, total dissolved solids, sulphate, magnesium, and sodium. In view of the fact that both wells are installed in the bedrock at approximately the same depth, the consultant should be requested to provide an explanation for the variation;
- The same is also true when comparing analyses results of well 98-02C and 98-03C with 98-04C; and
- Resampling of the wells in late fall of 1998 should be conducted to provide another set of data.

DISPOSITION OF COMMENTS FROM TAC MEMBERS ON THE PROPOSAL FILED

The comments were forwarded to the Consultant for a response. The Consultant’s response was subsequently sent to the TAC members concerned to determine whether their concerns were adequately addressed.

On November 12, 1998, I received a reply from the Environmental Operations Division of the Department of Environment regarding their acceptability of the Consultant’s response to their concerns. Their additional comments will be incorporated in the Licence.

C. Conyette held a meeting with Bob Betcher of the Department of Natural Resources on November 9, 1998 to discuss the department’s concerns regarding the Consultant’s proposed monitoring system. Bob Betcher has requested further information from the Consultant concerning the purpose and objectives to be achieved by the proposed monitoring system. The Consultant has provided further information on the monitoring system. This information has been forwarded to the Department of Natural Resources for their review.

RECOMMENDATION

1. A meeting should be held between the representatives of the Citizen Liaison Committee, the Consultant and the R.M of Taché to discuss and resolve the areas of concern regarding the Development prior to the issuing of a Licence to construct and operate the Development.
2. The Consultant's proposed groundwater monitoring system should be approved by the Department of Natural Resources before the system is installed.

Prepared by:

Charles Conyette, P. Eng.
Special Projects Engineer

November 12, 1998