

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS / RECOMMENDATIONS

PROPONENT: 4444648 Manitoba Ltd.
PROPOSAL NAME: 4444648 Manitoba Ltd.
CLASS OF DEVELOPMENT: CLASS 1
TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT: Asphalt Plant
CLIENT FILE NO: 4755.00

OVERVIEW:

A proposal was filed by Mr. Claude Laronge, P.Eng., on behalf of 4444648 Ltd. for the construction and operation of a development located on Lots 10 and 11 John Shott Road in Harbourview Industrial Park in the Rural Municipality of Springfield. The development involves the production of asphalt mix for construction purposes by mixing and heating raw materials including asphalt cement and aggregates. There is potential for noise, particulate matter and vapour emissions to the air. Emission control is provided by a baghouse. The development is expected to normally operate Monday to Saturday from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. from May till the middle of November..

The Department provided the Technical Advisory Committee with information on the Proposal and made public notification in the Winnipeg Free Press. The closing date for comments was April 12, 2002. The following summarizes the responses:

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Fourteen citizens submitted comments or concerns regarding the Development. Four petitions representing approximately 72 citizens were received regarding the development.

- Comment 1: Request public hearing.
Response: *The concerns raised during this assessment have been addressed and a public hearing is not warranted.*
Disposition: Deny a public hearing.
- Comment 2: Noise.
Response: *The development is located in an industrial area with a distance of over 2 kilometers to the nearest sizeable residential development. The proposed hours of operation are such that noise should not be an issue given the time and distance. Nonetheless, the licence will contain a noise nuisance clause.*
Disposition: No further action needed.
- Comment 3: Increased traffic flows; dust problems.
Response: *The main access to the development for commercial vehicles is from Springfield Road to Day Road to John Shott Road. Oxford Street is not to be used for access. John Shott Road is to be paved.*
Disposition: No further action needed.
- Comment 4: Particulate / vapour / fume / smoke / odour emissions.
Response: *These types of emissions will be controlled by a baghouse control device, and by requirements to maintain aggregate piles and the general yard site to prevent entrainment of particulates. Most probably, these emissions will not be a nuisance, and the licence contains conditions to address these issues.*
Disposition: No further action needed.
- Comment 5: Health.
Response: *With proper emission control, emissions have not been identified as a concern for health.*
Disposition: No further action needed.
- Comment 6: Asthma; allergies.
Response: *Concerns regarding effects on sensitive segments of a population are appreciated. Unfortunately, criteria used in regulating emissions is determined on exposures to average populations.*
Disposition: No further action taken.

- Comment 7: Fire / explosive hazards.
Response: *Fire and possibility of explosion is a common hazard to many developments. The licence will require the proponent to develop and submit an Emergency Response Plan do deal with these and other contingencies.*
Disposition: No further action needed.
- Comment 8: Ground water contamination.
Response: *Water is not used at the development other than for domestic purposes or to control entrainment of particulates from the aggregate piles / roads. Any spillage of asphalt cement is contained. The nature of this material prevents it from penetrating into the ground or running off property. The licence restricts any discharge of contaminated wastewater.*
Disposition: No further action needed.
- Comment 9: Hazardous material transportation.
Response: *The proponent will have to meet all applicable regulations regarding dangerous goods or hazardous wastes, should the situation apply..*
Disposition: No further action needed.

The appropriate comments were forwarded to the proponent for response, and the responses were forwarded to the commentors.

RELEVANT COMMENTS FROM THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

1. **Manitoba Culture, Heritage & Citizenship – Historical Resources Branch** – has no concerns.

No response necessary.

Disposition: No action needed.
2. **Manitoba Industry, Trade and Mines – Petroleum Branch** – have no concerns.

No response necessary.

Disposition: No action needed.
3. **Manitoba Industry, Trade and Mines – Industry & Trade** – did not respond.

No response necessary.

Disposition: No action needed.
4. **Manitoba Intergovernmental Affairs** – did not respond.

No response necessary.

Disposition: No action needed.
5. **Manitoba Conservation – Climate Change Branch – Air Quality Management** – did not respond.

No response necessary.

Disposition: No action needed.
6. **Manitoba Conservation – Policy Coordination Branch - Conservation Programs Division** – has the following comments:

4444648 Manitoba Ltd.
Summary of Comments

- 1) Active areas should be disked and recompactd so as to constitute a relatively low permeability layer.

As stated, water is not used at the development in any process, and the possibility of asphalt cement contaminating ground water at this site is extremely unlikely.

- 2) The site should be searched for any abandoned wells or other deep excavations and if found they should be thoroughly filled with grout and back filled by a qualified well driller.

The site has been inspected and no wells or other excavations have been discovered.

Disposition: No further action required.

7. **Environment Canada – Canadian Environment Review Agency** – responded that the application of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* with respect to the project will not be required.

No response necessary.

Disposition: No action needed.

8. **Manitoba Conservation – Environmental Operations Division – Red River Region** – responded that:

1. The baghouse exhaust stack must not exceed the particulate limit stated in the standard particulate Clause, which is 0.23 grams per dry standard cubic meter. This Clause should be incorporated into the Environment Act Licence.
2. Major particulate emissions do not come from the process when baghouse control technology is utilized, but rather from fugitive emissions. Fugitive particulate emissions from aggregate piles, roadways and hopper loading equipment may be a concern beyond the property boundaries (adjacent neighbours) if the emissions become wind entrained.
3. The Environment Act Proposal has not addressed the use of recycled asphalt products (RAP). If RAP will be processed at this asphalt plant the additional odours created may be a concern.

The above concerns are addressed in the licence.

Disposition: No further action needed.

9. **Manitoba Agriculture – Soils and Crops - Soil Resource Section** – did not respond.

No response necessary.

Disposition: No action needed.

10. **Manitoba Highways and Transportation - Highway Planning and Design** – has no concerns with this project..

No response necessary.

Disposition: No action needed.

11. **Manitoba Health - Public Health - Environmental Unit** – did not respond.

No response necessary.

Disposition: No action needed.

4444648 Manitoba Ltd.
Summary of Comments

PUBLIC HEARING:

There was 1(8 individuals) petition request for public hearings.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

A Licence considering the above relevant concerns as well as those of the Approvals Branch be prepared and issued. Responsibility for enforcement of the Licence should be transferred to the Region.

PREPARED BY:

Richard Johns
Municipal, Industrial & Hazardous Waste Approvals
June 5, 2002

Telephone: (204) 945-7023
Facsimile: (204) 945-5229
E-mail: rjohns@gov.mb.ca