

## SUMMARY OF COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

**PROPONENT:** Town of Souris  
**NAME OF DEVELOPMENT:** Town of Souris - Water Supply System  
**CLASS OF DEVELOPMENT:** Two  
**TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:** Water Development and Control - Water Withdrawal  
**CLIENT FILE NO.:** 4714.00

### OVERVIEW:

The Proposal was received on October 18, 2001. It was dated October 17, 2001. The advertisement of the proposal was as follows:

"A Proposal has been filed by Cochrane Engineering Ltd. on behalf of the Town of Souris for the construction and operation of a groundwater supply and treatment system. The system would replace the Town's present Souris River water supply. The proposed system would consist of a well north of NE 2-8-20W, a 15 km pipeline between the well and the town, and an upgraded water treatment plant. The well location is approximately 13 km east of Souris. The capacity of the new system would be 16.9 litres per second of treated water. Treatment would consist of nanofiltration, with filter membrane reject water being discharged into the Souris River. Pretreatment for iron and manganese removal may be required. Post treatment for disinfection and corrosion control would be undertaken. The proposed system would be constructed between the early winter of 2001 and the fall of 2002, with operation commencing in the fall of 2002."

The Proposal was advertised in the Souris Plaindealer on Monday, November 5, 2001. It was placed in the Main, Centennial, Eco-Network and Western Manitoba Regional Library (Brandon) public registries. The Proposal was distributed to TAC members on October 29, 2001. The closing date for comments from members of the public and TAC members was November 16, 2001.

### COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

**Rural Municipality of Glenwood** - Our zoning bylaw provides that where the public utility of another municipality is proposed to be located in the RM of Glenwood, it shall apply to Council for approval. The well for this water supply has already been constructed within municipal road allowance which is under our jurisdiction. To date we have not received an application for such approval from the Town of Souris or their project engineers. As a portion of the water supply pipeline is proposed within our municipal road allowance, it will also be subject to municipal approval by our Council.

The proposed route of the pipeline also suggests that there are other corporations which would be affected by the installation of this pipeline. Pro-Gilt Ltd., a large hog operation, already has a water line installed in the same road allowance. Enbridge Pipelines has several oil/gas lines which will have to be crossed just south of the well site. The route along PTH #2 will have to be coordinated with Canadian Pacific Railways and Manitoba Transportation and Government Services as it follows or crosses their rights-of-way.

Disposition:

This information was provided to the Manitoba Water Services Board. MSWB has discussed the matter with Town staff, and arrangements are being made for the Town to acquire the needed approvals.

...2

**COMMENTS FROM THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE:**

**Manitoba Conservation – Sustainable Resource Management** - The proponent has indicated that water samples will be taken in the late fall. Manitoba Conservation with the test results of these samples. Testing of these samples should include at least the following constituents: calcium, chloride, iron, hardness, magnesium, manganese, sodium, sulphate, pH, total dissolved solids.

Disposition:

An effluent monitoring program can be established through licence conditions to address impacts on the river.

**Manitoba Conservation – Western Region** - The licence conditions routinely applied to water pipeline construction projects should adequately address Environmental Operations concerns. The proponent indicates the quality of the residual water being discharged into the river should have no measurable impact on the river water quality even at minimal river flow. The licensee should be required to conduct a residual water quality monitoring program for a specific period of time after the plant commences operation to confirm this.

Disposition:

These suggestions can be addressed through licence conditions.

**Historic Resources Branch** - No concerns.

**Mines Branch** - No concerns.

**Highway Planning and Design Branch** - If PTH 2 and/or PTH 22 right-of-way are to be used, a formal agreement for placing underground facilities within Highway right-of-way will be required. This agreement would stipulate conditions for placement of the supply line, valves and clean-outs, as well as site restoration and erosion control. The Department has intersection improvements proposed for PTH 2 at the new Landmark Feeds facility in NW 34-7-20W that may affect placement of the supply line.

After reviewing the project plans and viewing the field location, the following comments are offered for consideration: In the area where PTH 2 is adjacent to the CPR rail line, the Highway right-of-way is confined on the north side to approximately 15 m from the centreline of PTH 2. This leaves very little if any right-of-way available for placement of the waterline. There is a restriction in the Highway right-of-way in SE 1-8-21W that would make placement of the waterline difficult. There are underground communication facilities (MTS and cable TV) on Highway right-of-way (north side) for the entire length of the project. There is a large ravine immediately east of Souris. Due to the high fill, the road grade (and grade slopes) occupies the full width of the right-of-way. Any construction in this area would require temporary erosion control measures be used. Were alternate route locations investigated, such as using municipal road allowances rather than PTH 2 right-of-way? The MTGS contact person for the project is the Regional Planning Technologist.

Disposition:

These comments were forwarded to the Manitoba Water Services Board for consideration in the final design of the project.

**Community Planning Services** - No objections and no major concerns with this project. However, there are a few points of information and comment to note.

...3

1. Water Supply Well:

A large hog barn has recently been constructed approximately 1/2 mile south-west of the well site, and the surrounding farmland in Sections 1 and 12 will be used for manure disposal areas. This may raise some questions about the risk of groundwater contamination near the water source. I understand that the depth of the water source, combined with the nature of the overlying material, will provide a very high level of protection for the aquifer. This should be reviewed and confirmed by environmental authorities.

I understand that the well has already been constructed in an undeveloped road allowance, as it was needed as part of the process of evaluating the capacity of the groundwater source. As rural road allowances (excluding provincial highways) are under the jurisdiction of the rural municipality, the construction of the well and pipeline system in the road allowance would be subject to municipal approval. Section 10 of PART IV of the R.M. of Glenwood Zoning By-law includes provisions for the construction of public utility by another municipality in the R.M. of Glenwood.

I understand that the well will not involve much "above ground" construction, other than some apparatus at the top of the pipe, and an electrical panel. I understand that the top of the well is very close to the edge of the road allowance, which would allow sufficient space for an east-west road to be developed in the future, if needed. I would suggest that the electrical panel should be placed as close to the property line as possible (or perhaps even on private property, subject to an easement, etc.). It might be prudent to provide some type of concrete barrier(s) to protect these structures from any vehicles that might accidentally leave the adjacent north-south road.

2. Pipeline Route:

I have been advised that the pipeline route will not be exactly as shown on the proposal. Due to the presence of a major natural gas pipeline and M.T.S. systems, the route along the south side of P.T.H. No. 2 is no longer being considered. Instead, it is proposed that the route would follow the north side of the highway. I would expect that the highway authority and any other utilities in the area will be consulted regarding this change in routes. I also note that a 1 1/2 mile segment of the Canadian Pacific Railway is located immediately north of the highway, which might raise some concerns for pipeline installation in this area.

The rural north-south segment of the pipeline is also proposed in a municipal road allowance, which again would be subject to municipal approval. There has been some indication that this alignment might be shifted slightly to the west, to put it on an easement on privately owned land, although this has not yet been finally determined.

The proposed rural pipeline routing will also involve a crossing of other transportation systems, such as the C.P. Railway and Enbridge Pipelines (formerly Interprovincial Pipeline). I would expect that these corporations would also be consulted concerning the proposed pipeline installation. C.P. should also be advised of the routing north of P.T.H. No. 2.

I understand that the pipeline route in Souris will follow existing streets or other public land, and that directional boring technology will be utilized instead of excavating trenches. This will minimize interference with any existing underground utilities, street pavements, etc.

...4

As a point of additional information, I would advise that Landmark Feeds has commenced construction of a large feed mill approximately 1/4 mile south of P.T.H. 2 (NW 34-7-20). I understand that there are plans to either connect to pipeline, or to install a parallel pipeline, to provide water service to the feed mill. This would require a highway crossing at this location.

Disposition:

These comments were forwarded to the Manitoba Water Services Board for information. Although the Board has free right-of-way in, on or under all road allowances and highways for pipeline installation, discussions will take place between the Town of Souris and the RM of Glenwood respecting the construction of the infrastructure for the project.

**Medical Officer of Health – Marquette, Brandon and South Westman Regional Health Authorities** - Please ensure appropriate waste disposal as per existing environment regulations. Dust, noise, gaseous and particulate emissions during construction may be a concern as may be the handling of gasoline products.

Disposition:

These comments can be addressed as licence conditions.

**Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency** - The federal comment period was extended to November 26 due to the short turnaround time for the review. An informal check of federal responses received by November 26 indicates that no federal agencies wish to participate in the provincial assessment process, and that two agencies (Western Diversification and Fisheries and Oceans) have CEAA triggers. Discussions with DFO staff indicate that a letter of advice will be issued for the project containing construction conditions.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

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

**RECOMMENDATION:**

All comments received on the Proposal are being addressed in the final design of the project 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 the Western Region.

**PREPARED BY:**

Bruce Webb  
Environmental Approvals - Environmental Land Use Approvals  
November 27, 2001

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