Dagdick, Elise (CWS)

From: Matthews, Rob (MWS)
Sent: March-20-13 7:05 PM
To: Dagdick, Elise (CON)
Cc: Thibert, Lorraine (MWS)
Subject: RE: Request for review & comments: EOG Pierson to MIPL Pipeline 5635.00 - Comments due: April 29, 2013

Elise,

As they will be diverting water for hydrostatic purposes we need to say the following:

"The diversion of water for hydrostatic testing purposes may require an authorization under The Water Rights Act. The contact person for this issue is Rob Matthews who may be reached at 204-945-6118".

Rob

Dagdick, Elise (CWS)

From: Janusz, Laureen R (CWS)
Sent: May-04-13 3:38 PM
To: Dagdick, Elise (CWS)
Cc: Bruederlin, Bruno (CWS); Long, Jeff (CWS)
Subject: EAP 5635 EOG Pierson to MIPL Pipeline due: April 29, 2013

Hi Elise,

Fisheries Branch has reviewed this proposal to construct a 32 km long 6"pipeline to carry sweet natural gas between the EOG oil battery at LSD 04-01-02-28 W1M and the proposed MIPL facility at LSD 05-06-03-29 W1M. There will be a 20 m wide ROW + 5 m width TWS along the length of the pipeline and the pipeline will be installed implementing conventional trenching methods. The proposed pipeline is located within an agricultural setting. Temporary facilities such as construction workspaces, shoo-flies/temporary access roads, equipment storage sites, pipe stockpile sites, bone yards and construction office sites may be required prior to or during the construction program. They indicate that water courses will be bored or open cut and the implementation of surface erosion control measures and riparian vegetation restoration will likely substantially reduce the potential for adverse effects. the pipeline will be pressure tested using water.

Fisheries Branch has the following concerns or recommendations:

1. Temporary facility sites: Proponents have developed a list of criteria to help select areas. There is no criteria that addresses selecting site areas that avoid proximity to surface water. Would it be possible to have a clause in the licence that ensures these areas are placed 15 m from the high water mark of 1st and 2nd order creeks and 30 m from the high water mark of 3rd order and higher rivers and lakes.
2. Watercourse crossings: They indicate the only watercourse with a defined bed and bank is Gainsborough Creek in SW ¼ of 3-2-29 W. They also indicate that for Gainsborough crossing and the crossing of two other water features in NW NW¼ 31-2-29WPM and SW¼ 6-3-29WPM, which have the potential to convey water, they will bore the crossings and the boring activities will be conducted outside of the riparian zone of all watercourses. They indicate in another section of the proposal that there are 8 natural drainages that will be open cut in the dry. It is not easy to identify if there is the need for any temporary vehicle crossings.
    - For ease of identifying the water crossing sites it would have been beneficial to have ALL surface water courses (pipeline and temporary) listed in a table along with locations.
    - All trenching and boring should adhere to DFO's operational statements (this was not noted in the EA proposal).
    - There is no indication of what width of riparian area will be retained for the trenching/boring. We would request the same widths be adhered to as in 1 above.
    - Regarding the natural drainages to be open cut: while these natural drainages may only carry water intermittently it is not unusual for them to provide spawning, nursery and feeding areas in the spring and, if not used by fish directly, they contribute to the overall health of the downstream receiving waters. We would like to note that regional fisheries staff have found watercourse crossings that are open cut often difficult to stabilize and result in ongoing erosion and sedimentation. We prefer any crossings that carry water throughout the year or intermittently that may provide spawning and nursery habitat, and **contribute to** downstream habitat **to be directionally drilled**.
    - If the proponents do continue with trenching then for those connected to downstream waters the work needs to be done outside of the spring spawning period (April 1-June 15) if water is present and, preferably in the dry.
    - The bed and bank must be contoured to resemble the pre-construction dimensions. If there is the need to consult on a particular water course crossing, the methods change or an incident occurs, Bruno Bruederlin is the regional fisheries biologist in Brandon. He can be reached at 726-6452 or email: bbruederlin@gov.mb.ca.

- We would recommend that mitigation measures identified in the proposal, such as erosion and sediment control measures and re-establishment of riparian areas (with native species), be included as conditions within the licence.
- For open cut sites it is equally important to conduct post construction monitoring. This is necessary until the crossings are stabilized. Monitoring should be done in the spring and after every major precipitation event. We would like to see watercourse crossings included as part of the post-construction environmental report - method implemented; success/failures; type of remediation if required and when.

3. Pressure Testing: Proponent indicates water will be used to pressure test the line but they did not indicate the water source. If the intent is to withdraw from surface water there will be requirements for screening the intake. Depending on timing, we would not want the withdrawal to occur during the spring spawning season (April 1 – June 15th) and outside of this window it is important that there is sufficient water to not cause pooling/ponding during the water withdrawal. The other concern is the discharge test water. We would not want this water discharged directly to any surface water but released at a location and at a frequency that would provide for infiltration into the land and/or some filtration by vegetation prior to entering the surface water. These concerns can be addressed through the review process when the applicant applies for a license from Surface Water Management.
4. Minimizing transfer of foreign biota: For any piece of equipment or machinery that is used in or near the water at different locations (e.g. large machinery, temporary bridges, mats, pump intake and screen, diversion dams, etc.) to minimize the potential for introduction of foreign biota the equipment/machinery should be visually inspected (any plants, algae and animals removed) and disinfected. We've been requesting equipment be cleaned off (not adjacent to the surface water) with a bleach solution and then rinsed with water prior to using. Rinsing equipment with hot water (140^{0}F) is also effective and again would need to be done to ensure rinse water does not runoff into the adjacent surface water. This should become a standard protocol every equipment is used at a new location.
5. As a reminder, any handling and/or transportation of fish and mussels during salvage operations require a Live Fish Handling Permit from Fisheries Branch, Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship. We would also expect that at open trench cuts mussels, if present, would be relocated to suitable habitat upstream of the crossing.
6. The proponent indicates that fish populations and aquatic habitat protection in Manitoba fall under the jurisdiction of the federal government through DFO and the *Fisheries Act.* This is not entirely correct as presented. In Manitoba control over crown land and natural resources was transferred over in 1930 under the Manitoba Natural Resource Transfer Agreement and under the federal Manitoba Fishery Regulations, 87 have the delegated authority for the day to day administration of the fishery.

Laureen Janusz
Fisheries Science and Fish Culture Section
Fisheries Branch,
Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship
Box 20, 200 Saulteaux Crescent
Winnipeg, MB R3J 3W3

Phone: 204.945.7789
Cell: 204.793.1154
Fax: 204.948-2308
Email: Laureen.Janusz@gov.mb.ca

Dagdick, Elise (CON)

From: Kaita, Adara (CON) on behalf of +WPG1212 - Conservation_Circulars (CON)
Sent: April-26-13 12:13 PM
To: Dagdick, Elise (CON)
Subject: EA Proposal - EOG Pierson to MIPL Pipeline 5635.00

Hi Elise,

The Sustainable Resource and Policy Management Branch and the Lands Branch have no concerns.

Adara Kaita
Crown Land Programs and Policy Manager
Conservation and Water Stewardship
Box 25, 200 Saulteaux Crescent
Winnipeg, MB R3J 3W3
Cell: (204) 945-6301
F: (204) 948-2197

Comment on the environmental assessment for the proposed construction of pipeline from Pierson, MB to Many Island Pipe Lines (MIPL) facility at LSD 05-06-03-29WPM by EOG Resources Canada Inc. pursuant to The Environment Act

Proponent: EOG Resources Canada Inc. Report prepared by Kelly WM Scott and Associates, Calgary

Purpose: Construction of a new 6-inch O.D. pipe from a proposed EOG oil battery at LSD 04-01-02-28W1M to Many Island Pipe Lines (MIPL) facility located at LSD 05-06-03-29W1M.

Prelude: This assessment is absolutely based on the information provided by the applicant, and no field investigation was carried out for the purpose of review or assessment at this point of time.

Observations:

1. The proponent EOG wishes to construct a new 6-inch OD 32 km long steel pipeline to transport sweet natural gas. EOG operates a natural gas liquids (NGL) recovery plant at Waskada. EOG proposes to transport natural gas to proposed MIPL facility near Gainsborough, as there is no infrastructure in place in the Waskada area for natural gas conservation. Cumulative impact of the pipeline construction on physical environment, soil quality, water quality, fish habitat, wildlife, wetland, vegetation, SAR and human health are claimed to be minimal or insignificant. For the SAR, the applicant will implement contingency measures to reduce effect on the local population. For the route, wetlands have been avoided to minimize impacts on wetland habitats. There are no situations where there is a high probability of occurrence of a permanent or long-term residual effect of high magnitude that cannot be technically or economically avoided. The EA report claims that the proposed pipeline route is environmentally satisfactory; most of the associated potential impacts arising from the construction can be readily mitigated through environmental protection measures.

2. As claimed in the report, approx. 75 workers will be involved in the construction project. For construction site(s), the applicant needs to comply with Section 4(1) of the Onsite Wastewater Management Systems Regulation MR 83/2003, enforced by Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship, '*No person shall discharge sewage, greywater or wastewater effluent into or onto the surface of the ground except in compliance with this regulation*'. General information on the compliance of the regulation can be found at http://web2.gov.mb.ca/laws/regs/pdf/e125-083.03.pdf . Given the fact that the construction sites are usually intended for short time stay, consideration shall be given to the use of either holding tanks or portable units of secondary wastewater treatment system. Any system should be installed by a licensed installer pursuant to Section 9(1) of the regulation. However, final disposal of the wastewater has to be done by registered sewage haulers. A list of certified installers and haulers can be found at http://www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/envprograms/wastewater/industry-group/index.html. In case of the use of a portable secondary sewage treatment system, the unit has to be pre-approved by and registered with Manitoba Conservation. Please note that Manitoba Conservation

communicated with oil companies working in the western region of Manitoba regarding wastewater management in the drilling sites, through correspondence dated February 13, 2012.

Conclusive remarks: Manitoba Conservation-Enforcement and Compliance Branch, Western region, has no concern about this proposed development at this point of time. However, please refer to our observation point 2 regarding compliance of wastewater management in the construction sites of the proposed development.

Reviewed by:

Apurba Krishna Deb
Environment Officer
Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Branch
Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship-Western Region
Brandon

Dagdick, Elise (CON)

From: Molod, Rommel (CON)
Sent: April-22-13 1:32 PM
To: Dagdick, Elise (CON)
Cc: Streich, Laurie (CON)
Subject: RE: Request for review & comments: EOG Pierson to MIPL Pipeline 5635.00 - Comments due: April 29, 2013

Hello Elise,

Air Quality Section has no air quality related comment on the above proposed gas pipeline. It is expected that the proposal has no significant impact on air quality. It is also expected that the pumps that will be utilized in the project are electricity driven. However, when natural gas-fired engines are used, they may be subject to the requirements of the proposed Base Level Industrial requirements (BLIERs) for reciprocating engines under the federally led Air Quality Management System (AQMS).

Thank you for the opportunity to review.

Rommel

Dagdick, Elise (CON)

From: Kelly, Jason (CON)
Sent: April-22-13 10:20 AM
To: Dagdick, Elise (CON)
Subject: FW: Request for review & comments: EOG Pierson to MIPL Pipeline 5635.00 - Comments due: April 29, 2013

Parks and Natural Areas Branch has reviewed the proposal filed pursuant to the Environment Act for the Request for review & comments: EOG Pierson to MIPL Pipeline 5635.00 - Comments due: April 29, 2013. The Branch has no comments to offer as this does not impact any parks or ecological reserves

Jason Kelly, M.N.R.M.
Ecological Reserves and Protected Areas Specialist
Parks and Natural Areas Branch
Conservation and Water Stewardship
Box 53, 200 Saulteaux Cres
Winnipeg, MB R3J 3W3

Phone: 204-945-4148
Cell:
Fax: 204-945-0012

Email: Jason.Kelly@gov.mb.ca

Dagdick, Elise (CON)

From: Wiens, Jonathan (CON)
Sent: March-22-13 3:04 PM
To: Dagdick, Elise (CON)
Subject: WB review of 5634.00 EOG Resources Canada Inc.

Dear Ms. Dagdick,

Clarification is required on aspects of the wildlife and vegetation survey conducted within the pipeline environmental assessment(client file #5634). Please accept the following comments from the Wildlife Branch:

- Chapter 5.1.8.3 Rare Vascular Plants – "A summary of plants identified within 1 km of the proposed pipeline right-of-way (previously accessed for the Pipeline route for Waskada to Pierson and Pierson to MIPL) by the Manitoba Conservation Data Centre is provided in Table 5.5. A request to Manitoba CDC was made to update current information was made in January 2013 however the information was not provided prior to completing this report and will be forwarded upon receipt.". The Wildlife Branch – Manitoba Conservation Data Centre (CDC) did not receive a request for data for this project in January 2013. Furthermore, the data accessed for the Waskada to Pierson pipeline project may no longer be up-to-date, or applicable for this project. The Wildlife Branch requests that the proponent contact the CDC as soon as possible to inquire about access to the latest data.
- Chapter 5.1.7 - *Wetlands* states that "Wetlands were avoided as a result of routing criteria (*e.g.*, avoidance of wetlands, minimizing impact) for the proposed pipeline route". The Wildlife Branch requires further information on the potential effects on wetlands. Environmental assessments need to outline all the habitat types along the proposed route, including a detailed description of the class, size, and health of wetlands occurring along the route ROW, and site specific mitigation efforts including boring, trenching etc. More detailed information is required before the Wildlife Branch can properly review this project.
- Table 5.1.8.1 states "The entire proposed pipeline route is located on cultivated land.". Please confirm that there is no pasture, prairie, wetlands or other natural cover along the pipeline ROW. It would be preferable for the proponent to provide a table outlining the distribution of vegetation communities along the pipeline ROW (cultivated, shrub, wetland, riparian, grasslands etc.). Where native prairie or pasture was not avoidable during the routing selection process, Wildlife Branch will require additional mitigation measures to prevent impacts to these important habitats.
- The survey data for rare and endangered species, in relation to the ROW is not provided. Table 5.5 provides some information but does not provide adequate spatial specific details for the purposes of a regulatory review by the Wildlife Branch. Although it is important to remain cautious about sharing endangered species locations, the Wildlife Branch requests a map of this data for the purposes of conducting a proper regulatory review.
- p.5-11: "*The proposed pipeline route is not proximal to any named lakes, Important Bird areas or NAWMP priority areas.*" This is a error. This project is being carried out entirely in the *Southwestern Manitoba Mixed Grass Prairie - Important Bird Area*.
- Given the known occurrences of nesting endangered bird species in the vicinity of the pipeline route, it may be required that the construction phase of this project be restricted between May 1st through August 15th. This is a critical time of year for many endangered bird species. These requirements are, in part, derived from the guidebook: **Petroleum Industry Activity Guidelines for Wildlife Species at Risk in the Prairie and Northern Region (2009),** as developed by Environment Canada.

Recommendations:

- Provide further review of the wildlife and vegetation resources within the study area. Provide at minimum:
  - A shapefile outlining the distribution of vegetation communities along the ROW.
  - A table outline the distribution of vegetation communities along the pipeline ROW (cultivated, native grassland, wetland, riparian, etc).
  - A table and map outlining the number, class, health, and size of wetlands along the pipeline ROW.

- A map outlining the occurrences of rare and endangered species in the pipeline ROW.

Jonathan Wiens, MSc
Habitat Specialist
Manitoba Conservation
Box 24 - 200 Saulteaux Crescent
Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3J 3W3
Phone: (204) 945-7764
Mobile: (204) 918-3420
Fax: (204) 945-3077
Email: jonathan.wiens@gov.mb.ca

Manitoba

Local Government

Community Planning Services Branch
P.O. Box 22147 2010 Currie Boulevard
Brandon, Manitoba, Canada R7A 6Y9
T 204-726-6267 **F** 204-726-7499

OUR FILE: 14-3-122-2013-0019
OUR FILE: 14-3-122-2013-0020

April 9, 2013

Jennifer Abel
Chief Petroleum Engineer
Petroleum Branch
Manitoba Innovation, Energy and Mines
227 King Street West
P.O. Box 1359
Virden, Manitoba ROM 2CO

Elise Dagdick
Environment Officer
Manitoba Conservation Division
2nd Floor. - 123 Main Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3C 1A3

Dear Ms. Abel and Ms. Dagdick:

RE: EOG Resources Canada Inc. - Gas Pipeline Proposal
Manitoba Portion of Gas Pipeline From Proposed Battery at 4-1-02-28WPM to Proposed (MIPL) Facility at 5-6-3-29WPM (Province of Saskatchewan)
(RM of Edward – Province of Manitoba)

I have reviewed the above referenced proposal and note the following information for your review and consideration concerning that portion of the gas pipeline being proposed for development in the Province of Manitoba. The route identified for the proposed 6" gas pipeline involves lands in the Rural Municipality of Edward which is a member of the Southwest Planning District. All development is therefore subject to the policies of the district development plan in effect and as may be further regulated in the RM of Edward Zoning By-law.

SOUTHWEST PLANNING DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT PLAN BY-LAW NO. 1-2004

According to the Southwest Planning District Development Plan, the lands on which the proposed EOG gas pipeline is being proposed are designated as **"RURAL POLICY AREA"** and the installation of oil and gas infrastructure can occur in this designation. In particular, PART 2, Section 2.3.8.1 Mineral Resources of the plan states the following:

"The exploration, development, production and termination of all aggregate, mineral, oil or gas resources located in the Planning District shall be undertaken in a manner that is environmentally safe, stable, and compatible with adjoining land uses and in keeping with applicable legislation and regulations as set from time to time by the Province of Manitoba."

RM OF EDWARD ZONING BY-LAW NO. 3-2005

According to the RM of Edward Zoning By-law, lands on which the proposed EOG gas pipeline is being proposed are zoned **"AG" – Agricultural General Zone**. This zoning by-law also contains general regulations governing uses, buildings and structures in all zones in the municipality. In particular, PART 2, Section 2.4.5 (a) of the by-law which deals with Public Utilities and Services states the following:

"This By-law shall be interpreted so as not to interfere with the construction, erection and location of the distribution facilities of a public utility. Office buildings, warehouse, maintenance or storage compounds operated by a public utility shall be subject to the provisions of this By-law.

Other utilities or services may or may not need local approval as follows:

(a) *Oil and gas pipelines, electric transmission lines and structures are deemed to be in compliance with this By-law if they are carried out, constructed and operated in accordance with federal and provincial law; and"*

CONCLUDING REMARKS:

Based on my review of the packages of information provided to this office by the Petroleum Branch and Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship – Conservation Division, in respect of the Manitoba-based portion of the proposed EOG - 6" gas pipeline, I have no concerns with the proposed development as it is generally consistent with the policies of the Southwest Planning District Development Plan and satisfies the requirements of the RM of Edward Zoning by-law.

I trust this information has been of assistance. Should you have any questions regarding my comments, please call.

Regards,

Please consider this a signed original copy – sent via e-mail

Peter Andersen
Community Planner.

c.c. Manitoba Local Government (Samantha Shaler)

Manitoba

Memorandum

Date: April 8, 2013

To: Climate Change and Environmental Protection Division
Environmental Approvals Branch
123 Main Street, Suite 160
Winnipeg MB R3C 1A5

From: Kevin Jacobs
Water Quality Management Section
Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship
123 Main Street, Suite 160
Winnipeg MB R3C 1A5

http://www.gov.mb.ca

Telephone: 204-945-4304
Facsimile: 204-948-2357
E-Mail: Kevin.Jacobs@gov.mb.ca

Subject: EAP 5635.00 REQUEST FOR TAC REVIEW/COMMENTS - EOG PIERSON TO MIPL PIPELINE

Hello Elise, please find below comments regarding the EAP file number 5635.00 EOG Pierson to MIPL Pipeline.

The proposed natural gas pipeline will traverse what appears to be a manly a relatively disturbed agricultural area. The pipeline will cross Gainsborough Creek and a number of un-named drainage channels. With respect to water quality the most significant potential impact would be related to a spill or malfunction causing a release into a waterway during the construction phase of the project. It is noted the pipeline will be installed under Gainsborough Creek by directional drilling under the streambed in accordance with Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada criteria.

Implementation of an environmental protection plan combined with the mitigation measures outlined in the proposal should be sufficient to alleviate potential concerns with respect to water quality.

- Any affected wetlands should be required to be restored to their previous structure and function.

- Hydrostatic testing of pipeline integrity will require authorization from Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship.

- It is recommended proponent implement the following:
  - a regular maintenance inspection schedule of the pipeline,
  - electronic leak detection equipment,
  - An emergency response plan, and having staff with training and equipment in the area for rapid response in the event of an accident or malfunction.

Concerning construction other recommendations include:

- silt curtains be installed several meters past the riparian margin along the right of way
- Biodegradable erosion control materials be used.,

- All re-vegetation should use a seed mix native to the area to prevent the spread of invasive plant species.
- It is also recommended that construction that could lead to sediment transport into waterways be halted during periods of heavy rain fall.
- If there are some undefined channels that carry water into a watercourse with a defined bed and banks and the crossing will be trenched, the work shall be conducted during dry conditions and temporary and permanent sediment and erosion control measures are implemented until the sites have stabilized.

Further comments:

- In order to protect riparian areas, including during trenchless drilling, the proponent is required to establish and maintain an undisturbed native vegetation area located upslope from the ordinary high water mark and adjacent to all water bodies and waterways connected to the provincial surface water network:

- A 30-metre undisturbed native vegetation area is recommended for lands located adjacent to surface waters;

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above telephone number.

Kevin Jacobs
Water Quality Management Section

Manitoba

Memorandum

Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives
Land Use Knowledge Centre

DATE: March 27th, 2013

TO: Elsie Dagdick
Manitoba Conservation
and Water Stewardship
Elsie.Dagdick@gov.mb.ca

FROM: Elaine Gauer
Land Use Specialist
Land Use Planning Knowledge Centre
1129 Queens Avenue
Brandon, MB R7A 1L9
PHONE NO: 761-0701

SUBJECT: EOG Pierson to MIPL Pipeline 5635.00: RM of Edward

On behalf of Manitoba Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives, I have reviewed this proposal submitted pursuant to *The Environment Act*, to construct and operate a 168.3 mm sweet natural gas pipeline in the RM of Edward. This will run from a proposed EOG oil battery in 4-1-02-28W to a proposed Many Islands Pipe Lines (MIPL) facility in 5-6-3-29W. Construction is to begin in the spring of 2013.

MAFRI has reviewed the Pipeline Construction and Reclamation Plan, as well as the General Project Description. Plans to protect soil against erosion and loss are in place. A need to manage for invasive plant species is noted. It is very important that machinery and equipment be cleaned between sites, to prevent the spread of invasive plants, such as leafy spurge.

Provided that all measures are taken to control erosion, replace topsoil upon completion of construction, and to prevent the spread of invasive plants, MAFRI has no significant concerns. Remediation concerning erosion protection must follow immediately or close to construction, as there is potential for erosion.

Input based on agricultural producers knowledge will be important in reducing the impact of the timing and long term effects of construction.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this proposal.

Sincerely,

Elaine Gauer, P.Ag.MSc
Land Use Specialist

cc: Chris Budiwski MAFRI

Dagdick, Elise (CON)

From: Toop, David (MWS)
Sent: March-25-13 10:23 AM
To: Dagdick, Elise (CON)

Dear Elise

I have reviewed the proposal in respect to groundwater, as requested.

I have the following comments:

- The description of Groundwater in section 5.1.3.2 is too general, making it meaningless for this proposal. I have sent a comprehensive set of reference material to the consultant, so that he has the resources to write an appropriate discussion of local groundwater conditions.
- The drilling database should be reviewed for the region along the pipeline route. The database shows wells completed in sand and gravel and in shale bedrock in the affected townships.
- The pipeline route crosses the Pierson buried valley aquifer. The location where the pipeline crosses the aquifer needs to be identified by the consultant. The potential risk to the Pierson Aquifer needs to be discussed.
- The location of water wells within 500 m of the proposed pipeline route should be field verified during consultation with affected landowners. Protection of groundwater resources should be included as part of the spill contingency plan (Section 8). Landowners who have a well within 500 m of the spill should be notified.

Kind Regards

David Toop

David C. Toop
Hydrogeologist
Groundwater Management

Manitoba Conservation
and Water Stewardship
Box 18, 200 Saulteaux Crescent
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3J 3W3
ph. 204-945-7402
fax. 204-945-7419

Dagdick, Elise (CON)

From: Stibbard, James (MWS)
Sent: April-26-13 11:41 AM
To: Dagdick, Elise (CON)
Subject: Re: 5635.00 EOG Pierson to MIPL Pipeline EAP

Ms. Dagdick,
I reviewed the above noted EAP. The EAP concludes that environmental effects from the project, both during construction and operation, are anticipated to be minimal. I would note the following:

- The area in which the pipeline is to be constructed has several existing rural domestic water distribution pipelines in it. The proponent will have to ensure his gas pipeline alignment does not interfere with water pipelines.
- The EAP notes that no effects are anticipated to groundwater in the area. As noted in previous EAP reviews similar to this, it would be helpful if the proponents could identify existing public water systems in the area and assess possible impacts on their raw water supplies, almost all of which in that area are groundwater.
- The EAP notes the pipeline will cross under Gainsborough Creek by directional boring. This creek drains into the Souris River, which drains into the Assiniboine River. The Assiniboine River is the water source for a number of public water systems downstream of where the Souris River enters it. Thus, a major spill of a deleterious substance into Gainsborough Creek would have the potential to contaminate the drinking water source of public water systems on the Assiniboine River. As such, ODW would recommend that the contact information for the downstream public water systems be included in the emergency procedures for the development with instructions that, in the event of a major spill of deleterious materials into Gainsborough Creek, the water system owners be contacted.

Beyond the above noted pints, ODW has no other concerns with the EAP or the proposed development.
I trust this is satisfactory, but if you have any questions, please call.
Regards,

James Stibbard P. Eng.
Approvals Engineer
Office of Drinking Water
1007 Century Street
Winnipeg MB R3H 0W4
phone: (204) 945-5949
fax: (204) 945-1365
email: James.Stibbard@gov.mb.ca
website: www.manitoba.ca/drinkingwater

Manitoba

Infrastructure and Transportation
Highway Planning and Design Branch
Environmental Services Section
1420 – 215 Garry St., Winnipeg, MB R3C 3P3
T (204) 619-4359 F (204) 945-0593

April 15, 2013

Tracey Braun, M. Sc.
Director, Environmental Approvals Branch
Manitoba Conservation and Water Stewardship
123 Main St., Suite 160
Winnipeg, MB R3C 1A5

RE: EOG Resources Canada Inc.
Pierson to MIPL Project
Client File No 5635.00

Dear Ms. Braun:

MIT has reviewed The Environment Act Proposal noted above and would like to offer the following comments:

- The proposal indicates the pipeline will be installed through Provincial Road (PR) 256, as well as Provincial Trunk Highway (PTH) 3, these installations will require an underground utility agreement prior to commencing the work.
- Under "Temporary Facilities – Proposed Pipeline", the proposal indicated the need for temporary access roads, shooflies, stockpile sites and staging areas, contractor construction offices and yards. As such, the proponent should be informed that, under the Highways and Transportation Act (for PR's) and the Highways Protection Act (for PTH's), any new access, relocation or alteration of an existing connection onto a PR will require a permit from MIT and from Highway Traffic Board for PTH (including any change in use for an existing PTH access). A permit is also required for any construction (above or below ground level) within 38.1 m (125 ft) or for any plantings within 15.2 m (50 ft) from the edge of the right of way along the PRs or PTHs identified above.
- For underground utility agreements and permit applications, please contact Ashley Beck at (204) 726-7000 or Ashley.Beck@gov.mb.ca.

Thank you very much for providing us the opportunity to review the proposal.

Sincerely,

Ryan Coulter, M. Sc., P. Eng.
Manager of Environmental Services

Dagdick, Elise (CON)

From: Farmer,Kristina [CEAA] [Kristina.Farmer@ceaa-acee.gc.ca]
Sent: March-21-13 4:24 PM
To: Dagdick, Elise (CON)
Subject: FW: Request for review & comments: EOG Pierson to MIPL Pipeline 5635.00 - Comments due: April 29, 2013

Hi Elise,

FYI re: NEB responsibilities for this project.

Kristina Farmer
Section Leader, Prairie Region | Chef d'équipe, Région des Prairies
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency | Agence canadienne d'évaluation environnementale
Suite 101, 167 Lombard Ave Winnipeg MB R3B 0T6 | 167, avenue Lombard, bureau 101 Winnipeg MB R3B 0T6
kristina.farmer@ceaa-acee.gc.ca
Telephone | Téléphone 204-984-0427
Facsimile | Télécopieur 204-983-7174
Government of Canada | Gouvernement du Canada

From: Dylan Adderley [mailto:Dylan.Adderley@neb-one.gc.ca]
Sent: March-21-13 09:33 AM
To: Farmer,Kristina [CEAA]
Cc: Graham Emmerson
Subject: RE: Request for review & comments: EOG Pierson to MIPL Pipeline 5635.00 - Comments due: April 29, 2013

Hello Kristina

Thanks for the note regarding this matter. The Board was aware of this proposed project, however in consultation with the Manitoba Dept. of Energy it was determined that the project was outside of NEB jurisdiction as it did not cross provincial boundaries and would be solely regulated by Manitoba. Indirectly, Manitoba also informed the NEB that the linking project on the Saskatchewan side will be owned and operated by a different company (MIPL). In response to your question, there is no NEB contact because the NEB has no jurisdiction for the project.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or concerns.

Dylan Adderley
National Energy Board | Office national de l'énergie
444 Seventh Avenue SW | 444, Septième Avenue S.-O., Calgary, AB Canada T2P 0X8
dylan.adderley@neb-one.gc.ca
Telephone | Téléphone 403-299-3319
Facsimile | Télécopieur 403-299-2780
Government of Canada | Gouvernement du Canada