

## **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS**

**PROPONENT:** Rural Municipality of Gilbert Plains  
**PROPOSAL NAME:** Rural Municipality of Gilbert Plains -  
Rural Water Supply Pipelines  
**CLASS OF DEVELOPMENT:** Two  
**TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:** Transportation/Transmission - Pipelines  
**CLIENT FILE NO.:** 4903.00

### **OVERVIEW:**

The Proposal was received on January 30, 2003. It was dated January 27, 2003. The advertisement of the proposal was as follows:

"A Proposal has been filed by the Manitoba Water Services Board on behalf of the Rural Municipality of Gilbert Plains to construct water supply pipelines throughout the municipality. Pipeline would be installed in the 2003 and 2004 construction seasons on provincial and municipal road allowances or on easements. Pipeline sizes would range from 50 mm to 150 mm. Water for the system would be supplied from a proposed well located in NW 26-26-23W. The water would be treated by nanofiltration to remove iron, manganese and hardness, and would then be chlorinated. Nanofiltration reject water would be discharged to an adjacent swamp area on Sulphurspring Creek. The system would produce an estimated average daily volume of 333,000 litres of treated water and 111,000 litres of reject water. Annual raw water use for the system is estimated to be 163 cubic decametres or 132 acre-feet."

The Proposal was advertised in the Dauphin Herald and the Grandview Exponent, both on Tuesday, February 18, 2003. It was placed in the Main, Centennial, Eco-Network and Dauphin Public Library public registries. The Proposal was distributed to TAC members on February 7, 2003. The closing date for comments from members of the public and TAC members was March 17, 2003.

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

No public comments were received.

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

**Sustainable Resource Management** - In order to protect aquatic habitat the proponent should refer to the "Manitoba Stream Crossing Guidelines for the Protection of Fish and Fish Habitat during planning and construction. Specific attention should be paid to disturbance of riparian areas, erosion control measures, revegetation of disturbed areas and timing of stream crossing work (i.e. not prior to June 15.) Where it is not possible to bore/push/auger the crossings, the proponent should contact and consult with Manitoba

Conservation regional fisheries staff to determine a suitable construction alternative, including appropriate mitigation measures, to be used at each crossing.

Disposition:

These comments can be addressed as licence conditions. Reference will be made to the Watercourse Crossings document of the Canadian Pipeline Water Crossing Committee rather than the Manitoba Stream Crossing Guidelines, since the Watercourse Crossings document provides more specific direction for pipeline crossings.

**Historic Resources Branch** - The Historic Resources Branch has concerns with regard to this project's potential to impact heritage resources. There are 85 archaeological sites recorded within the Rural Municipality of Gilbert Plains representing human occupation of the area for over 10, 000 years. The majority of these sites are located within 100 meters of streams. The location of the production well in NW 26-26-23 WPM is within the high potential zone for heritage resources. Much of the 240-km pipeline route is inside designated government road allowances, most of which have been improved, reducing the potential for intact heritage resources. There are some unimproved road allowances along the proposed water pipeline route, and many stream crossings where intact heritage resources may be located.

Under Section 12(2) of *The Heritage Resources Act*, if the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Tourism has reason to believe that heritage resources or human remains are known, or thought likely to be present, on lands that are to be developed, then the owner/developer may be required to conduct at his/her own expense, a heritage resource impact assessment and mitigation, if necessary, prior to the project's start.

In order to identify and assess any heritage resources that may be negatively impacted by the pipeline construction, it is recommended that a preliminary heritage resource impact assessment be conducted of:

- the proposed production well site in NW 26-26-23 WPM,
- all of the pipeline route within unimproved road allowances,
- and all of the proposed stream crossings within 100 meters of the streams.

The Historic Resources Branch is willing to cooperate with the Rural Municipality of Gilbert Plains by providing staff archaeologists to carry out the heritage resource investigation. In the event that significant heritage resources are identified during the field survey, the proponent will be contacted and a mutually acceptable heritage resource management strategy can be implemented.

In the interim it is recommended that the application be allowed to proceed subject to Branch findings.

Disposition:

These comments were forwarded to the Proponent's representative for information. Compliance with the Heritage Resources Act can be required as a licence condition.

**Mines Branch** - No concerns.

**Petroleum Branch** - No concerns or comments.

**Highway Planning and Design Branch**

- Additional information must be provided before the Department will enter into a utility agreement for placing pipelines within Departmental right-of-way. Impacts on the provincial highway system cannot be determined until detailed profiles and cross-sections for highway ditch burials and crossings are submitted.
- Erosion control measures that are to be employed would also be of interest, where trenching in creek valleys in the highway ditch. The utility agreement would require that departmental right-of-way be restored to an acceptable condition.
- Since deep burial will be required (i.e. 2.4 m plus), there is concern about potential groundwater blowout in the highway ditch in some locations.
- Regional staff should be contacted in these regards - the Regional Technical Services Engineer or Regional Planning Technologist in the West Central Region.

**Disposition:**

These comments were forwarded to the proponent for information.

**Medical Officer of Health - Parkland RHA** - It is anticipated that the provision of potable water meeting CDWQ guidelines to residents in the R.M. of Gilbert Plains will have a positive impact on human health.

**Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency** - An environmental assessment under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act will be required. The contact will be with PFRA. Environment Canada and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans have offered to provide specialist advice. The Canadian Transportation Agency and the Canadian Coast Guard will require additional information to determine whether or not they have environmental assessment responsibility. (DFO and Environment Canada indicated an interest in participating in the provincial review of the project.)

**Environment Canada** - We note that the project will involve a considerable amount of water pipeline (about 240 km) and that funding for the project may be obtained from PFRA. This may trigger the need for a federal environmental assessment under CEAA. Consequently, we have an interest in the project related to possible impacts to migratory birds and fish, and would like to participate in the provincial review pursuant to Clause 59 of the Canada-Manitoba Agreement on Environmental Assessment and Cooperation. Our specialist comments on the project are as follows.

The description of any potential wildlife habitat through which the proposed pipelines are to be constructed is very minimal. Although we understand that much of the pipeline will

be laid along government road allowances and through agricultural lands (thus mitigating potential impacts to wildlife, including migratory birds), the EIA report indicates that a large number of stream crossings will be required. While the intention is to directionally bore these stream crossings, thereby minimizing potential impacts to the aquatic environment, the riparian areas near streams, in particular, may serve as habitat for migratory birds. We recommend that additional information be provided on the potential impacts of the pipeline construction in these areas and any specific mitigation measures required.

Because of the number of stream crossings that appear to be involved, information should be provided on mitigative measures to be used in areas where erosion or sedimentation may be a concern. Also, once areas have been identified that are not suitable for

directional drilling, additional information on proposed crossing method, impacts to fish and mitigation should also be provided.

In order to avoid potential violations of the Migratory Birds Regulations, which prohibit the disturbance or destruction of migratory bird nests, the report should include mitigation to avoid potential violations. Several species of waterfowl, as well as other ground-nesting shrub-nesting migratory birds, utilize the rough grass and shrub vegetation habitat commonly found along rights-of-way, especially the edges furthest away from the road surface. Unless the proposed right-of-way for the pipeline is agricultural land currently under cultivation, or the pipeline is to be laid close to the road surface where habitat is less likely to be affected, we recommend that construction occur outside the nesting season between May to the end of July.

Chlorine can be deleterious to fish at very low levels (0.005 mg/L or higher). Chlorinated water should, therefore, not be released to any fish bearing streams as a result of testing or servicing of water lines. Prior to release, the residual chlorine concentrations should be tested to ensure it is non-detectable, not 0.1 mg/L as indicated on page 11.

Disposition:

These comments can be addressed as licence conditions. The chlorine discharge limit of 0.1 mg/L was set on the advice of the Water Quality Management Section several years ago because it is the lowest concentration that can be reliably measured with field equipment.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:**

No additional information is required to address the comments received.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

As no public concerns were identified, a public hearing is not recommended.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

All comments received on the Proposal can be addressed as licence conditions, or have been forwarded to the Applicant's representative for information. Therefore, it is recommended that the Development be licenced 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  
March 26, 2003  
Telephone: (204) 945-7021 Fax: (204) 945-5229  
E-mail: bwebb@gov.mb.ca