

## **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS**

**PROPONENT:** Town of Melita  
**PROPOSAL NAME:** Town of Melita Water Supply Project  
**CLASS OF DEVELOPMENT:** Two  
**TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:** Water Development and Control  
**CLIENT FILE NO.:** 5177.00

### **OVERVIEW:**

The Proposal was received on February 24, 2006. It was dated February 24, 2006. The advertisement of the Proposal was as follows:

“A Proposal has been filed by KGS Group on behalf of the Town of Melita for the construction and operation of a water supply system for the town. The system would consist of two wells located in NW 23-5-27W, a pipeline from the wells to Melita, a new water treatment plant in Melita in NW 6-4-26W, and a wastewater disposal pipeline from the water treatment plant to the Souris River. The wells would be located adjacent to the existing Broomhill tank loading station in the Broomhill Wildlife Management Area in the Rural Municipality of Albert. One well would serve as the primary water source for the system, and the other well would be for backup purposes. Up to 250 cubic decametres (200 acre-feet) of water would be withdrawn annually by the system. Three pipeline routes have been examined. All follow provincial and municipal road rights-of-way. The preferred route extends directly north from Melita to PR 345, then west and north to the well locations. The water treatment plant would utilize a combination of manganese greensand filtration and nanofiltration to remove manganese and hardness from the raw water. Treated water would also be chlorinated. Backwash water from the manganese greensand filters and reject water from the nanofilter would be piped to the Souris River. This process wastewater would contain elevated levels of manganese and dissolved solids. Construction of the project is proposed for the summer of 2006.”

The Proposal was advertised in the Melita New Era on Saturday, March 11, 2006. It was placed in the Main, Winnipeg Public Library and Manitoba Eco-Network registries and the R. M. of Albert and Town of Melita offices as registry locations. It was distributed to TAC members on March 7, 2006. The closing date for comments from members of the public and TAC members was April 13, 2006.

## **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

**R. F. Walker** As a resident of the Town of Melita, jointly owning a home at 118 North Drive, I'd like to state that I am for this proposal. Engineering environmental recommendations show little or low consequence, therefore we should proceed to provide for the future growth or even survival for our community. Delay will only mean increased costs for future necessary work.

**W. Marlene Walker** I'd like to state that I am for the proposal being made by the Town of Melita to upgrade the water supply. I am a joint owner of a home at 118 North Drive. Environmental concerns appear to be slight. Water improvement is a necessity.

**Wayne and Faye White** As a homeowner in Melita we feel it is necessary to upgrade and secure the town water supply into the future and so we very much support this project.

**Ted and Pat Wall** We, the joint owners of 56 Olympic Crescent in Melita, believe that the proposed new water supply to Melita will be a much needed upgrade that is long overdue. Apparently past councils have ignored the issue with patchup jobs at the present well site and the tower. The need for a safe secure supply of water for the town of Melita cannot be debated. The present supply from the river basin wells has a high risk of security in the event of a flood. The quality of the water means high maintenance. The wells themselves are not dependable and the water tower as part of the system is likewise not reliable and needs repair. We are tired of dealing with the hardness of the present water supply, the lack of water pressure, the appearance of scum in the water at times and our lack of confidence in being able to drink it. It is time to move on with a safe plentiful source of water that will ideally keep people in Melita, attract people and business to Melita and give this town the lifeline it needs.

**Brenda G. Nestibo** As a resident of Melita and property owner, I strongly support the efforts of the Melita Town Council to pipe water from Oak Lake Aquifer to the Town of Melita to supply us with good, safe and adequate supply of water.

**Ronald Nestibo** As Mayor of Melita I strongly support the initiative of the Town council in its endeavours to obtain a good and reliable water source. Our four low quality and quantity wells, along with a 50 year old treatment plant are at the end of their usefulness. A secure quality water supply will be necessary for any long term growth or development for the Town of Melita and area.

**Helen and Richard Filteau** As a resident and property owner in the town of Melita, I am interested in the future potential development and prosperity of our town. The provision of an ample supply of potable water is essential to the future of Melita. I therefore support the Melita Town Council's application to pipe water from the Oak Lake aquifer to provide us with an ample supply of excellent drinking water.

**Peter Kovac** In regards to the Town of Melita Water Supply Project (File 5177.00), as a business owner in the Town of Melita I believe that the new water supply is essential to the future financial health of this town and its residents. There is a cost associated with it but the long term savings from not having to upgrade the lagoon and wastewater treatment facilities more than justify the expense of the project. The current water supply does not meet many of the provincial guidelines or standards. The current wells are going to be insufficient to attract any industries to town. The funding is available now from the province and may not be in the very near future so the town needs to take advantage of this opportunity while it has the chance.

As a homeowner in the town of Melita I would like to state that I am all for the Town of Melita Water Supply Project (file 5177.00). The quality of the existing water is very poor as is the water pressure. The environmental damage to the Souris River from the waste water runoff and from the lagoons is most likely quite high. The quality of the new water would be much higher and the town of Melita would be able to attract new businesses or industries much easier.

**Mark Emrick** I am writing to you to show my support for the Town of Melita new water project. I am well aware of the situation with our existing wells, and water supply, and feel that this is the right time to proceed with this project. A clean healthy water supply is probably the most important commodity that a viable community can have. It is an absolute essential of life. From a business perspective, I own a carwash in town, and I cannot wait for the soft water to flow through the pipes. It will save me far more than it will cost just in maintenance alone. Not to mention, the satisfaction of my customers with a spot free rinse! My wife also has a restaurant in town, and she looks forward to the better quality water for her customers as well. There has been mention by some of the cost being a burden, I should tell you that I will have to pay at 3 different locations (my house, my shop, and my wife's restaurant) and I have no issues with that at all when you consider what we are receiving in return.

**Darren Snyder** I Darren Snyder reside in the Town of Melita as a property owner. I am in favor of the water proposal for our town to secure a long term, good quality water supply for the Town of Melita. Please consider my letter in the decision of this water proposal.

**Eleanor Loucks** I am in favor of this proposal. It has to be done some time, it might as well be now.

**Don Loucks** We need it. Bring it on!

**David Dickson** As a resident of the Broomhill area, I am concerned with the location of the wells, they are right beside the existing community well. This well is used by residents when their own water supply runs low. It is also used as a source of drinking water by many families. What will happen if the new wells deplete this well? Will the government or the town of Melita be responsible to supply water to these residents and farmers?

The testing was done in an extremely wet year. The results could have been different in a dry year, which we frequently have.

The Kinless Water Co-op takes its water from this aquifer – they have seven farms and one hog barn on this pipeline. They have had one instance where they were told they had lots of water. It lasted about five years, then they had to extend their pipeline to another water source. This could happen to the Melita pipeline. There are other hog barns, farms and ranches located further northwest on this aquifer. I don't believe their usage has been taken into consideration.

If the aquifer is lowered the hay land and pastures will suffer. Who will compensate the farmers for their loss? This is a very real possibility, the only reason this land produces a crop of grass or grain is because of the water that is available.

Disposing of the waste water in the Souris River is adding to the pollution of water downstream, including Lake Winnipeg. Also chlorinating water produces carcinogens in the treated water. There is a safer system such as the one installed and used by Holland MB. (newspaper article is enclosed.)

**Disposition:**

Impacts on other users are addressed in the Water Licensing process, and the applicant would be responsible for addressing impacts on other consumptive users. However, other users were considered in the design of the project and the assessment of impacts. Impacts of the project on vegetation and on the Souris River were also addressed in the Environment Act Proposal. The provision of a chlorine residual in the treated water is a requirement of the Public Health Act.

**Rita and Bernie Murray** We are absolutely in favor of the water proposal for the Town of Melita. We want to secure a long term, good quality water supply for the town.

**Rural Municipality of Albert** The Rural Municipality of Albert has many concerns regarding the Town of Melita water project. We have attended all the meetings and listened to all information available but still remain concerned for the taxpayers of Albert.

1. It is said that the outlying areas are serviced with “pockets” of water. It is a well known fact that in dry years, these pockets go dry without the hooking on of Melita.
2. It was noticed in the proposal that there will be two (2) wells, one to be a backup. This has never been brought up at any meetings that we attended.
3. The concern of this well being too close to the Broomhill community well has been brought up many times but the Melita well has not been moved. We keep this area open year round for residents and we are concerned that our grader will have problems clearing snow with this well so close to ours.
4. Ratepayers with livestock nearby have concerns of their water supply being depleted without warning and there is no provision for their livelihood in this event. Once Melita is hooked up, they will have priority over our livestock.

5. Who is monitoring the amount flowing to Melita? There have been rumours of other community wells along the way hooking on and of an ethanol plant needing 800 acre-feet of water hooking on. We know water is supposed to be shared but there is no guarantee that there will be enough to last everybody. The Groundwater Licensing Board assures the RM of Albert that our community wells are protected under a "First in Right, First in Time" clause. Does this mean they will shut off Melita if our community wells go dry? We think not!
6. There will be conditions to a water pipeline as according to our by-laws in regards to permission to cross road allowances and to the depth of the pipes, etc.

Finally, the council for the RM of Albert requests a public hearing in their Town Hall so all from this area can voice their concerns as well.

**Disposition:**

Most of these concerns involve impacts on municipal users. These are addressed in the Proposal and under the Water Rights Act. With respect to the location of the well, the need for snow clearing around the tank loading station will be brought to the attention of the proponent's consultant. The need for compliance with municipal requirements for pipelines will also be forwarded to the consultant. The request for a public hearing is discussed in a later section of this summary.

**Earl and Betty Sterling** (Letter 1) My wife and I have attended two public meetings in the Legion Hall in Melita where the Town of Melita water supply project was discussed. Many questions were asked and answered. Members of the Melita town council gave a report on the condition of the water tower and the water treatment equipment which appear to be in bad shape and in need of replacement. This equipment has served this town for several years. It is our intention to support the Melita Town Council in their efforts to provide the residents of the Town of Melita with water from the proposed sites. It would appear that Melita will have an ample supply of water from this source for many years to come. The 50% financing arrangement with the provincial government is going to be a big help. It could also be an incentive for other industry to come to Melita. My wife and I retired from our farm and bought a home in Melita. Melita has all the services that we thought we would need. It appears now that the Town council will have to do something about a better source of water for the town.

(Letter 2) Betty and I have long and hard about the plan for bringing water to Melita from east of Broomhill. It is going to be expensive, however we all know that we have to have a good supply of good water. The wells that are now supplying the water, the treatment plant, and the water tower have apparently served the community long enough. We do have one concern however. That is we hope there are enough people in Melita who are going to pay their share of the cost of this project to raise the one and a half million dollars. We are going to support the Council in their effort to supply the town of Melita with water from the proposed site.

**Sam Mark** I live and own a business in Melita. As a citizen of Melita, I am in favor of the Town of Melita Water supply Project proposal, because the current water supply is

of a quality that is slowly deteriorating and will need improvements at some future date, to secure a long term, good quality water supply for the town of Melita.

**Doreen and M. H. Davis** I reside in the affected area and own property. I am in favor of the proposal for all of the above reasons. (Note appended to sheet suggesting support for the project.)

**Burt and Darleen Hicks** We are Burt and Darlene Hicks and we reside and work in the town of Melita. We own a home in the north end of town and we literally have no water pressure plus the water is often in a deplorable condition with such a brown colour that you would not even wish to boil an egg in it let alone drink it. Because we saw what the water was really like several years ago through a water testing....we invested in a reverse osmosis purifier for our drinking water a long time before bottled water and purifiers were the fashion. I, Burt, am the custodian at the Melita School and every morning I have to run water in the sinks and water fountains to get the worst of the "brown" colour out before school begins. We will not the drink the water in Melita unless it has been purified first and therefore realize that a change has to be made soon and we might as well do it right. We are definitely in favour of the proposal.

**Karen Jones** I have several concerns that I need to let you know about as we are on the outlying fringes of the Oak Lake Aquifer. This past two years have had adequate rainfall, and in 2005 we had several major rainstorms that brought the water table up substantially. This has made water almost a problem on the east side of our R.M. That being said, I monitor our own well in the yard, and since the water that has soaked away, it (the well) has not come up. It has dropped 22 inches since the beginning of October. There will be no recharge now, as all the snow is gone. We have had the livestock on it since January 18<sup>th</sup>.

Water Services has said that there is all kinds of water for Melita, at the Broomhill Wildlife Area but, also, they have in the past said that water supplies in the area have been abundant. Namely, Tilston trenched to the north of town in 1980 or 1981 to get a new and better water supply, only to have to go further the next year. Stony Ridge Pork, situated a mile northwest of our yard ran out of water in 2001 and had to go to the community well for water.

These are two projects that Water Services have said that there was more than enough water, only to have been proved wrong.

Melita has stated that they are asking for a water licence for 200 acre-feet, but, the pipeline that is proposed is 400+ acre-feet, pumping capacity. I have concerns that the water pipeline will continue on past Melita, and once there is domestic needs, no one can shut it off. And we do not know where the pipeline will stop.

The proposed well is situated at the deepest part of the water supply at Broomhill, and all the engineers in the world will not convince me that when the center of that water supply goes down, the outside draw edges, namely where we are, will drop dramatically. All one has to do is look at a water pond above ground. The center will drop, but the outside

moves in greater proportion. Who will ensure that our water is going to be here when we need it?

Melita has adequate water coming from the Souris River Basin, but, the quality is not very good. They do need a new water treatment plant and pumping station, but, I wonder why they cannot treat and purify the water they have. Notably, Holland, Manitoba has made their water supply dramatically improved. This must be an option for Melita.

Disposition:

Monitoring wells a distance from a pumping well provide a better indication of aquifer changes than observations of fluctuations in a pumping well. The edge of the Oak Lake Aquifer has a thin water bearing layer, and small changes in aquifer level may cause wells along the edge of the aquifer to dry up. In addition, some farm wells in the area may be supplied by small localized aquifers rather than the Oak Lake Aquifer. The situations discussed in this letter appear to be wells on the edge of the aquifer, whereas the project involves a well further inside the aquifer where the water bearing layer is thicker. With respect to the volumes of water involved, the annual volume is reported to be 250 dam<sup>3</sup>/year, or 200 acre-feet per year. It is not unusual for water supply systems to be designed for higher capacities to account for peak demands. The system is sized to accommodate anticipated growth over 20 years, including some rural pipeline demand. The water treatment system mentioned at Holland involves a disinfection method rather than a complete water treatment system capable of treating a highly variable surface source such as the Souris River.

**Kathleen McKague** As a taxpayer and property owner in the Town of Melita, I wish to go on record as being totally in favor of the proposed water treatment project. We need to have our entire system upgraded and the time is now. I'm sure the good folks of Melita faced the same controversy in the 50's when water and sewer were installed in the town but where would we be without these services today? While the money required will be a hardship for some....it is necessary to have a potable water supply and a system capable of handling the needs of today and those of the future. It is imperative that the project proceed.

**Albert William Lawrence** The water supply project in Melita is a must. While not a homeowner in town at this time I was in business here for many years and had to install my own water supply at an expensive cost. The town can not hold its own let alone progress unless its needs are met in such an important area as this. Please add my support to this necessary endeavour.

**Keith Boulton** As a user of water out of the Oak Lake Aquifer, I am concerned of the amount of water that will be allotted in the future. Our water is delivered by the Kinloss Water Co-op and this was a very expensive venture. I am not worried about our supply at present as we are in a very good spot in the aquifer. But what about the people who live on the edge of the aquifer, if this aquifer is like a bowl, when it drops the peoples' wells on the edge go dry. There are a lot of clay ridges on the edge of the aquifer that trap the water when it is high, but when the water drops the

property owner just has the water that is trapped there. I hope when allotting water you will look at the whole picture, not just the best spot in the aquifer,

Disposition:

These concerns also involve the impacts of aquifer level fluctuations on the edges of the aquifer. The Proposal has addressed these impacts, and limits can be imposed on both the Environment Act and Water Rights licences.

**Dick Pander** In regards to the Melita Water Supply Project, I am in total favour of this project. I believe water is the main amenity for a community. In your meeting, letters and newspaper articles you have made it clear why Melita needs to upgrade their water supply. Keep up the good work.

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

#### **Manitoba Conservation – Sustainable Resource Management Branch**

Regarding the above EA proposal, the following comments have been received from the Wildlife and Ecosystem Protection Branch:

- The proposal indicates that construction of a new well within the Broomhill Wildlife Management Area (WMA) to supply drinking water for the town of Melita will likely impact 102 ha of surrounding land within the WMA, resulting in drier conditions at the surface and the potential for corresponding changes in vegetation. The existing well operated by the RM has not caused any problems to date, and the Branch has no concern with permitting its continued use. However, the volume of water to be withdrawn by this proposed well is much greater than the present use and there is concern that there will be significant impacts to habitat.
- The consultant looked at various options for the pipeline route, but there is no indication that alternate well locations were evaluated. The proponent must investigate alternate locations for the development of a water supply well. If it is found that the site in the WMA is the only place where the water reserves are sufficient, the Branch may consider allowing the development - but only on the condition that the proponent replant all excavated or badly disturbed area of native cover in the WMA with native species of grasses/forbs to mitigate the impact on habitat within the existing WMA.
- The proposal indicates that Water Stewardship staff said that the site within the WMA would be leased or sold to the Town. However, that is incorrect, as lands designated as WMA are not available for sale and the Town would not be allowed to purchase a portion of the WMA.

- The proposal does not acknowledge that about half of the section where the proposed well would be located is leased for gravel mining and there is an active gravel pit on the property. Gravel extraction activity is a potential source of contamination for the well. Note: the quarry lease was granted prior to the enactment of *The Endangered Species Act* and is something that the Branch would oppose if such a request were made today.
- The security fence is also a concern as it would bar the public from using public land and result in an obvious loss of public use and enjoyment without any mitigation. WMAs have been managed on the premise of no net loss of habitat within the WMA, so the land may not be rendered unusable by anyone without habitat being secured to replace the area being impacted.
- The proposal indicates that the Biodiversity Conservation Section of the Branch was contacted for information about the occurrence of rare species in the well site area and along two of the three options for a pipeline route (options A and B). Biodiversity Conservation indicated that there were several records of rare and uncommon species (S1, S2, S3 ranked) that do occur or have the potential to occur within the project area and along pipeline route options A and B. These are listed in Appendix F of the proposal and are an indication of the high value of this habitat to species at risk. No species data was requested from Biodiversity Conservation for the third pipeline route option (option C), which is not only the route preferred by the proponent, but is the route that may actually traverse more undisturbed land than either options A or B. The rare and uncommon species that occur along route options A and B likely also occur along route option C.
- Since the information provided by Biodiversity Conservation suggests that there is a high potential for rare species to occur within the project area, a rare plants survey must be conducted in all areas that could potentially be impacted by this development. This survey would need to be conducted on two separate occasions during the growing season to increase the chance of observing early and late season plant species.
- The proposal failed to indicate that, in addition to Baird's sparrow and ferruginous hawk, the Broomhill WMA and much of the proposed pipeline route is very significant habitat for loggerhead shrike, which, along with the former species, is also listed as endangered under *The Endangered Species Act* (Manitoba). Furthermore, the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC) lists the loggerhead shrike and Sprague's pipit (also observed in the project area) as threatened and the ferruginous hawk as a species of special concern.
- The proponent should be aware that it is the responsibility of the proponent to inspect the project area prior to and during construction to determine if any rare or endangered species may be impacted. The proponent needs to be aware that if rare or endangered species are present, removal or destruction of

individuals or their habitat may be in contravention of Subsection 10(1) “Prohibition” of *The Endangered Species Act* (Manitoba). In addition, the federal Species at Risk Act prohibits any activities that kill or otherwise harm COSEWIC-listed plant or animal species and prohibits destruction of habitat for these species. If species of concern are present, the proponent must contact the Biodiversity Conservation Section of the Wildlife and Ecosystem Protection Branch to discuss possible mitigation options well in advance of any disturbance.

- The proposal does not reference or acknowledge *The Endangered Species Act*, but refers only to “rare species”. The Act protects not only the species listed as endangered, but their habitat as well. As this project may affect the vegetation of the WMA, it may also affect the habitat of the endangered species that utilize the area. Considering the small amount of publicly owned wildlife habitat in this area, long-term, adverse impacts on the vegetation of the WMA are unacceptable. Contrary to the consultant’s assessment that the potential impacts to the WMA are not significant, the Branch considers the potential impacts to the WMA to be highly significant from an ecological perspective.

In consideration of the above concerns, the Wildlife and Ecosystem Protection Branch opposes in principle the development of a water-supply well for the Town of Melita in the Broomhill WMA and will only issue a permit for it under the following additional conditions:

- That the Town declares that there are no practical alternative water-supply well sites.
- That any new pipeline(s) be routed along municipal road allowance adjacent to the WMA, rather than on the WMA, or, if explicitly prohibited, within 1 meter of the WMA boundary.
- That the proponent replant all excavated or badly disturbed area of native cover in the WMA, including the well site; temporary access routes for installation purposes; area excavated for the pipeline(s); etc., with native species of grasses/forbs obtained from a Manitoba source, to the satisfaction of MB Conservation staff.

Additional Comments:

1. This WMA and surrounding area is important habitat for rare, threatened and endangered flora and fauna, in particular a number of grassland bird species. The Wildlife and Ecosystem Protection Branch has identified a number of bird and plant species in the report. The report indicated that the removal of water will potentially affect the vegetation composition of the WMA by making the site more arid. Concern has been expressed that alteration of habitat may affect the suitability of the area to support these species. The construction of the well would impact a small portion of the WMA. The pipeline appears to be situated primarily in the road rights-of-way which have been previously disturbed. While the physical impacts of the well construction and pipeline construction could probably be mitigated the long

term potential for alteration of habitat is the greater concern. It is preferred the selection of an alternate site in the area if possible. If the WMA site remains the only suitable location mitigation to offset the potential loss of habitat is recommended.

2. Regardless of where the well site is located (public or private land) if the site is comprised of native vegetation there could potentially be negative impacts to rare, threatened and endangered species. If that is the case mitigation through securing of alternate habitat could be recommended regardless of the site.
3. There is currently a municipal water tank loading facility on the same site as the proposed well. This well has been in place for many years. The RM has verbally expressed concerns to my office regarding the impact of the new well on the existing well and water supply. The report indicates that although minimal there could be impact on local well water supplies. The RM's interests should be protected in some way.
4. Information provided by KGS Group indicates sand/gravel pits surround the proposed development. It is recommended that setback distances of future pit development be proposed to prohibit any adverse activity that may impact this water supply. The socio-economic impact of this restriction should be assessed.
5. Throughout the report KGS Group emphasizes during construction steps will be taken to prevent leaks, spills and releases by providing secondary containment for fuel storage, requiring drip trays for equipment, providing fuel handling training for operators, provide spill clean-up equipment and material, prepare an emergency (spill) response plan, and have periodic inspections for leaks, spills and releases. Manitoba Conservation, Environmental Programs would require a written plan of these procedures and requirements which could be submitted upon request.

**Disposition:**

These comments were provided to the proponent's consultant for information and further discussion. The consultant was asked to discuss water supply alternatives and to confirm the pipeline route and assessment information along the route. The consultant was also asked to discuss details of the well location and associated works with Wildlife and Ecosystem Protection Branch staff. The present tank loading station is located a few metres inside the Broomhill WMA. The proposal indicates that the pumping well would be installed in the same general vicinity. Once project details are finalized to the satisfaction of the Wildlife and Ecosystem Protection Branch, a number of habitat protection and mitigation requirements discussed above can be addressed as licence conditions.

**Manitoba Water Stewardship – Planning and Coordination**

Manitoba Water Stewardship has reviewed the above proposal and submits the following comments for your consideration:

- The proponents have applied for a water rights license. They have been issued a Groundwater Exploration Permit to conduct field investigations pertaining to the development of a groundwater source.

- The proposal refers to water works. As per the Public Health Act, Regulation 331/88R (waterworks, sewerage and sewage disposal regulation) the project will require approval prior to construction. The Office of Drinking Water can be contacted for information on the approval process and submission requirements.
- Appropriate well head protection should be provided. For example, grading should drain flood water and contaminants away from the well.
- No process flow diagram was found within the proposal. It is not clear how the consultant estimated the total hardness of 100 to 120 mg/L without conducting a pilot study.
- A raw water flow of 5.6 litre/sec is required for nanofiltration if the desired treated water flow is 4.2 litre/sec if the recovery rate is 75% (section 2.6.4). Thus the total volume of concentrate should be approximately 100 cubic metre/day.
- Section 4.4 suggested that domestic wells affected by pumping of the municipal well will be connected to the proposed water supply. The Office of Drinking Water strongly discourages the supply of untreated water to residences from a public water system due to bacteriological safety and other accountability reasons. The consultant is requested to provide detailed information regarding this proposal as part of the Public Health Act approval submission for the project, if such measures are deemed necessary.
- Only calcium and magnesium have been mentioned in the assessment of the backwash and concentrate residual water and concentrations were not provided. A more complete listing of expected constituents should be provided along with concentrations so that the impact of the residual water on the Souris River can be adequately assessed.
- The impact of the discharge of the backwash and concentrate residual water was assessed as compared to existing water quality and quantity in the Souris River near Melita. However, water quality data provided for the Souris River were not referenced and no information was provided with respect to where these data were collected, what time of year, how many samples were collected, etc. Also, no information was provided with respect to the statistical analysis performed on these data – was an average of several samples provided in Appendix E or were the results from a single sample? Flow data from the Souris River were also not referenced – how many years were used in the assessment of minimum/maximum flows? The proponent should provide an estimate of the total dissolved solid concentrations in the Souris River under low flows (7Q10) during discharge of the residual water. A similar assessment should be provided for other relevant constituents identified above.
- The final route for the Town water supply has not yet been determined which makes it difficult to assess if there could be any site specific concerns with regards to fisheries. The proponent has indicated that they will horizontal

directional drill below **any** water crossings in accordance with the Manitoba Water Services Board Watercourse Crossing Guidelines and incorporate erosion and sediment control measures along water drainage routes to mitigate sediment entering water features. These measures should address any concerns we might have. We would like to clarify the proponent's statement regarding directional drilling "any creeks containing water". Based on regional experience it is our preference that at minimum those crossings with a defined channel and potential to carry water during spring runoff be directional drilled. This is due to the difficulty in stabilizing those sites when open cut trenching is used and the ongoing erosion and sedimentation which results. There also appears, depending on the route, the potential to cross some water bodies and we are assuming that directional drilling will also be applied to these areas.

- The work is to take place in the summer so there will not be the potential to interfere with spring spawning. Should the method change for any of the crossings or with the bodies of water, or the proponent will be working in the spring spawning timing window (April 1 – June 15) then we would request they consult with the regional fisheries biologist (Bruno Bruederlin 204 726-6452).
- Due to the limited information we have at this site, one area of concern is the potential of the groundwater drawdown to negatively affect Stony Creek flows. As this is an intermittent creek there needs to be a better understanding of the potential drawdown (100 mm) on the frequency, duration and timing of flows within the creek and the interrelated effect on water chemistry, in particular temperature and oxygen. Further determination of the presence and utilization of fish and invertebrates in the affected reach is also required to determine what effect the drawdown could have.

Disposition:

These comments were provided to the consultant for information and followup. Several of the comments can be addressed as licence conditions. For most other items, additional information is needed to address the comments.

**Historic Resources Branch**

No concerns.

**Mines Branch**

No concerns.

**Petroleum Branch**

1. The proposed fresh water pipelines cross a high pressure oil pipeline operated by Petrofund Energy Trust. They are to be contacted prior to any construction to ensure that their personnel are on site to supervise all construction within 30 metres of the pipeline right of way. The contact person for Petrofund in Manitoba is Duane Martens, production foreman and he can be reached at: 306 – 634-9022, cell at 306 – 421-6674, Waskada office at 204-673-2528 or via e-mail at martensd@sasktel.net.

2. It should be noted that this oil and gas pipeline is regulated by the Province of Manitoba under Section 52 of The Oil and Gas Act.
3. If the proposed fresh water pipeline route varies from the road allowance it should be noted that there are abandoned wellbores located in the area. The Waskada District of the Petroleum branch should be contacted at 204-673-2472 to review any variance from the original proposal.

Disposition:

This information was provided to the consultant for information.

**Intergovernmental Affairs and Trade – Community Planning Services Branch**

1. While the Southwest Planning District Development Plan 2020 By-law and RM of Arthur and RM of Albert Zoning By-laws are all in draft form, there are no current municipal land use by-laws in effect in the rural area between Broomhill and Melita.
2. Those forthcoming land use by-laws will allow for public utilities as a permitted use within the rural Agricultural and urban Commercial Zones as drafted.
3. The current Town of Melita Zoning By-law (The Melita District Planning Scheme 1961 -- By-law No. 885) does, however, show the location of the proposed water treatment plant within the “A” Rural District; this zone does allow for public utilities as approved by Town Council.
4. In other words, the old and new municipal land use planning by-laws allow for the type of public development encompassed by this Project.
5. The background study prepared in 2002 by planning and engineering consultants for the Southwest Planning District Board recommended upgrading the water system in Melita.
6. In their analysis of existing infrastructure, these consultants suggested that, while the quantity of water available from the source wells may be adequate for the immediate future, there was a need to add pumping capacity to meet new demands for municipal water and to reach a desired level of fire protection.
7. The recommendations from their hydraulic analysis included the construction of a new pumping station to replace the aging water tower and to continue the watermain replacement program started earlier by the Town Council.
8. The general parameters of the Water Supply Project under review is in keeping with those recommendations by the consultants back in 2002.
9. Information from the CAO for the RM of Albert suggests that people living in the vicinity of the proposed source well are concerned about the removal of water from “their aquifer” and they wonder about the location of the well in a provincial Wildlife Management Area.
10. The Community Planning Services Branch has no concerns with the Project as reviewed and would suggest that an ample supply of good quality water for municipal use would be welcomed by the current residents of the Town of Melita and will hopefully add to the opportunities for future economic development desperately needed in Melita and the southwest corner of the province.

**Transportation and Government Services – Construction and Maintenance Division**

- The Department would prefer either Option A or C in general terms to limit the utilities within the right-of-way of PTH 83, in case of future highway upgrading or maintenance activities. Bridge site #2823 on PTH 83, north of Melita, is due to be replaced in the near future which would involve extensive work within the right-of-way and on Jackson Creek.
- As noted, a formal waterline agreement with the Department is required for waterlines within or crossing highway right-of-way (PR 345 and PTH 83). As part of the conditions of this agreement, the proponent would be required to rehabilitate the right-of-way to pre-construction condition (including re-seeding of disturbed areas) and maintain it for 2 years. The Department requires a 3-4 week time frame to prepare the formal agreement and circulate for a signature.
- Directional boring would be required for any proposed crossing of provincial roadways. Also as noted, road crossings would require a sleeve to minimize damage to the road embankment should the waterline fail.
- The Department would ask to be circulated a copy of the route location plan for additional comments once the route is selected. The proponent may contact the following in these regards:

Keith Bogue  
Regional Planning Technologist  
[Kbogue@gov.mb.ca](mailto:Kbogue@gov.mb.ca)  
(204) 726-6822

**Disposition:**

These comments were provided to the applicant for information.

**Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives**

It appears that the proposal will have no significant impact on agricultural practices in the area, and therefore we have no comments or concerns.

**Medical Officer of Health – Assiniboine and Brandon RHAs**

The proposal's Environmental Management Practices outlined in Section 5 adequately addresses potential environmental impacts.

**Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency**

I have undertaken a survey of five federal departments (Fisheries and Oceans Canada - DFO, Environment Canada – EC, Health Canada – HC, Transport Canada – TC, and Indian and Northern Affairs Canada - INAC) with respect to determining interest in the project noted above. I can confirm that the project information that was provided has been reviewed by all federal departments with a potential interest.

Based on the responses to the survey thus far, the application of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (the Act)* is not likely to be required for this project. Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) has not yet provided a response, but it will be forwarded to you when it is available.

Please note that among the responses received, three federal departments (EC, HC and TC) have identified expertise that might assist in the environmental assessment of this project. In addition both EC and HC would like to participate in the provincial review process. I would ask that you include the representatives of these departments on the provincial Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) that you are leading. Copies of all of the responses from the federal departments are attached, along with a list of contacts.

**Environment Canada**

Environment Canada (EC) received a copy of the above proposed project document on March 14, 2006 from the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (CEAA) for review. EC would like to participate in the provincial review of the proposed project consistent with the intent of Clause 59 of the expired and Clause 61 of the proposed new Canada-Manitoba Agreement on Environmental Assessment Co-operation.

Environment Canada has reviewed the above project description proposed by Town of Melita for the development of new water supply course by the town of Melita. EC understands that the project involves the construction of two wells with pumping equipment, construction of water supply pipeline from the wells to the new water treatment plant in Melita, and construction of the new water treatment plant using nano-filtration membrane.

Based on the information provided in the report, is it correct to assume that there will be no accumulation of sludge from the whole filtration process? In addition, it is not clear to EC whether there will be an increase in temperature of the backwash water that will be discharged in the receiving body of water.

**Disposition:**

Additional information was requested to address these comments.

**Health Canada**

We have reviewed the information submitted and have determined that Health Canada would not require an EA under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA) and is therefore not a Responsible Authority in accordance with the Act.

The following comments are offered in accordance with the Canada-Manitoba Agreement on Environmental Assessment Cooperation as based on the review of the February 26, 2006 document entitled "Town of Melita Water Supply Project Final Manitoba Environment Act Class 2 Development Licence Proposal" along with selected appendices as forwarded:

- More detail should be provided on the proximity of the project areas to any potential sensitive receptors (e.g. daycares, seniors homes, schools, playgrounds).
- The proposal should address the potential for pedestrian and vehicle traffic safety issues with the increase in construction and excavation equipment during the construction phase. Will mitigation measures be implemented at the WTP site and

associated pipeline trenches (e.g. traffic routing, fencing, signage, public notice) to protect area residents, school children, etc.?

- Will site security be required to prevent trespassers/visitors etc. from being injured and protect the water resource from being vandalized at the water treatment plant during construction or operation?
- The proposal should indicate any fail-safe measures for the post chlorination system (e.g. backup chlorination, monitored alarm, automatic shutdown).
- The proposal should indicate whether the project would affect the distribution system's capacity of community fire protection during the construction or operation phases. Adverse effects should be addressed in the mitigation measures.
- The proposal should indicate to which level the project would be flood protected.
- Section 4.4 of the proposal states that bacteria have impacted two domestic wells in the area. Has the source of this contamination been identified? Could the new wells be impacted by the same conditions? It is recommended that a formalized Wellhead Protection Plan/Program be implemented to safeguard the new wells, and old wells that will not be decommissioned.
- Will components of the old water supply wells and treatment plant be decommissioned? If so, will these actions be undertaken using provincial or equivalent standards/guidelines? What mitigation measures will be required?
- Could water service disruptions affect any nearby health facilities, schools, residences, etc. during the construction/hookup phase of the project? Will they receive prior notification if any possible disruptions? Are other mitigation measures required?
- The proposal does not provide sufficient detail on the new Water Treatment Plant. Will it have a lab, washrooms, chemical storage, etc. How will any waste/wastewater from the facility be disposed?
- Excavation, construction and other activities during the construction and operation phases can create hazards for workers. The hazards should be assessed, and mitigation provided.

Disposition:

These comments were provided to the consultant for follow-up.

**Transport Canada** Transport Canada has had an opportunity to review the subject proposal with respect to our areas of mandate, specifically the Navigable Waters Protection Act (NWPA).

The proponent has identified in Section 2.6.3 of the proposal the requirement horizontal directional drilling in order to install the water supply pipeline below any creeks. Attached is a document titled Navigable Waters Protection Program Pipeline Crossing Guidelines. The proponent is reminded that although an Approval is not required if the proposed works follow these guidelines, any deviation from the guidelines will require the proponent to contact the Navigable Water Protection Program for Approval.

The proponent is encouraged to obtain additional information from our website or contact the Navigable Waters Protection Officer for Manitoba, Mr. Al Jones at (519) 383-1864. Transport Canada does not foresee any additional potential triggers pursuant to CEAA with respect to this project if the attached guidelines are followed.

**Disposition:**

The guidelines provided were forwarded to the consultant for information.

**Department of Fisheries and Oceans**

I did have a few questions regarding the background levels of TDS versus the proposed released level. While I can find the later in the report, I cannot find the former other than the statement that the released TDS will be slightly higher than background levels. Depending on these values, this may be bordering on the release of a deleterious substance.

Also, I had some questions on the hydraulic connection between the groundwater supply and the Stoney Creek. There is mention of drawing down the creek but the impact is not readily apparent.

**Disposition:**

Additional information was requested to address these comments.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:**

Additional information was requested on May 9, 2006 to address comments received during the preliminary review of the project. The attached reply dated September 19, 2006 was received on September 20, 2006. Detailed responses are provided to all TAC comments. Further brief comments were requested to address rural water demands and water conservation measures. The attached response on these items was received on October 19, 2006.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

One request was received for a public hearing. A public hearing is not recommended. A suggestion was made to the consultant that a meeting with the R. M. of Albert would be appropriate to discuss the most recent project details, assessment results and the municipality's concerns. The R. M. could choose to invite other concerned individuals to such a meeting. The consultants indicated that considerable discussion had

already occurred with the R.M., and that the discussions had involved individuals in the R. M. as well. The consultants reported that modifications to the project design had been developed to eliminate impacts on the R.M.'s infrastructure, and that water level impacts were insignificant.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

All comments received on the Proposal have been addressed in the additional information 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 Assessment and Licensing - Land Use Section  
May 9, 2006 Updated: October 20, 2006  
Telephone: (204) 945-7021  
Fax: (204) 945-5229  
E-mail: bwebb@gov.mb.ca