

**MINUTES  
COUNCIL COMMITTEE MEETING  
MUNICIPAL DISTRICT OF PINCHER CREEK  
June 26, 2018**

**Present:** Reeve Quentin Stevick, Councillors Brian Hammond, Bev Everts, Rick Lemire and Terry Yagos

**Staff:** Interim Chief Administrative Officer Sheldon Steinke, Director of Operations Leo Reedyk, Director of Development and Community Services Roland Milligan, and Executive Assistant Tara Cryderman

**Also:** Tom Leavitt and Jody Petrone, with MPE Engineering Ltd.

Reeve Quentin Stevick called the meeting to order, the time being 9:00 am.

1. Approval of Agenda

Councillor Rick Lemire

Moved that the Agenda for the June 26, 2018 Council Committee Meeting be approved as presented.

Carried

2. Beaver Mines Water and Wastewater Project

Tom Leavitt and Jody Petron, with MPE Engineering Ltd, attended the meeting to speak to the Beaver Mines Water and Wastewater Project.

The Capital Project List and Summary, dated June 21, 2018, was discussed and explained.

The Raw Water Intake project will be commissioned after July 1. They will test this pipeline for a few weeks to ensure that the system is operating properly. Once satisfied that the system is operational, the existing raw water intake line will be decommissioned.

The timeline for the decommissioning of the old line will be approximately two weeks after that.

The Regional Water Pipeline was explained.

80% of the waterline project is complete. The project is scheduled to be completed by the end of July. Components of the project were explained. After the decommissioning of the current raw water intake, the existing raw water line will be repurposed for potable water.

The Castle River crossing is the last outstanding aspect of the project. An urgent status enquiry has been submitted as this has been approved at the local Lethbridge office of the Public Lands Department in March. The final approval is now awaiting confirmation from the Edmonton office. Council is prepared to apply pressure through their channels if

required to keep the project moving. The timeline of the drilling aspect of the project (drilling under the Castle River) once the approval is obtained, should be approximately one week.

The three components of the Mechanical aspect of the Water project were explained. The timeline of the Mechanical aspect was discussed. It is behind schedule.

A standpipe for the community was discussed. Direction on the location of the standpipe is required. Council will need to determine the location of the standpipe. MPE will be asked to brief Council on the technical issues associated with placement of a standpipe at various locations.

The Water Distribution Wastewater Collection project was discussed. This project is all dependent on the waste water project. Once the waste water treatment option is identified and approved, tenders will be sent out for the Water Distribution Wastewater Collection project.

Castle Area Water Supply was discussed. This project is nearing completion of the detailed design phase. Applications for approvals will be submitted when appropriate. There may need to have additional lands, similar to the process for the water line, for a booster station. All GIS drilling has been completed and the Geotechnical report is almost completed. The environmental report should be completed within the next two weeks. The project will be tendered later this year and the completion date for this project is estimated spring 2019, as winter will cause a construction shut down.

The costs of the project, and the MD's portion of the costs, was discussed.

Castle Mountain cannot get water before Beaver Mines does as the water to Castle flows through the Beaver Mines Distribution system.

Alberta Environment has verbally provided a statement that possibly a sewage/wastewater holding tank could be installed within the Hamlet, but the operational logistics for this solution is costly and challenging. Written confirmation is required.

Castle Mountain's wastewater solutions was discussed. MPE hasn't been requested to take part in this project. Castle Mountain has its own lagoon system. Alberta Environment has indicated that Castle Mountain's sewer system is adequate and not to be a part of this project.

The temporary interim solution of a wastewater holding tank was further discussed. Perhaps it is the only short term solution at this time. This solution still requires further investigation.

10 acres is the rough size requirement for a lagoon including setback. There is a 300 m buffer required between the lagoon and an occupied building.

The discharging of treated effluent was explained.

The letter of interest regarding a lagoon site was discussed. We have received one response, in the negative, and are waiting for a response from three others.

Council direction is required for the wastewater project.

A sequencing batch reactor wastewater solution was discussed. Again, MPE requires Council direction to pursue the solution presented.

The project costs were further discussed. Perhaps having the possible solutions, with costs and piping identified, on a map would be beneficial. MPE could provide a spread sheet with the system type, capital and operational costs and land requirements.

Perhaps additional viable wastewater solutions could be presented by MPE from the personnel experienced with the system.

Direction of the treatment options is required for MPE, then they can pursue that solution and provide costs.

The approximate costs of the wastewater portion utilizing the Town of Pincher Creek wastewater system is 7.4 million to tie into their lagoon system. Costs associated with all waste water systems was discussed. It was felt that \$7.4 million should be the maximum costs.

Discussions have occurred between MPE and the Town of Pincher Creek on that waste water treatment option. Information on additional requirements from the Town are forthcoming. At that time, probable costs can be identified.

Completion dates and penalties of the existing two contracts were discussed. These contracts are interlocking, depending on one another. There is a domino effect from projects not being completed on time. The Mechanical Contractor has been made aware of the potential for liquidated damages.

Tertiary treatments were discussed further. Is there land available for this system? Given the distance from Beaver Mines, where does the option become to expensive?

Costing of the waste water treatment systems were discussed. MPE needs clear direction of the system Council wants to utilize. Once that is determined, costs can be supplied. Council is requesting costs on all solutions.

### 3. Question and Answer Period

A question was asked about expropriation, and why this isn't a possible solution, as the land needed is minimum and the costs would be more favourable.

A statement was given as to when a public meeting should have occurred.

A question was asked as to why MPE went to the Castle Mountain Community Association (CMCA) and not the Beaver Mines Community Association. MPE went to Castle Mountain, not CMCA, for a technical meeting only and not necessarily a public consultation. The public consultations which have occurred was discussed. MPE is directed by Council and Administration to hold and host public consultation sessions.

A question was posed as to whether clear direction is going to be provided to MPE, by Council, at the end of this meeting? It is hoped that hearing the statements from the residents will help provide direction.

A statement was given as to the lack of objectives provided to MPE. The task asked of MPE is vast, without clear objectives being provided by Council.

A question was posed as to if the cost of the lagoon included the purchase of the land or if that is in addition to the stated costs. How did the cost of pipeline to Cowley increase? This original cost was going through private land, however, residents provided barriers to this option. The proposed costs now includes using existing right of ways only, probable rock excavation given the new alignment, which increased the amount of pipeline required and lift stations are now required.

A statement regarding the costs was provided.

The rationale as to why the water does not include the Beaver Mines Park was discussed. The resident was using a preliminary drawing that has been updated to include the park service.

The walkway as mentioned. This is not part of the project. Council provided input on a trail network for the Hamlet once the water/wastewater system is constructed.

Construction along the highway was discussed. Minimizing the impact to the highway was discussed. Slot trenching may be required. Performance criteria will be worded within the contract regarding the construction along the highway.

A question of the water main crossing on 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> street was discussed.

A question was posed as to whether the Hamlet will be consulted prior to the finalization of all plans? Perhaps a community advisory committee could be initiated.

A statement regarding the Firesmart perimeter was mentioned.

The design of the access road to the reservoir was discussed.

The design drawings were discussed. Several suggestions were made and discussed.

Water looping within the Hamlet itself was discussed. A suggestion for a loop at 7<sup>th</sup> street was provided. This would be at an increased cost with no functional benefit as all segments of the system can be isolated.

A question was posed to Council regarding the grant application for the wastewater portion. The grant application has already been made, and is awaiting the final wastewater option aspect of the project to be identified.

The timelines regarding the projects and grant funding was discussed.

Consultation with the community regarding the wastewater project was requested. The suggestion for a community advisory committee was provided again.

A question was posed regarding the tie in to the residences. The utility is provided to the edge of the property line. It is then up the landowner to connect to the residence itself.

A question was posed regarding services to the park itself.

An appreciation for holding this meeting was provided.

A question was posed as to whether each resident will be mandated to connect to the system or have the option to opt out. Residents will not be mandated.

Communication was mentioned and discussed.

A question was posed as to whether the costs for a tertiary option will be provided. A cost was provided in the November 2014 study.

The health of the residences of the Hamlet was mentioned.

The growth of the Hamlet was mentioned and discussed. 2% growth rate for the community was used as Water 4 Life will not fund beyond that. Developers requiring additional services for land development would be required to increase system capacity for additional serviced properties.

Expandability of each option was mentioned. This is an additional factor for consideration.

Data collecting and social impact were mentioned.

The existing private systems that are still functioning were mentioned.

#### 4. Roundtable Discussion

##### Division 2

- Water leaking at the standpipe

##### Division 3

- Request for Decision format

5. In-Camera

Councillor Terry Yagos

Moved that Staff and Council move In-Camera, the time being 12:09 pm.

Carried

Councillor Bev Everts

Moved that Staff and Council move out of In-Camera, the time being 12:30 pm.

6. Adjournment

Councillor Brian Hammond

Moved to adjourn the meeting, the time being 12:31 pm.

Carried