#1 - REQUEST FOR REVIEW: RA19016 / Kramer Dairy Ltd.		
Filed By:	Reinder Kramer	
Deadline for RFRs:	December 11, 2019	
Date RFR received:	November 29, 2019	
Status of party as per Decision Summary:	Directly Affected	

## REQUEST FOR BOARD REVIEW SUBMITTED TO THE NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION BOARD

IRA 19016

Application No:	IRA 19016		
Name of Operator/Operation:	Kramer Dairy It	td.	
Type of application (check one):	☐ Approval	☐ Registration	☐ Authorization
Location (legal land description):	SE 2 43 25 W4		
Municipality:	Ponoka County		
right to request a Board review becone):  I am the producer seeking I represent the producer	g the approval	/registration/author	ization.
☐ I represent the municipal		biotentegiodedoin	addionization.
I am listed as a directly a		the Approval Offic	er's Decision.
<ul> <li>I am <u>not</u> listed as a direct</li> <li>Decision and would like to</li> </ul>			Officer's

## IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS

- 1. You must meet the specified 10-day timeline; otherwise your request will not be considered.
- 2. Section 1 of this form must be completed only if you are requesting that the Board review your status as "not directly affected". Sections 2 to 5 must be completed by all applicants.
- 3. This form must be signed and dated before it is submitted to the Board for its review.
- 4. Be aware that Requests for Board Review are considered public documents. Your submitted request will be provided to all directly affected parties and will also be made available to members of the public upon request.
- 5. For more assistance, please call Laura Friend, Manager, Board Reviews at 403-297-8269.

## 1. PARTY STATUS

F YOU ARE NAMED A DIRECTLY AFFECTED PARTY IN THE APPROVAL OFFICER'S DECISION, YOU DO NOT NEED TO COMPLETE THIS SECTION)

Party status ("directly affected" or "not directly affected") is determined pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Operation Practices Act (AOPA) and its regulations. Upon receipt of an application, the Approval Officer must notify any affected parties. Affected parties include municipalities and owners or occupants of land as determined in accordance with the regulations. To obtain directly affected status, the owner or occupant notified in the above process must provide a written submission to the Approval Officer during the stage at which the Approval Officer considers the application. The Approval Officer will then determine who the directly affected parties are and include this determination in the Decision Summary.

Under its governing legislation, the Board can only consider requests for review submitted by directly affected parties. If you are not listed as directly affected in the Approval Officer's decision, you must request that the Board reconsider your status (please note that under the provisions of AOPA, the Board cannot reconsider the status of a party who has not previously made a submission to the Approval Officer during the application process).

In order to request your status be reconsidered, you must explain why your interests are directly affected by the decision of the Board. Please list these reasons below:

My grounds for requesting directly affected status are as follows:				

## 2. GROUNDS FOR REQUESTING A REVIEW (ALL PARTIES MUST COMPLETE THIS SECTION)

In order to approve an application, NRCB Approval Officers must ensure the requirements of AOPA have been met. Your grounds for requesting a Board review should identify any requirements or specific issues that you believe the Approval Officer failed to adequately address in the Decision.

My grounds for requesting a review of the Approval Officer's decision are as follows:
We hereby request a board review of the permit condition on the EMS made by the Approval
Officer. Jeff Froese. We request for the following reasons:
a. The applied NRCB's environmental risk screening tool demonstrates that our application
was "low risk." Therefore, with a low EMS risk established, we believe that this should be a
sufficient enough indicator to allow us the opportunity to make slight adjustments to our
bam
b. Our adjustments and plans involve adding a modest addition to the barn - 3.1m x 21m,
and a calf lean-to, which will assist in creating a more economic efficient operation.

3.	REASONS	YOU AI	RE AFFECTED	BY THE	<b>DECISION</b>
----	---------	--------	-------------	--------	-----------------

(ALL PARTIES MUST COMPLETE THIS SECTION)

In order to support your reasons for requesting a review, please explain how you believe you would be affected by the Approval Officer's decision.

believe that, as a result of the Approval Officer's decision, the following prejudice or damage will result:				
We believe there are several impacting factors:				
A. A single decision which is not backed with proof will result in substantial costs that will				
effect our operation negatively in accordance with the economic times we are facing.				
B. Given the current economic climate in Alberta, we need to be careful and frugal in order				
to remain viable and thus remain trusted suppliers of quality agricultural products.				

Officer's deci	he Board to take the following actions with the respect to the Approval ision:
_	
<i>a A</i>	Amend or vary the decision
12	Reverse the decision
Please descri	ibe why you believe the Board should take this action:
We request a Jeff Froese	board review of the permit condition of the EMS made by the Approval Officer
The action tak	ken does not accord with the results of the NRCB's environmental risk
The barn add	ition is a modest enlargement to allow for greater efficiencies on our farm.
quality food po compliance wi	ul of and careful stewards of our farm and the environment with a track record of roduction. We have been farming here for 30 years and have always been in ith all necessary regulations.  ecides to grant a review (in the form of either a hearing or a written review), all
Approval, Reg	ed parties are eligible to participate. The Board may consider amending the istration, or Authorization on any terms and conditions it deems appropriate.  The Board cannot make any amendments unless it first decides to grant a
conditions, tha	ranted by the Board, are there any new conditions, or amendments to existing at you would like the Board to consider? It is helpful if you identify how you believe d conditions or amendments would address your concerns.
Ne would like	the board to reconsider the condition applied to rebuilding our earthen liquid
nanure storag	e (EMS). The condition as it is stated currently does not indicate any risks nor
suggests any i	ndication of high risks in the foreseeable future. We believe, therefore, that the
nandatory con	idition of re-lining or rebuilding the EMS is invalid and request that this condition
e released.	

5.	CONTACT INFOR				F
Co	ntact information of	he person requesting th	e review:		
Name:		Reinder Kramer			
	dress in Alberta:	RR#1			
_ `	gal Land Description: one Number:	SE 2 43 25 W4	Fax N	umber:	
E-N	Mail Address:				
Top or other transport	Signature:	Zo	Date: _	November 29 2019	Service Co.
	Also, if you do not r	ctions of the form must be com neet the timeline identified, you ned and dated before being sub	request will no		d.
inf	ou are, or will be, repormation (Note: If yo ard will be directed to		ty, please pi al counsel, d	rovide their contact correspondence from the	
Na	me:				
Adı	dress:				
Phone Number:			Fax Number:		
E-N	Mail Address:		<u> </u>		
	When	ou have completed your n	equest, pieas cuments to:	e send it, with any	
		SW	Phone: Fax Email:	403-297-8269 403-662-3994 laura.friend@nrcb.ca	

Please note, Requests for Board Review are considered public documents. Your submitted request will be provided to all directly affected parties and will also be made available to members of the public upon request.

For more assistance, please call Laura Friend, Manager, Board Reviews at 403-297-8269.