| 11/20/2019 | Conditions Explained * | I met with Mr. and Mrs. Kramer at their house along with Chris Ullmann of Alberta      | Edit Delete |
|------------|------------------------|--|-------------|
|            |                        | Agriculture and Forestry to deliver the authorization and to go over its terms and     |             |
|            |                        | conditions. I stressed to the Kramers how based on the information before me, the      |             |
|            |                        | earthen liquid manure storage appears to present a risk to groundwater despite its     |             |
|            |                        | low ERST score. We discussed several possible ways that they could address the the     |             |
|            |                        | risk presented by the EMS including but not limited to: conducting additional testing  |             |
|            |                        | and relining the storage. I stressed that what ever way they wanted to proceed that    |             |
|            |                        | they would need to submit a written plan as per condition 10. We then discussed        |             |
|            |                        | how if they did not agree with my assessment of the risk posed by the EMS that         |             |
|            |                        | they were allowed to request a review of my decision from the board. We discussed      |             |
|            |                        | the RFR fact sheet briefly. They did not seem pleased with the requirement             |             |
|            |                        | (condition 10) that they need to address the risk posed by the EMS. The                |             |
|            |                        | conversation then turned towards how the CAP program administered by Alberta           |             |
|            |                        | Agriculture and Forestry may be able to aid in cushioning the costs of addressing      |             |
|            |                        | the risk posed by the EMS. We then discussed the permit's other conditions related     |             |
|            |                        | to construction and water well testing. I stressed to the Kramers how the NRCB         |             |
|            |                        | requires nitrate and chloride analytical info, not microbiological as per the Canadian |             |
|            |                        | Quality Milk Program. The Kramers provided me with results of historical water well    |             |
|            |                        | testing at their farm, those results are stored under the conditions tab (an easily    |             |
|            |                        | accessible location for inspectors and sci-tech). Chris discussed with the Kramers     |             |
|            |                        | how he would likely need to come back to the farm to collect additional information    |             |
|            |                        | if the Kramers were to apply under the CAP for additional funding, I joined Chris and  |             |
|            |                        | Mr. Kramer while Chris was toured around the farms EMS and water wells so that         |             |
|            |                        | Chris would not need to make a return visit for that purpose at a later dateJJF        |             |

\*\*/ \*\*/ \*\*\*

The Transportation response