#10 - REQUEST FOR REVIEW: LA20014 / Granum Colony

Filed By:

Logan Jensen

Deadline for RFRs:

September 17, 2020

Date RFR received:

September 17, 2020

Not Directly Affected

Status of party as per Decision Summary:

REQUEST FOR BOARD REVIEW SUBMITTED TO THE NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION BOARD

Application No:	LA20014				
Name of Operator/Operation:	Hutterian Brethren Church of Granum				
Type of application (check one):	Approval	□ Registration	□ Authorization		
Location (legal land description):	SE 25-11-28 W4M				
Municipality:	M.D. Willow Creek				

I hereby request a Board Review of the Approval Officer's Decision and have the right to request a Board review because *(please review all options and check one)*:

- □ I am the producer seeking the approval/registration/authorization.
- □ I represent the producer seeking the approval/registration/authorization.
- □ I represent the municipal government.
- ☑ I am listed as a directly affected party in the Approval Officer's Decision.
- □ I am <u>not</u> listed as a directly affected party in the Approval Officer's Decision and would like the Board to review my status.

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

(IF 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:

Since my name appers on page 9 & 10, I am making the assumption from the following comment places us in the "directly affected" category based on the Approval Officers comments:

The following individuals who submitted responses to the public notice reside on or own land outside of the affected party radius. However they may still qualify as direstly affected parties based on their "exposure to potential nuisances or risks" posed by the proposed CFO []jtsma,RFR 2011-05, page 3]: [see page 9]

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:

I do not feel my voice has been heard. The process used allowed the agent of the applicants' the abbility to rebut my concernes, which I feel is unfair, In addition since this application I have learned from others who live close to a similar chicken barn operation what it is like. If this application is granted there needs to be more safeguards in place to ensure the surrounding neighbours quality of life is not diminished and their water supply quality and quantity unchanged. I am concerened about the saftey of the roads, inparticualrly at the intersection of Meadow Creek Road [TWP114] and Range Road 280, mere meters from the chicken barn. There are two school bus routes that travel the Meadow Creek road four times per day every school day. This intersection is where the Hutterian Brethren would cross to access their landholdings and colony to the south. As it is now this intersection is well knowen to be dangerious and there have been serious collisions in the past in this very spot. There would be high ammounts of of traffic travelling between the proposed chicked barn location and the current Hutterian Brethren Colony. Including large trucks and large slow moving machinery. It is also concerning that this machinery will also be driven by young, inexperienced drivers. This intersection and surrounding roads will have decreased saftey for everyone. The dust created by the increased traffis is of great concern, from both of the school bus drivers and local rural residents. Reduced visability and the effects of dust on the the respiratory system will have its toll on thoes traveling that section of the Meadow Creek-Road. The large chicken barn's stench will also affect the air quality not just for a few close by but for many miles to the north east, east and south east which includes the entire town of Claresholm, this in itself is unaceptable to put this type of facility upwind from and entire town. Furthermore there is a concern with the manure spreading that Claresholm Beef Producers has stockpiled manure on the field to the south of the feedlot. The road they cross is a real concern to both Hope Jensen and her students as well as others traveling that part of the road, this road has multiple spots where the road has been damaged creating dangerious bumps especially when dust is present and visibility is poor. Although you may feel this comment is irrelevvent it is a direct example of problems that will occure and get worse than the current conditions. As we have stated in our concernes for the water systems this location with the specific situation of all the underground water, Creeks and runoff streams with the addition of hilly ground this is a poor location for such an operation and the risks are far to high. From what we have shared we believe we were not heared and the potentialy dangerous out comes have not been consitered and the Approval Officer failed to address our concernes regarding negative health or negative impacts. Therefore a board review is necessarv.

3. REASONS YOU ARE AFFECTED BY THE DECISION

(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.

I believe that, as a result of the Approval Officer's decision, the following prejudice or damage will result:

Myself and many residents travel past this location to get to Claresholm. At times the conditions are a concern and can be very poor as it is. Increased traffic of heavy trucks will deteriorare the roads further. With the current fiscal shortfall the rates payers of the M.D. of Willow Creek need to cover a \$1,000,000 loss this year. Adding a new bridge or any other infrastructure will also be detrimential to the area. this is not the time to be adding more stress to the already fragile infrastructure due to excessive traffic.

In the Approvial Officer's risk assessment to the surface water and ground water she states " poses low potential risk to ground water and surface water" [page 3]. There is significant evedence that large amounts of flodding occure near the proposed location. In the area there are three drainage pipes that go into Willow Creek. At the intersection of Range Road 280 and Meadow Creek Road [TWP 114] you can see where the fence has been moved on an angle because of flooding. Hope Jensen has walked on the south portion of section 25 with the previous landowner and saw the burried drainage pipe that emptys in to the Meadow Creek water stream. When the next time excessive water runoff is present there is a high probability the chicken barn and manure storage will cause severe consequences relataed to water contamanation, not to mention the inability for the chickens to be fed due to the flood waters. This will have very devistating effects. The Approval Officer also neglected to mention all the CFO's within a short distance from this chicken barn [LA20014] There are four big operations already, The pig barn, Morkin, Lozeman, and Claresholm Beef Producers and now this chicken barn, along with the proposed feedlot [LA2004] and another poultry barn [LA20024].

It does need to be noted that Meadow Creek is a seasonal creek and dries up and completly quits running durning the summer of most summers, so accessing water for this operation is not feasible in this location.

From what we have shared we believe we were not heared and the Approval Officer failed to address our concernes regarding the negative environmental, health and economic impacts, Therefore a Bord review is necessary.

4. ACTION REQUESTED (ALL PARTIES MUST COMPLETE THIS SECTION)

I would like the Board to take the following actions with the respect to the Approval Officer's decision:



Amend or vary the decision



Reverse the decision

Please describe why you believe the Board should take this action:

I feel the process that was used was not fair. the process is piecemeal, when our concernes were shared many of them were marginalized, dismissed and or told that the NRCB does not handle that concern. It was only after the approval was granted did we learn some of our concernes needed to be addresses to a different department whithin the govnernment which by then was too late. Therefore, a request for a review should be granted. The Hutterian Brethren are a large corporation that is going to operate at the expence of smaller landowners. Many of these landowners have been here for generations and we feel their concernes should be taken seriously. It is concerning that the Brethren intend to conctruct even more large scale CFO's in the area like LA20024. The lack of transparency with their tong term intentions makes one wonder what other unforeseen consequences will arise.

If the Board decides to grant a review (*in the form of either a hearing or a written review*), all directly affected parties are eligible to participate. The Board may consider amending the Approval, Registration, or Authorization on any terms and conditions it deems appropriate. **Please note the Board cannot make any amendments unless it first decides to grant a review.**

If a review is granted by the Board, are there any new conditions, or amendments to existing conditions, that you would like the Board to consider? It is helpful if you identify how you believe your suggested conditions or amendments would address your concerns.

There needs to be a more thorough look into a more suitable location that would have less of an impact on the environment and with all the land the Brethren own im sure they already own such a propery that would not tax the already fragile infrastructure. There needs to be a water drilling report done in the area. This will appease those directly impacted by the chicken barn and set a bench mark regarding water usuage and quality in the area. In the event problems arise those living whithin the area the longest should be granted access to water first. As environmential stewards of the land we feel this location selected would have an adverse effect on both infrasructure and the quality of life for thoes living along the Meadow Creek.

5. CONTACT INFORMATION

....

. . .

(ALL PARTIES MUST COMPLETE THIS SECTION)

Calgary, AB T2P 0R4

- - -

ne person requesting the review:					
Logan Jensen					
Claresholm, Alberta, T0L 0T0					
SW 27-11-28-W4M					
Fax Number:					
Date: Sept 17 2020 ections of the form must be completed in order for your request to be considered. meet the timeline identified, your request will not be considered. Form must be ned and dated before being submitted for Board consideration					

If you are, or will be, represented by another party, please provide their contact information (Note: If you are represented by legal counsel, correspondence from the Board will be directed to your counsel)

Name:					
Address:					
Phone Numb	oer:		F	ax Numbe	er:
E-Mail Addre	ss:	1			
	Whe	ו you have complete suppo	d your reque rting docum	est, please ients to:	e send it, with any
Laura Friend, Manager, Board Reviews Natural Resources Conservation Board		ews ard	Phone:	403-297-8269	
19 th Floor Centennial Place 250 – 5 th Street SW			Email:	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.