

September 4, 2020

To: NRCB – Joe Sonnenberg

RE: Application LA 19032 – Courtesy Notice
Corner's Pride Farms Ltd.
NE 7 – 7 – 20 W4M

Please be advised that we, Kim & Linda Jensen of [REDACTED] Lethbridge County, AB along with Justin Jensen and Travis Jensen & families of [REDACTED] Lethbridge County, AB; owning the following parcels of land:

NE 13 – 7 – 21 W4M	Home Quarter (1 home 1.25 miles from proposal)
SE 13 – 7 – 21 W4M	
SE 18 – 7 – 20 W4M	
NE 18 – 7 – 20 W4M	
SW 17 – 7 – 20 W4M	
SE 17 – 7 – 20 W4M	Home Quarter (2 homes 1.25 miles from proposal)

Are: potentially and directly affected and **“OPPOSED”** to Application LA 19032 from Corner's Pride Farms Ltd. to construct a new confined feeding operation (CFO) at NE 7-7-20 W4M. We are a family united with our community and propose this application be **“DENIED”** for the following reasons:

- 1) **Succession Plans:** Our farm has been in the family for more than 100 years and we are proudly in our 4th generation. We live here, work here and we are directly involved in the community. Our farming practices are sustainable, environmentally friendly and we are respectful of each other and our neighbours. For several years now we have been working on succession planning with our two sons and their families. This includes the construction of two new homes on two separate quarters of land. The designated quarters are:

SE 18-7-20 W4M - SE corner, directly across the road N of the proposed CFO
SW 17-7-20 W4M - SW corner, directly NE and across from the proposed CFO

To enable our succession plan SW 17-7-20 W4M (160 acres) purchase was finalized this year, in “2020”. We had no prior communication from the applicant or the farm operator regarding a possible CFO application even though the original date on Application LA19032 was August 1, “2019”. This information would have affected our decision process: why was there no community consultation by the applicant with neighbours and other parties who may be affected by the proposed development?

No one wants to live directly across the road to the N or NE of a CFO where S and SW winds prevail, let alone build beautiful new homes within such close proximity.

The tax value on “EACH ONE” of the new homes would be individually greater than the total tax revenue from the proposed CFO without the burden on municipal infrastructure. The development we have planned would be a benefit to our local economy, increase neighbour's land values - all without the negative issues associated with a CFO.

If Application LA 19032 is approved in the proposed location, the development will severely limit our land use options due to close proximity and effectively and permanently negate our plans now and for future generations.

We shouldn't have to create the buffer zone in our land which is the result an application from an adjacent landowner. The applicant should be responsible to select a site that does not disrupt his neighbours and surrounding community negatively and he should be fully responsible for the buffer zone.

- 2) **Local Economy / Location / Impacts on Infrastructure:** The applicant for LA 19032 lives in BC; his business and dairy farms are primarily located in BC; the economic profit of the proposed CFO will grossly benefit the province of BC. The application is to enable a livestock operation for replacement dairy cows creating stock piles of manure (823m by 19.5m at ground level), a breeding ground for flies, intense odour and air pollution along with the introduction of a potential environmentally hazardous earthen liquid manure storage (EMS / lagoon / catch basin) (75m x 35m x 4.5m). All of this in our backyard instead of the applicant's backyard.

The operator of the existing haying operation has no idea why application LA 19032 is such a "big deal" as the facility will be enclosed. In viewing the proposal, the barns may be "partially" enclosed but not the corrals, lane ways, manure storage or EMS (lagoon). And, if not a 'big deal', why is the proposed CFO being developed as far away as possible from the yard in which the operator and his family live? Additionally, why was the proposal kept secret?

The proposed location is the furthest NE corner of the property in question which effectively minimizes the impact to the applicant's existing farmyard from a majority of the daily ramifications and places the CFO upwind to that same yard. It is an insult that the applicant has proposed this development in a populated community where many of us will be downwind from the development and affected daily by the nuisances created by the proposal while he doesn't even live here.

An approval for this development will create millions of dollars expense in infrastructure construction, decades of increased maintenance costs and considerable negative impacts on neighbouring properties in both Lethbridge County and the County of Warner.

- 3) **Communication & Garbage Containment:** NRCB information under "Common Complaints" advises that many operators practice good neighbour relations by advising neighbours in advance of manure spreading. I am unsure of how that makes the spreading of manure any less offensive but I am sure of the unlikely event of neighbourly communication regarding these activities.

There has been NO communication or consultation from either the land owner or the farm operator which shows a lack of courtesy and poor neighbourly business practice.

Our experience to date has been picking up plastic bale wrap that has blown into our in fields, yard and fence lines from the applicant's bale storage area located at the proposed CFO site. There have been no apologies offered which is a good indication of the issues we would potentially face with the approval of a CFO in such close proximity. If approved we will be dealing with straw, containers, twine, plastic wrap and garbage blowing across our land, into our yard and cluttering our fence lines.

- 4) **Nearest Residence:** The application states that the nearest residence is 1.5 miles away which is corrupt and misleading information. From the proposed site there are ten (10) residential homes within the 1.5 mile radius with one (1) of those homes located within a 1 mile mile radius. If you expand and factor in the 1.5 mile radius to residential homes that will be affected by manure application from corner to corner of the land in this application currently owned by the applicant, the potentially affected homes will jump to approximately twenty nine (29) in total. Names and locations will be provided upon request.

Some received courtesy letters - many did not. None of us had any prior knowledge of this proposal until the NRCB courtesy letter was received or a concerned neighbour that received a letter, called another.

- 5) **Water Drainage / Soil Contamination / Environmental Pollution:** NE 7-7-20 W4M along with lands situated to the south of that location to the correction line (Township Road 70) including land to the east and west have a very high water table. When irrigation water is applied, there is substantial pooling that takes 4 to 5 days to partially soak in. The runoff water in this quarter section runs from north to south with a history of substantial flooding and large areas of low bottom land. The land is also traversed by an RID irrigation ditch. These facts do not make the land suitable for CFO development or conducive for spreading liquid or solid manure. To complicate matters there are sand streams and sand pockets at this location and the surrounding areas. For example, you can see an area where a large pit was excavated just west of the proposal site in the same quarter section. Sand was produced and in quantity.

The application also mentions a natural drain south for surface/runoff water to be directed by grade and by a runoff ditch to a drainage lagoon at the south end of the yard (NE 6-7-20 W4M). I would question the practice of manure runoff water into a drain ditch that parallels Range Road 20-5 south to a flood plain area and view it as an environmentally unstable practice. The probability of fecal contamination in the drain ditches further south and east is extreme and I don't believe drain ditches are built to allow for liquid manure overflow. An onsite inspection will reveal the installation of drain ditches along the north, east and west borders of the Applicant's hay land. I would question the legality of manually diverting surface water and excess irrigation water to lower elevations of neighbouring land. Now, factor manure contaminants into the equation.

Considering the natural drain of water to the south correction line (Township Road 70), complicated by man made drain ditches, sand steams and pockets, there is not only the potential risk for ground water and irrigation water contamination but also well water contamination. SE 17 -7-20 W4M has a functioning well on site as do several other land owners within close

proximity.

Although the 9 test holes drilled show the presence of varying levels of clay, they also show evidence of sand (test holes #1 and #9). The number of test holes drilled do not adequately demonstrate the subsurface structures and makeup of such a large area. It was also noted in Part 2 - Technical Requirements of the application:

Flood Plain Information - not completed

Surface Water Information – questionable information: 1,600 m to nearest standing water, slough, lagoon?

Ground Water Information – questionable information: this land has a very high water table. I do not see any tests confirming a 40' depth and would question that information.

To complicate the situation, there is information circulating that manure application on hay land does not require incorporation into the soil. Our community will have to endure offensive odour for weeks at a time. We will be impacted with poor air quality and loss of enjoyment of life.

Due to the north to south drainage, a high water table, and low bottom land this area is not conducive to the spreading of liquid or solid manure. Introducing a large liquid manure storage with a potential overflow risk running directly south to the flood plains area has the probability of causing further contamination and destruction. It is possible that shallow groundwater, including manure and manure-impacted ground water can move from the EMS (lagoon) into a sand layer and toward the uppermost groundwater resource. It is also noted the close proximity of the EMS (lagoon) and fresh water lagoon to the property line and county road easement.

Compound this information with the fact that CFO's generate significant greenhouse gas emissions and other air pollutants (odour, ammonia, dust) which are all detrimental to human health and natural ecosystems.

- 6) **Taxes / Land Values:** Due to the increased demand on county infrastructure coupled with yearly maintenance, a negative impact on taxes will be realized by both Lethbridge County and County of Warner ratepayers. Gravel roads are not suited for this type of traffic and public safety will be jeopardized. Home and land values of residents in the immediate area of the proposed CFO will decrease. Once again, no one wants to live in close proximity to an intense livestock operation.

- 7) **Effects on Our Community:** Our quiet community neighbourhood will be forever changed if this development is allowed. The "Vision Statement" for Lethbridge County is "**an innovative and prosperous community offering quality county living**". The NRCB statement is "**Balanced decision making in the public interest**".

The proposal itself has disrupted our quality of life. It is creating incredible stress among our community as we are trying to rally and present information in an effort to have this application denied. There are delays in mail delivery due to COVID 19 and many of us are in the middle of harvest. We are fighting to keep our quality of life while relying on a decision that could permanently and negatively affect our lives, our community and our net worth.

- 8) **Conclusion:** Due to the potentially negative and long term impacts to the community, demand on infrastructure in not one but two counties creating an economic burden on ratepayers coupled with a high water table, low elevation and poor drainage on the proposed quarter section, our conclusion is; this is not an appropriate use of the land in question.

From a global aspect, CFOs and ILOs are significant drivers in “Global Warming”. They are a consequential factor in Canada's per capita greenhouse gas footprint with one of the highest per capita rates. This is ironical since Canada has taken a leading role impeding action on climate change.

As a family, we stand together and strong with our community in “**OPPOSITION**” to Application LA 19032 and propose it be “**DENIED**”.

Please Note: Attached Picture #1 Standing water after irrigation in hot, dry weather approximately 1/16 of a mile south of proposed CFO.

Attached Picture # 2 Standing water in same location four days later.

Attached Picture # 3 Shreds of plastic remaining on our fence line after the majority of it was pulled off and taken to the dump. This is one area of many and does not show the plastic warp littering our fields and farmyard.

Please see attached “Signature” page.

Dated at: LETHBRIDGE COUNTY in the Province of: ALBERTA

On: the 4th day of SEPTEMBER, 2020



Kim B. Jensen



Justin V. Jensen



Linda J. Jensen



Travis R. Jensen





