

From: T Jay [mailto:]
Sent: October-16-19 10:18 PM
To: Adria Snowdon <Adria.Snowdon@nrcb.ca>
Subject: Opposition to Application LA19036

To: NRCB, Lethbridge, Alberta Re: Application LA19036
Submitted via email to: adria.snowdon@nrcb.ca

P.O. Box [REDACTED]
Fort Macleod
Alberta T0L 0Z0
SE 14-09-27 W4M

October 16, 2019

Sirs/Mes'dam:

Re: Application LA19036

I would like to register my opposition to the above mentioned proposed expansion of the property

This property lies to the west of ours by less than a mile (.8 at the closest). Our water source is from the mountains, also to the west of us and has to pass under the mentioned property. While our well is 75' deep, it has in the past, tested as requiring treatment due to animal contamination while the area was experiencing an extreme wet time. With the excessive number of animals this application indicates, I can only express the deepest concern about our water quality. The local health facilities allow one free test a year. Far more frequent testing will have to take place and it takes a couple of weeks to get the results each time - potentially allowing illness to become entrenched in my family. Having that large a facility so close by, will require almost continuous testing to assure the household doesn't become ill, not to mention the expense out of our pockets. This is not acceptable.

My next big concern is the uptick in heavy vehicular traffic. Highway 785 is poorly monitored by the police, and speeding is rampant by the big trucks. There are four gravel pits in the area who have large trucks whipping up and

down the road at excessive speeds. There are big rigs hauling cattle and hay crops, slower farm equipment, as well as innumerable tourists meandering off to Buffalo Jump. The last thing this poorly monitored, shoulderless road needs is more heavy traffic that the proposed expansion would create.

I would also like to address the matter of the extreme odours from such an operation. Being downwind with the prevailing airflow from them to us would make the air unbreathable. There is a similar operation to the proposed one on Hwy 785 closer to Hwy 2 - but in that instance there is no habitation downwind of the prevailing winds. The stench from that one can be very intense when driving by downwind, so there is no reason to believe this proposed operation would be any different.

Lastly, I noted that the original application by the Parties involved was for 100 swine. They now admit to having 250 on hand. Unless there are papers missing, one can only assume they have exceeded their allowed number by one and a half times. Does this mean that they would expect to have 7,500 cows not the stated 3,000 on their property?

For the above stated reasons, I am adamantly opposed to this project being given the go ahead. I am 74 years old and on a fixed income and can not afford all the extra water testing this would entail, and most certainly could not handle any illnesses brought on by contamination.

Yours truly,

Signed (digitally) Terri J. McCullough