Environmental Risk Screening Tool for Manure Facilities at Confined Feeding Operations Version 1.2 – September 2011 (Information on how to complete this form is available in a companion document.)

Facility 1 Name: Open pens (2 existing) Facility 2 Name:	Open pens (1 new)	Facilit	y 3 Name:	Catch Basin
Legal Land Location: NE 10-009-27 W4	CFO name:	Muilwijk, Arie & \	Villemina	
Screening Completed By: Scott Cunningham				
NOTE- Each facility	should be score	d individually		
HAZARD POTENTIAL				
Manure Type				
Solid Manure Runoff water with manure constituents (e.g., catch basin Liquid Manure	contents)	4 10 20	Score:	4 4 10
Annual Manure Amount (tonnes)				
>60,000 40,000 to 60,000 20,000 to <40,000 <20,000		8 5 2 1	Score:	1 1 1
Total Hazard Potential Score (maximum 28): 5	5 11			

PATHWAY

GROUNDWATER

General comments and	d overall	scoring	criteria
----------------------	-----------	---------	----------

If there is a water well directly located within the manure storage area, score the groundwater section as high risk.

If the above condition does not exist, continue scoring the groundwater section.

To help score the next two factors, complete the following and provide a sketch if possible:

Depth of storage below grade
Depth to top of Protective Layer below grade
Depth to bottom of Protective Layer below grade
Thickness of Protective Layer
Depth of UGR below grade
Depth to UGR from the bottom of the facility

0	0	1.8(A)
1.0	1.0	1.0 (B)
2.7	2.7	2.7 (C)
1.7	1.7	<u>0.9</u> (D)
2.7	2.7	2.7 (E)
2.7	2.7	<u>0.9</u> (F)

Notes:

Uppermost Groundwater Resource (UGR)

	Subsoil Texture							
Depth to UGR (m) (from the bottom of the facility)	Fine - Medium	Fine - Medium Coarse Very Coarse						
>30	1	4	7					
8 - 30	2	5	8					
<8	3	6	10					

Score: 6 6 6

Protective Layer(s) (PL) Between Bottom of Facility and UGR

• Score is 20 if the storage is constructed into the UGR

	Subsoil Texture							
Thickness of Protective Layer(s) (m)	Fine	Medium	Coarse – Very Coarse					
>10	1	3	8					
5 - 10	4	6	12					
2 - <5	6	9	16					
<2	8	12	20					

Score: 20 20 20

Liner Type

Meets AOPA liner or protective layer requirements	1
Concrete liner – no specs	2
May meet AOPA requirements	15
Does not meet AOPA requirements	20

Score: 15 15 1

Notes

The applicant has not been able to demonstrate that the RCC liner for the open pens can meet AOPA groundwater protection requirements. "May meet AOPA requirements" instead of "does not meet AOPA requirements" has been used to provide a "best case" scenario because of this.

Water Well Risk Scoring

Complete the table below for each water well within 400 m of the reference point identified. If the well is upslope of the facility, the well should be given a score of 1.

The "Highest Risk Water Well" is the well with the highest score.

	Distance to Water Well (m)							
Depth to top of open interval in water well (m)	>100 to 400	60 to 99	30 to 59	<30				
>100m	1	2	3	4				
30-100m	5	6	7	8				
<30m	9	10	12	15				

- If well annulus filled with cuttings, add 3 points
- If well has a drive shoe seal, add 5 points
- If well has no seal or the nature of the seal is unknown, add 8 points.

Well I.D.		115735						
Score	15	15	14					
Well I.D.								
Score								

Highest Risk Water Well (highest score from wells scored above):

Infiltration Potential

	Average Annual Precipitation (mm)					
Predominant	<400	400-600 >600				
Soil type						
Fine	1	2				
Medium	3	4				
Coarse	5	6 8				

Medium	3		4			
Coarse	5	6	8			
			Score:	6	6	6
Special Considerations (Allowable range of -8 to +8 with a total score for this section not to go over or under the allowable range). <i>Score is 0 if there are no special considerations</i>						

Special consideration examples:

- Pumping rate of nearby water well (concern is that even if the well is upslope, a cone of depression may develop which could draw in contaminated water)
- Presence of any springs that have the potential to be impacted by the CFO.
- Water well in pit
- Certainty of information (ie. remove points for high quality of information, is not intended to be used for low quality of info)
- Additional points may be added if there are multiple wells that score high in the water well risk scoring criteria

If a special consideration(s) is used, describe:	Score:	
Total Groundwater Pathway Score (maximum score 81): 62	47	

EXPOSURE POTENTIAL

GROUNDWATER

☐ ☐ ☐ If no water wells are completed within 400m of the confined fe	eeding operation facility being assessed, use an exposure potential
factor of 1	
\square \square If one or more water wells located within 400m of the confined	d feeding operation facility, but greater than 100m from the confined
feeding operation facility, use an exposure potential factor of 1.1	
If one or more water wells located within 100m of the confined	d feeding operation facility, use an exposure potential factor of 1.2
Hazard Potential Score + Groundwater Pathway Score =	67 × Exposure Potential Multiplier 1.2 = Risk Score 80.4
Hazard Potential Score $\frac{5}{}$ + Groundwater Pathway Score $\frac{62}{}$ =	$\frac{67}{2}$ × Exposure Potential Multiplier $\frac{1.2}{2}$ = Risk Score $\frac{80.4}{2}$
Hazard Potential Score + Groundwater Pathway Score =	$\frac{58}{2}$ × Exposure Potential Multiplier $\frac{1.1}{2}$ = Risk Score $\frac{63.8}{2}$

Risk Level Hazard Potential Score + Groundwater Path (maximum score – 109)		
High Potential Risk to the Environment	>90	
Moderate Potential Risk to the Environment	70 – 90	
Low Potential <i>Risk to the Environment</i>	<70	

you checked off the following in the groundwater section, indicate here as well. If there is a water well directly located within the manure storage area, score the groundwater section as high risk.	
otes	

PATHWAY

SURFACE WATER

General con	nments and overall scoring criteria
	If body of water is known to be upslope of the facility, score the surface water section as low risk.
	If no water body within 800 m, score the surface water section as low risk.
	If the facility is located less than 1 m (in elevation) above the 1 in 25 year floodplain level, score the surface
	ction as high risk.
	e above conditions exist, continue scoring the surface water section.

Likelihood of Runoff Reaching a Water Body

	Slope of land from facility to water body (%)			
Horizontal Distance to Water Body	<4	4 - <6	6 - 12	>12
>100m	1	2	3	4
30-100m	2	3	4	5
<30m	3	4	5	6

Score:	1	1	1

Surface Water Runoff

	Average Annual Precipitation (mm)			
Predominant Soil type	<400	400-600	>600	
Coarse	1		2	
Medium	3		4	
Fine	5	6	8	

Score: 2	2 2
----------	-----

All upslope surface water diverted around the facility Most upslope surface water diverted (>80% - 99%) Minimal upslope surface water diverted (<80%)	0 1 5	Score: 1 1 1
Manure Impacted Area Runoff Control No yard runoff (e.g., covered facility)	0	

No yard runoff (e.g., covered facility) All runoff controlled Most runoff controlled (>80% - 99%) Minimal control of lot runoff (<80%) 20

Score: 4 4 4

Runoff Flow Path between Facility and Receiving Body of Water

	Vegetation Cover					
Type of Yard Runoff Flow	> 50% Vegetated < 50% Vegetated or Frozen					
Dispersed flow	1	4				
Channelled flow	7	15				

	Score:	1 1 1
Notes		

Special Considerations (Allowable range of -5 to +5 with a total score for this section not to go over or under the range). *Score is 0 if there are no special considerations*

Special consideration examples:

- Secondary containment
- · Amount of freeboard
- Above ground earthen storage
- Certainty of information (ie. remove points for high quality of information, is not intended to be used for low quality of info)

Managed and identical (a) is used along the	Score:		
If a special consideration(s) is used, describe:			
When scoring the surface water section of the tool choose runoff water with manure constituents	nts for solid manure facili	ties.	
Additional score of 6 for solid manure storage			
Total Surface Water Pathway Score (maximum score 54): 15	9		
Notes			

SURFACE WATER

 In lif highest use surface water body (with the greatest number of types of operation facility being assessed is a small slough or creek on private land factor of 1 In lif highest use surface water body (with the greatest number of types of facility being assessed is a common body of water with little human use (with surface). In lif highest use surface water body (with the greatest number of types of facility being assessed is a high use common body of water (recreation, water life). 	out not a common body of water, use an exposure potential of users) located within 800m of the confined feeding operation thin 10 miles downstream), use an exposure potential factor of users) located within 800m of the confined feeding operation	
Hazard Potential Score + Surface water Pathway Score = × E	xposure Potential Multiplier = Risk Score	
Hazard Potential Score $\frac{5}{}$ + Surface water Pathway Score $\frac{15}{}$ = $\frac{20}{}$ × E	xposure Potential Multiplier = Risk Score	
Hazard Potential Score $\frac{11}{2}$ + Surface water Pathway Score $\frac{9}{2}$ = $\frac{20}{2}$ × E	xposure Potential Multiplier = Risk Score	
Risk Level	Hazard Potential Score + Surface Water Pathway Score (maximum score – 82)	
High Potential Risk to the Environment	> 58	
Tilgit i dedition i text to the Environment		
Moderate Potential Risk to the Environment	44 – 58	
<u> </u>	44 – 58 <44	