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(PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 9:28 A.M.)
THE CHAIR: Well, good morning, everyone, and welcome. My name is Peter Woloshyn, and I'11 be chairing this Panel of the NRCB to hear Mr. and Mrs. Muilwijk's appeal of Decision LA19036.

So, first of all, I'd 1 ike to thank all the parties for accommodating the Board request for holding this hearing in late April. This did accommodate our
hearing of the Springbank Dry Reservoir Project. That hearing was March 22nd through April 6th, or April 7th. So we really do appreciate that accommodation.

I would like to briefly introduce the Pane1. For your reference, the Board bios are all on the NRCB website in more detail, but $I$ would like to introduce -- we can maybe give a wave so people can see you, as I introduce you to Page Stuart. Page has a lot of background experience in the feeding industry. She was management -- on management of a large feedlot in central Alberta, chair of the Alberta Cattle Feeders Association, worked with Elanco, and has been with the Board for over three years.

Mr. Earl Graham, a familiar wave, perfect, Mr. Graham, has extensive experience in municipal politics, including being deputy reeve of

Clearwater County for a number of years. Mr. Graham has spent time on various committees of Alberta Water Council, and he also has experience with the Subdivision Appeal Board.

Ms. Indra Maharaj -- where are you there? There you go. Thank you. Indra is a lawyer with 30 years of experience, including adjudicator tribunals and energy regulation. She's also served as the chair of the Criminal Injuries Review Board.

And I am Peter Woloshyn. I grew up on a forage and beef farm near Devon, Alberta. I have been with the NRCB since my appointment as CEO back in May 2006, and then had that position, when I was voted chair late in December 2017.

I have a background in resource economics, policy, and 1 ed several research divisions in both crops and the livestock area. During my tenure as CEO I led the management team, of course, here at the NRCB, and that management team included Mr. Cumming.

Assisting the Board today, we have Mr. Kennedy, your general counse1. Good morning, Mr. Kennedy. And many of you have been speaking with both Mr. Kennedy and Ms. Friend, our manager of Board reviews. So welcome.

And, as well, the Panel has contracted Mr. Jim Prince, a professional engineer, to assist the Panel with technical review of submissions and the evidence provided today. Mr. Prince spent a good part of his career with Lafarge.

So at appeal services we have a number of NRCB staff, of course, including the participants of the review. We have Ms. Vance, the chief legal officer for operations. Good morning, Ms. Vance.

MS. VANCE:
Good morning, Mr. Chair.

Good morning. Mr. Scott
Cunningham, an environmental specialist, is also here, as he assisted the approval officer here in making his original determination on the application.

And we have a couple staff from the NRCB for document management. And these folks helped us out on the SR1 project. Ms. Sylvia Kaminski will be running document management today.

And, Ms. Kaminski, are you there? You're often a little shy. There she is. Hi, good morning.

And backing up Ms. Kaminski in case something goes wrong is Ms. Carolyn Taylor. Ms. Taylor, are you online?

MS. TAYLOR:
Good morning, Mr. Chair. Yes, I am. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Good morning. So they did a phenomenal job with SR1, and they are now seeded veterans at document management in the virtual hearing setting. But when you do want a document shared, we would ask you to clearly say the exhibit number. And if you have it, if you repeat it once or twice, that's okay. These folks will be busy looking for that number on the fly. So if you clearly say the exhibit number. And, if you can, if you have it available, the pdf page number so they can get to the exact location in that
exhibit quickly. And then just give the document manager, you know, a couple of moments to get that up. They're very quick, but it isn't instantaneous. So just give them a moment or two to get that document up on the screen.

And I would like to introduce our Zoom host, who also hosted our SR1 hearing, Mr. Wiebe with MNP. Mr. Wiebe, are you online? Will you be online?

MR. WIEBE:
THE CHAIR:

MR. WIEBE:
THE CHAIR:

THE CHAIR:
I think $I$ have this right. And if you don't have this number, please write it down. Mr. Wiebe can be reached at 780-424-6398, and he is at extension 345.

MR. WIEBE: Yeah, that's correct.
THE CHAIR:
flying solo. Mr. Wiebe. And he'11 be overseeing all of our technical end on the virtual hearing.

And if you have an issue, Ms. Friend, did you want folks to contact you or Mr. Wiebe directly?

MS. FRIEND:
Yeah, either is fine. Whatever they can get to quickest is...

Okay. So, Mr. Wiebe, I've got --
Yeah. Of course I am.
Yes. We hope you are, or we're Yeah.

A11 right, okay. Thank you,
cell number, if you could just read that out, please.
MS. FRIEND:
Sure. It's 403-620-8294.
THE CHAIR:
So if something happens, just get ahold of one of those two folks. And if we notice it, we'11 of course alert them as well. If there's something that happens, you're having difficulty or your audio goes out or whatever, just let them know so that we can get you back online.

Also present are our ace court reporters from Amicus Reporting, who will provide a transcript of today's hearing. Welcome, Ms. DiPaolo. And I believe Ms. Gerbrandt is on this afternoon; is that right? Okay, thank you. So welcome this morning, Ms. DiPaolo. And Ms. DiPaolo will give us the signal, wave her hands or sometimes -- and also just via audio if she's having difficulty hearing, getting things down, or if you're speaking too quickly, Ms. DiPaolo will let us know. Hopefully I'11 be on top of that, but if not, Ms. DiPaolo, don't be shy.

MR. KENNEDY:
I see Ms. DiPaolo actually has her

THE CHAIR:
MR. KENNEDY: screen.

THE CHAIR:

She's waving at Mr. Kennedy.

Okay. I don't know.
So do you have something up on your Zoom, Ms. DiPaolo? It's all working? Okay. MR. KENNEDY: I just got a text. It was my operator error.

THE CHAIR: And we'11 leave it there, even though that is a perfect opening for me, Mr. Kennedy. Thank you.

Okay. So the NRCB has also provided a YouTube link on its website for members of the public to observe the proceedings. You can get to that 1 ink on the NRCB's main web page. It's fairly clearly laid out there. If you have any difficulty, you could also text Ms. Friend, and she'11 have someone from the organization, Ms. Decosemo here, to help folks out, but it should be pretty clear.

If there are any members of the media on our YouTube feed and you have a question regarding today's process, I would ask you to contact Janet Harvey, our NRCB communications specialist. And Ms. Harvey can be reached at janet -- J-A-N-E-T -- .harvey - -H-A-R-V-E-Y, @nrcb.ca, or you can phone her directly at 780-720-2317.

So your participation in this hearing is important to the Pane1. We do recognize that this decision will
have a significant impact on those folks involved, and particularly the Muilwijks, and we take this responsibility seriously.

The process, as you can see, is inherently formal. This is a quasi judicial proceeding. And so a certain level of formality is necessary. However, we do try to minimize this formality to the extent possible so that you folks can feel comfortable as we move through the process.

Mr. Muilwijk and Mrs. Muilwijk, we understand that you are not represented by legal counsel, and this is your first NRCB hearing. And, Mr. Metheral, the Board also understands that the hearing process is new to you. So to both of you folks, the Board encourages you to ask questions. If you're unsure about the process or when you're allowed to interject, and please do this at any point, I'll do my best to answer your question or I can -- if necessary, I'11 direct Mr. Kennedy to help you out. And if we need to take short breaks so Mr. Kennedy can spend a few minutes with you to help you understand the process, that's fine as well. We do recognize that it is somewhat popucated (phonetic), it's new to you, it's probably a little bit intimidating, but we don't want you to get lost in the process. If you have any questions, please don't be
shy and let us know. We'11 do our best to accommodate. In addition, if there's a need for parties, field services or the Muilwijks, to caucus off the record, we have created breakout rooms for you to do that. I understand that in the test session, I think the breakout rooms were up and running. So I think you have a feel for those already. But if you do need to use those breakout rooms and caucus, they are available, and Mr. Wiebe is here to help you get there if there's any difficulties.

So the purpose of this hearing is to review Decision Summary LA19036, dated January 14th, 2021. It was issued by approval officer Andy Cumming. You can find the feeding operation, or CFO, is located at northeast Section 10-Township 9-Range 27-west of the 4th meridian in the Municipal District of Willow Creek. The approval officer denied the application by Mr . and Mrs. Muilwijk to convert a swine CFO to a feed calf CFO. Subsequently, a request for review from the operators, the Muilwijks, was filed by the deadline of February 4th, 2021.

We received two rebuttals on February 11, 2021, from John Green and Dean and Hannah Brauer. I understand the Brauers have notified Ms. Friend by email that they recently sold the property and will not
be participating.
The Panel met on February 16th and 17th, 2021, and in a letter dated February 18th, 2021, advised the parties that it made its decision to grant the RFR date of oral hearing on four subject issues.

The Panel's RFR Decision 2021-02 followed on February 24th, 2021, and provided reasons for granting that appeal. In its decision, the Panel advised that we would hold a virtual hearing using the Zoom platform, and that would commence today, 9:30 a.m., April 20th.

In that decision the Panel also requested a submission from field services. That submission was received on March 19th, 2021. And the Pane1 also directed that the approval officer make the complete application record available by March 26th; and the record was received on March 19th, 2021.

The Panel also directed that written submissions by all directly affected parties should be filed with the Board no later than April 8th, 2021. Submissions were received from John Green and Terri McCullough on April 7th, and from the Muilwijks on April 8th, 2021.

The McCullough and Green parties have decided not to participate today and will not be providing further direct evidence or cross-examining. The Board has read
and will consider those submissions from the McCulloughs and Greens in reaching our final decision.

The legislation requires that the NRCB consider the municipality where the operation is located be given directly affected party status. And in this case that is the MD of Willow Creek. They did not provide a hearing submission, and they will not be participating formally at today's hearing.

So all Panel members have read and are familiar with the complete set of documents that parties have submitted as evidentiary materials for the hearing. So given this, there is no need for you to reread into the record materials already submitted. We would ask that in order to make the best use of your time, we request that each party use the presentation time to high1ight or to clarify the important points that are relevant to your written submissions.

So just a brief overview of process. First, all parties will be registered. Then each participant will have an opportunity to raise any preliminary matters that they may have. We will then begin with the evidentiary or direct evidence portion of the hearing. In the past AOPA appeal hearings the Board has found it beneficial for the approval officer, in this case Mr. Cumming, to proceed as the first witness; followed
by the applicants for the review, or in this case the Muilwijks.

When it is your turn to provide evidence, you will be sworn in by the court reporter. And once sworn in, any new written evidence that you may want us to consider to be entered into the record on request. We'll then give you a chance to highlight or expand upon any points of your submission that you feel are particularly significant. And after each witness has concluded their presentation, they will then be open to questions by NRCB field services, or in the case when the field services are up, the Muilwijks, Board counse1, and Pane1 members.

Once questioning is complete, if you are up -were up giving the direct evidence, you will have an opportunity to redirect, and essentially, that gives you a chance to Schmidt any further evidence or comments to address areas raised in the questions that were posed to you that you believe are useful for the Panel to have.

Once we've completed direct evidence and cross-examination from both field services and the Muilwijks, we'11 allow for final argument. So for final argument, though, we reverse that order and we have the Muilwijks go first, followed by the approval
officer; and that gives the Muilwijks the final word in a reply argument near the close of the hearing. And this would be your opportunity, so Mr. Muilwijk, Mr. Methera1, to address any issues that may be raised in the approval officer's final argument.

So that's sort of the lay of the land for the day. And if you have any questions right now, please field them. Ms. Vance or Mr. Methera1, are there any questions that you have?

MS. VANCE:
I don't have any. Thank you,
Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Metheral?
MR. METHERAL:
No questions, thanks.
THE CHAIR:
Okay, thank you.
So we did indicate in our -- the notice that went out that obviously the hearings would be today, and we ask for you to reserve tomorrow morning, should the hearing go past today.

Now, we're hoping that we can get this done today; I think we can. But if we are close, I would ask the Muilwijks, Ms. Vance, court reporters, and Mr. Wiebe, if we do have the ability to stay a bit later, so that would -- you know, typically we would go till 5:00, if necessary. But if we needed to go, say, an hour later to wrap things up, and we could then not need to

MR. METHERAL:
THE CHAIR: clients?

MS. VANCE:

THE CHAIR:
MR. WIEBE:
THE CHAIR: Okay.

MS. VANCE:
THE CHAIR:

MR. METHERAL:
reconvene tomorrow, are you available to sit a little later? So Mr. Metheral and the Muilwijks?

THE COURT REPORTER:

Of course I'm available.
Okay, that's great. And now that I've asked, we may be wrapped at $1: 00$ or something. Okay. We11, thank you very much. I think we can begin with the registered parties. Sorry, was somebody asking a question? I thought I heard something. No?

So Ms. Vance will be representing Mr. Cumming, Mr. Cunningham?

That's correct.
Thank you. Mr. Metheral, you'11 be representing Mr. and Mrs. Muilwijk, Mr. Lobbezoo, Mr . Both. Do we have that correct?

THE CHAIR: Are there any other parties that anyone has that we weren't aware of that you were
intending on bringing for a witness?
MR. METHERAL:
No.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Hearing none, perfect.
So are there any preliminary matters that anyone has for this morning, Ms. Vance?

MS. VANCE: matters, thank you.

THE CHAIR:
I do not have any preliminary

MR. METHERAL:
No.
THE CHAIR:
MR. KENNEDY:
Mr. Kennedy?
I'm ready to start, Mr. Chair.
We're ready to roll?
Perfect.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. That's his opportunity to let me know if I've forgotten something. All right, perfect. Thank you, Mr. Kennedy.

We have a pretty extensive exhibit list, and that hearing exhibit list was prepared and posted on the NRCB website for all parties to reference and help prepare for the hearing. I'd like to propose that we formally adopt that hearing exhibit list, which includes the relevant documents that are before the Pane1.

Are there any objections to adopting the entire exhibit list as it stands for our hearing?

MS. VANCE:
We have no objections to that. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIR:
MR. METHERAL:
THE CHAIR: that is adopted.

And we can get started with the evidentiary portion with field services, Ms. Vance. And Ms. DiPaolo, you can swear in the witnesses. So Ms. Vance.

MS. VANCE:
Thank you, Mr. Chair. I wonder if the Panel would indulge me with just a few opening comments, which the purpose of them is to lay out a bit of foundation so that when $I$ come to asking questions, I think, all the parties will understand sort of where I'm coming from and why I'm asking the questions that I am. Can I have about five minutes tops for that, Mr. Chair?

THE CHAIR:
Yes, please proceed with that.
And then I'11 ask Ms. DiPaolo to
MS. VANCE: swear in my witnesses.

THE CHAIR:
MS. VANCE: opportunity to present evidence and make some select submissions.

A bit of verbal housekeeping. If I refer to "AOPA," I am referring to the Agricultural Operations Practices Act. If I refer to the "Standards Reg," I am referring to the Standards and Administration Regulation promulgated under AOPA by the Minister of Agriculture.

If I refer to "the site," this will be the Muilwijk's site at NE 10-9-27 West to the 4th. And if I refer to "RCC," and I'm betting I'm not going to be the only one referring to RCC, I mean roller compacted concrete.

So there's two things that I want to just talk about briefly before we get to evidence to understand why field services is providing the evidence that we are.

So I want to talk about the role of the approval officer in this kind of review and also the scope of our presentation. We're going to focus on issue 1, and I will explain why we're doing that, and then we will be into the evidence. So thank you for your patience.

I will ask when -- we get to the evidence, I will be asking Mr. Cumming, who was the approval officer on this file, for a few clarifications on his decision. Then I will ask Scott Cunningham to answer some questions. Mr. Cunningham is a member of the NRCB's
science and technology team. And Mr. Cunningham does not have a decision being reviewed by this Panel, but, of course, you will recall that he did assist the approval officer in the ERSTs on this file; that's the environmental risk screening tool.

He also provided some analysis on the uppermost groundwater resource and average calculated permeability as presented in the revised Wood report 1ast November.

So as to the role of the approval officer in this hearing, I want to be clear that the approval officer takes no position on remedy. So no position on what the Board should do about application LA19036, with the information that the Board has already, and the information it will hear today.

My goal is not to persuade you that the approvals officer decision was right or wrong. My goal is to help everybody, but in particular, the Board, understand the approval officer's decision.

The Courts in Alberta, and indeed the Supreme Court, have been clear that the role of the decision-maker in a review of that decision is limited. This particularly -- this particular statutory review under Section 25(4) of AOPA is also a de novo review, so the Board has information before it that the
approval officer did not have when he made his decision in January. And of course the Board has extensive remedial powers.

So in this way, if you trace the eventualities, it is possible that this application will come back to this same approval officer at some point in time, perhaps with new information or new direction, and for that reason, the role of the decision-maker in this review is limited to clarifying the record and responding as necessary to any allegations of procedural unfairness.

Fundamentally, why the approval officer denied the permit is contained in the decision documents, and this would be Exhibits 2 and 3, the decision summary, and the technical document.

So the presentation is not intended, to be clear, as a defence of the decision or to supplement reasons for the decision; that's important to realize. So the approval officer will offer explanation when explanation is needed, and of course answer any questions as best he can.

In terms of the scope of the presentation and the evidence, the Panel did identify four issues for hearing in its RFR decision in February. Our evidence will really focus on issue 1. This is where the --
whether the RCC met AOPA's groundwater protection requirements. The other three issues are related to the application that was before the approval officer, and did I touch on them briefly in the written field services submission, which is Exhibit 80.

You will recall issue 2 is about potential permit conditions in the event the permit is eventually granted. Because this was a denial, the potential conditions and the decision summary are, of course, suggestions only, and the approval officer is happy to answer questions about those.

Issue 3 is about risk associated with the water well in the yard. Our written submission at Exhibit 80 explains a bit about the difference between an exemption under the Standards Reg and a variance under the Act related to the 100 -metre setback to water wells.

Since the decision was a denial, both a variance or an exception -- exemption were premature, but again, the approval officer is happy to answer questions about
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Examined by Ms. Vance
written submission, the approval officer concedes that the permitted capacity of the operation on January 1, 2002, was 100 sows farrow to finish.

Unless the Board has any questions, I will move ahead with the evidence.

THE CHAIR:
Hearing none. Thanks, Ms. Vance.
Please proceed.
MS. VANCE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
So I'm offering two witnesses in panel format. My questions in direct are framed to be one at a time. I will do Mr. Cumming and then Mr. Cunningham. But of course -- actually inspired by a question $I$ received from Mr. Woloshyn. The hearing, I think, will be more efficient if Mr. Cumming and Mr. Cunningham can answer questions from the Muilwijk team or from Board staff and Panel together, and then you get the appropriate answers from the appropriate witnesses without having to choreograph that.

Okay. Mr. Cumming and Mr. Cunningham, you will need to be sworn or affirmed by the court reporter at this time.
A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM (For NRCB Field Services), sworn/affirmed MS. VANCE EXAMINES THE PANEL:

THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Vance, you're on mute.

## A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM
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MS. VANCE:
Yeah, I know. It's not the last time that's going to happen to me, guaranteed. I apologize.

So potentially during this hearing, Mr. Cumming may wear several hats. So he is, of course, the approval officer, whose decision is under review. At the same time, he is the head of NRCB applications. He is the director of NRCB field services, and he's also a member of the Technical Advisory Group, or TAG.

So I will do my best, but if anybody else, when we get to questions for Mr. Cumming, if you think that he should be wearing a hat other than the approval officer hat, I think Mr. Cumming would appreciate that being made clear, just for all our benefit.
Q. So, Mr. Cumming, just to start out somewhat gently, can you tell me a bit about your education.
A. MR. CUMMING: Thank you, Ms. Vance. Yes, I hold a degree, a Bachelor of Science degree in engineering, specializing in agricultural engineering from the University of Natal in South Africa.
Q. And what is your experience post-education in agriculture?
A. MR. CUMMING: Following receipt of my degree, I worked for a consulting engineering firm in South Africa, and our projects related to both

## A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM
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agricultural, as well as more commercial type of operations.

I then moved to an agricultural development corporation, which $I$ worked at in Southern Africa for a number of years prior to immigrating to Canada.

Once I was in Canada, I spent several years working with Alberta Agriculture, and subsequent to that, with the Natural Resources Conversation Board.
Q. And moving on to that, could you tell us about some of your experience in the NRCB. For instance, what your roles have been.
A. MR. CUMMING: I was hired on to the NRCB just prior to the AOPA mandate coming into effect, and my primary responsibility there was to assist and develop a system where we could receive applications into the NRCB related to confined feeding operations and process those.

I was also instrumental in setting up the applications division of the NRCB, and continued to do that to this day to manage applications across the province.
Q. Thank you. So as director field services application, in broad terms, what do you do?
A. MR. CUMMING: I primarily manage and look after staff, approval officers, and other support staff

## A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM
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across the province. I am also instrumental in developing policy, liaising with Alberta Agriculture and other stakeholder organizations and the public.

And as you pointed out earlier, I'm also a member of the Technical Advisory Group. I also sit on the NRCB's operational management team.
Q. Thank you. And when you put on the approval officer hat, what do you do in that role?
A. MR. CUMMING: As an approval officer, I am responsible under the legislation to receive and process permits for confined feeding operations and manure storage facilities to assess whether or not they meet all of the requirements that are set out in the Act and its regulations.
Q. How is it that you came to be the approval officer on this file?
A. MR. CUMMING: In early 2020, the approva1 officer who was handing this file at the time took some health-related 1 eaves and then resigned from the NRCB.
officers. The other two approval officers were really busy processing applications that they already had on their plate. We sat down as a group and shared the workload, and I took over several of the files of the

## A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM <br> Examined by Ms. Vance

approval officer who left in order to make workloads manageable.
Q. Thank you. So we have your decision summary and your technical document. Those are -- those are somewhat 1engthy, but maybe you could just tell the Board in your own words why you denied application LA19036?
A. MR. CUMMING: The decision document Section 6 -so that's Exhibit 2, I believe -- Section 6 sets out the rationale and the reasons for my decision, my denial decision. The primary reason is that $I$ did not -- well, I concluded that the applicant did not meet their burden to show that the roller compacted concrete that they were proposing as a liner for the covered and open pens could meet the AOPA groundwater protection requirements set out in the Standards and Administration Regulation.

I also identified that there was a shallow water table at the site and that the requirement for the catch basin to meet the 1 metre separation at the - at the time of construction may not be able to be met.

And then the third one was the setback distance from the water well that the operation could not meet.
Q. Mr. Cumming, at what point did you know you were going to deny this application?
A. MR. CUMMING: It would have been when I was

## A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM
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writing the decision summary. So this would have been sometime in December, early January that I had reached the conclusion that it was going to be a denial.
Q. Thank you. It has been pointed out that the NRCB issued a permit for RCC as a liner under application LA18053, be as it turned out. A1so, you know that the Board in its RFR decision acknowledged, quote: (as read)
"Stakeholder expectations that the consistent application of AOPA
legislation and associated regulations
is an important pillar for a respected regulator to uphold."

End quote. And so my question to you, Mr. Cumming, is when you made this decision on this file, LA19036, what steps did you take to ensure that your decision would meet the expectations of consistent decision-making at the NRCB?
A. MR. CUMMING: That's -- it's an interesting question because the file that you referred to, the LA18053, is -- would have been the very first time that roller compacted concrete would have been considered and permitted by the NRCB as a -- as a liner.

Subsequent to that decision, we have done a lot to try and determine the requirements for roller compacted

## A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM
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concrete, the feedlot sector, primarily, has been very interested in utilizing impact roller compacted concrete in their feedlots. Typically our experience has been that they have put this on top of existing 1iners.

When we did some investigations, spoke to a number of different people, received presentations on roller compacted concrete, it became clear through all of this that roller compacted concrete can be very variable and that it's not necessarily 100 percent clear as to whether or not it can meet the AOPA groundwater protection requirements.

The other thing that is -- should be taken into consideration is that every single application that we deal with has some level of uniqueness. The soils at the site, the slope of the site, et cetera, et cetera. With LA18053, the permit was issued prior to any roller compacted concrete actually being placed in the pen floors. And if you look at the conditions in the -- in that particular permit, there is a lot of requirements that relate to the preparation of the base on which the roller compacted concrete is placed, as well as to detail how the -- and the expectations for the roller compacted concrete placement on top of that.

With the application that I dealt with, LA19036,

## A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM
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when I took over the application, I was informed by the -- by the applicant that they had already placed the roller compacted concrete on -- on top of or in the areas that they were looking to place it, so that precluded any potential conditions about the site preparation, any testing that might be required prior to placement of roller compacted concrete, and any supervision or -- or testing on the -- on the actual roller compacted concrete itself. So they're two distinctly different things.

In addition, in the time frame between the issuance of -- of LA18053 and this permit or the decision that $I$ made here, we had done a number of things, tried to review a number of studies. Alberta Agriculture had provided one study, and that's actually included in the record. I do forget the -- the exhibit number, but it is included in the record here.

And then we also raised this at the Technical Advisory Group, and it was agreed that the Technical Advisory Group that we -- the group would put forward a request to go and look at the research to determine whether or not a guideline could be developed to assist with providing direction on roller compacted concrete and how it could potentially meet the groundwater protection requirements in AOPA.

## A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM

Examined by Ms. Vance

As you are aware, and as is indicated in my decision summary, that report was circulated to Technical Advisory Group members just prior to Christmas, I think December 23rd of last year. It had a protected A status, which means that it was not a public document at that point in time, so I was not able to utilize that as part of my decision-making process.

Subsequent to that, and the TAG team has reviewed the document, and they have released it publicly, and it is included in the record and forms part of the record. But just to be clear, I did not utilize that document and the findings in the document in my decision summary or my decision).
Q. Thank you very much.

At the time as you and the prior approval officer were processing this application, there was also some compliance activity going on. I wonder if you could just explain to what extent that compliance activity might have coloured how you processed this application?
A. MR. CUMMING: It didn't -- it didn't colour how I processed the application at all. In fact, when I contacted Mr. Muilwijk in May, and there is copies of that correspondence in the record, as well, he did indicate that he had already constructed the roller
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compacted concrete liners in the different pen areas.
I informed him that I would have to pass this on to one of our inspectors, which I did do, and that they would follow that up through one of their processes, which I understand that they did.

One of the other things that typically happens in a case of non-compliance is that, in many instances, the way for the operator of that confined feeding operation to come back into compliance is to obtain a permit, and the two processes run independently of each other.
Q. Thank you.

Document manager, could you kindly bring up Exhibit 77?

So Exhibit 77 is a technical guideline for non-engineered concrete 1 iners, as you can see.

Mr. Cumming, this is one of the guidelines that you reference in the decision summary?
A. MR. CUMMING: That is true.
Q. In general terms, can you tell us, what is the purpose
A. MR. CUMMING: The document helps to provide information for applicants of -- who are wanting and looking to utilize concrete as part of their -- for liners for their confined feeding operations or manure
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storage areas.
It provides guidance --
Document manager, if you could scroll down a little bit, please, to the next page? Thank you.

It provides guidance. And you can see here it sets out four different categories for -- for concrete and sets what the -- what they would be.

For this particular application, if you have a look at Category C and Category D, you will note that one is for pen floors and the other one is for indoor or covered solid manure storage facilities. Pen floors and outdoor solid manure storage facilities.

So pen C would be for the outdoor open pens, and pen -- sorry, Category $C$ would be for the outdoor open pens, and Category $D$ would be for the indoor or covered pens.

Could you go onto the next page, please, document manager? Thank you.

And then when you get to look at what the guideline does, it sets out what would be acceptable
have to utilize an engineer to design the concrete for the particular manure storage liner.

If -- if you scroll -- I think it's scroling up. The exhibit, the concrete liner here. If you go to the previous page, please, up one page. Stop right there. Thank you.

You will notice that it offers two different ways that operations could meet the AOPA requirements. And the first one is -- and we're looking down on the left-hand side of the page here -- is for $B, C$, and $D$, and you'11 remember we're looking at C and D type of liners, is that the liners should be engineered by a professional engineer. And if it's not engineered by a professional engineer, then it must meet the design and construction requirements will be in accordance within -- as on the table that we just reviewed.

So essentially if you're not going to use the concrete that's in there, you need to get it designed and engineered by a professional engineer.
Q. Mr. Cumming, what exactly does that mean, to have it engineered?
A. MR. CUMMING: The engineer would look at the specific circumstances and come forward with a design, which would include the mix of the concrete, the specifications for the concrete, the type of aggregate
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utilized in the concrete, the water/cement ratio, all of that sort of technical detail that goes into the design of a concrete mix, as well as dealing with crack control and ensuring that it could meet the requirements that are set out in the standards and administration -- regulation.
Q. Thank you. We may be looking at this document again, but I think I'm done with it for now.

Document manager, if you could bring up -- this is one that's actually not an exhibit number, it's a new Document Number 1.

MS. VANCE: While she's doing that, I will just advise the Board that $I$ did send this document to Mr. Muilwijk and to Mr. Metheral on Friday. I'm not asking it to be marked as an exhibit at this point as it's actually not part of our evidence; it's sort of more of a reference, but...
Q. So this one, this is Agdex 096-61. This one is determining equivalent protective layers and constructed liners. You know, when I read the decision summary, $I$ did not see a reference to this guideline in there, and I'm wondering if you can tell me why that is.
A. MR. CUMMING: It's actually quite straightforward. I did not use it. The applicant
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proposed as the liner the roller compacted concrete. They did not propose to utilize protective layer or layers. And they actually told me, when I asked them, that the materials, the soils at the site weren't suitable for a protective layer. That's why they chose to go with the roller compacted concrete.
Q. Thank you very much.

Document manager, could you kindly bring up Exhibit 58?

So while she's doing that, these are -- Exhibit 58 and 59 are site forms, site information forms. And these -- so Exhibit 58 is the form for the covered pen -- covered pens and the two barns. And then Exhibit 59 is for the open pens, the catch basin, and the two earth and liquid manure storage facilities, which I will call EMSes in the future, if I have to talk about them again.

So I thought we would look at this one just as an example, one of the two. What are -- what are these site information forms used for?
A. MR. CUMMING: The site information form is utilized to gather information about the site for the various facilities to be utilized in the ERST. Do we need to say the whole thing or can we use the acronym ERST? Environmental risk screening tool.

## A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM

Examined by Ms. Vance
Q. Yes, we all know that ERST means environmental risk screening tool. Thank you.

So just to get an idea of how these forms work, it appears that there's information entered in red. And at the top of this page, I could see that staff completing assessment, there are actually two names: your name and Mr. Cunningham's names. Why are both names on here?
A. MR. CUMMING: I had asked Mr. Cunningham to do the initial and assist me with the ERST for the site. He is very experienced at doing this, and he had not been on the site before. And so he was gathering some information that -- that he could out of the application and other sources, and then $I$ was able to fill in and go through the information that had been provided there to make sure that it actually fit the -what was actually present on the site.
Q. So although there's two names on here, which of you had the final say over the information that went in here?
A. MR. CUMMING: I did.
Q. And we will go a little bit further into this document in a moment, but where did you get the information to put on these forms?
A. MR. CUMMING: From various sources. It would be from the application. As I had indicated, Google Earth
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provides the basis for doing it. We also look at the Alberta Environment water well database to provide information there, as well as on site.
Q. And document manager, if you could just scroll to sort of the bottom part of this page. Perfect. Thank you.

So the bottom of this page, there's some bold writing about protective layer and then some entries for that. And it appears that the references for the protective layer in this case was borehole AM4-19. Can you tell us why you chose that particular one as the reference?
A. MR. CUMMING: We -- we chose it, it was representative of the site. We could have chosen any of them, and they would have given us essentially the same. For consistency sake we just chose this one.
Q. So for consistency sake with what?
A. MR. CUMMING: Across the site information forms.
Q. Okay. Okay, let's -- if we could just scroll down to page 3 of 4. Thank you. And so this is for -- it says the west barn. And if you go a few lines down, there's liner thickness, and then there's liner meets AOPA, and there appear to be four choices: yes, no, liner may need AOPA, and concrete no specs.

So can you explain why concrete no specs was chosen here?
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A. MR. CUMMING: It was initially checked off on -on that one.
Q. This is for the barn, one of the barns?
A. MR. CUMMING: Okay, sorry, sorry, sorry, I am looking at the wrong one then.

Okay, concrete no specs, when we -- when I was discussing the barns with the applicant, he indicated that it had a concrete liner. The barns were constructed a long time ago; there wasn't any specification available for those barns, and hence the choice for the barns was concrete no specs.
Q. Okay, thank you. And the next box down is visible condition of 1 iner, and you have marked "uninspectable." Why was it uninspectable?
A. MR. CUMMING: I didn't actually enter the barns. The barns were populated with livestock, and the pits in the barns, which would be the manure storages, had manure on top of them, so you couldn't actually see the concrete.
Q. Okay, that makes sense.

And then it says -- just underneath that there's a text in red that says, in the second sentence: (as read)
"Concrete no specs represents a
best-case scenario."
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What does that mean?
A. MR. CUMMING: It would provide the lowest potential risk for that particular facility.
Q. Okay. If we could just scroll up to page 2, which is the page immediately before this. So this -- if you just scroll to the top, this is for the proposed covered pens. And in this one we can see under "1iner meets AOPA," which is several boxes down, again the four choices, and under this one, the box is checked off that says "liner may meet AOPA." Can you tell me
A. MR. CUMMING: At the time that we did the ERST, I had not made the determination that it does not meet the AOPA requirements. So it was my decision to say that it may meet AOPA again, it provides the lowest level of risk for that particular liner.
Q. Okay. And is that why it says "liner may meet AOPA chosen as best-case scenario" there?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes.
Q. And then for this one, again, we have "visible condition of liner," the box "uninspectable" is checked off. Why were the covered pens uninspectable?
A. MR. CUMMING: The -- when I did my inspection, it was approximately a year after the liner had actually been installed, there had been livestock in
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there the majority of that time. The pens were essentially covered in manure and bedding material, and you couldn't see the concrete.
Q. Okay. And we're just going to keep in mind that you have marked off the box that says "liner may meet AOPA."

Okay. And then, document manager, if you could just scroll to the end of this page.

We have some notes in red at the bottom, and the first line says: (as read)
"Liner chose as concrete no specs,
worst-case scenario for RCC."
This seems to be a little inconsistent with the box that's checked above. Can you explain that?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes. And this is the -- this is an error. As I've mentioned initially, the -- I'd asked Mr. Cunningham to go through and look at the -the RCC -- the site and enter the information, which he did in red in the document. I then went through it with him and did the corrections -- did the corrections on the top and forgot to change the note on the bottom.
Q. Okay, thank you for that explanation.

And I actually have one more question about consistency.

So, document manager, if you can scroll up a
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little bit. I love -- I have to say I love how big this page is.

So at the very top there we've got a box called "Liner thickness in metres," and you've got 0.18. Okay. So this is for the covered pens.

And, document manager, if you could just bring up document -- or Exhibit 59. And so -- and then down to page 2.

This is for the open pens. So both open and covered have roller compacted concrete. And in this one you've got a liner thickness of 0.15 metres.

Why different thicknesses?
A. MR. CUMMING: It's -- it's reflective of the 6 inches to 7 inches indicated and shown through the coring samples in the Wood report. It actually doesn't have any significant bearing on the ERST itself, but it -- it's -- it fits within the range of what was there at the site and tested.
Q. And so when you talk about bearing on the ERST, the 3-centimetre, the 3--
A. MR. CUMMING: The 3-centimetre difference, it does not have any implication or effect on the risk ranking for the facilities.
Q. Okay, thank you.
A. MR. CUMMING: It says 15 here -- . 15 or . 18
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here. It would not change the risk rate.
Q. Okay, thank you.

I am done with those documents. However, I would like to see Exhibit 63.

So at 63 is again one example of several ERST documents that we have in the record for this hearing. I believe they run from 60 to 63 . This one is for the new open pens, the existing open pens, and the proposed catch basin.

Now, just on this page, on the right-hand side near the top it says: "Date completed: December 9, 2020, revised." Why revised?
A. MR. CUMMING: As I mentioned earlier on, Mr. Cunningham went through, did an initial risk scoring based on the information that he had. I then went through and worked through the document with him, and we corrected some of the information that he had utilized in that document. And our way of differentiating between the two was to add the "revised" here.
Q. Okay, thank you. And it appears to me that catch basin numbers will be in blue. Is that fair to say?
A. MR. CUMMING: That is correct. The way that the -- this form is utilized is that Facility Number 1 is on the extreme left-hand side, Facility Number 2 is
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the middle row, and Facility Number 3 is on the right-hand side. So when you're looking at the scoring, you will also see that they're colour coded, and so catch basin would be the one in blue and on the right-hand side.
Q. And I personally appreciate the colours. I really find that handy.

Could we please go down to page 4 , I think it is. Perfect. So this -- when I'm looking at the score about two-thirds of the way down the screen, the blue for the catch basin is 14. Now, Mr. Metheral has said in Exhibit 97, no need to bring it up -- or 96, pardon me, that: (as read)
"If the water well is upslope from the catch basin, it should score 1."

And I have to say that that does seem to be what the text at the top of this page says. Do you agree with that?
A. MR. CUMMING: I do agree that. And you'11 see there that we put it in as 14, and I'm quite prepared to change that to 1.
Q. To 1?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes.
Q. So if we change that blue score from 14 to 1 , that will change the score also at the bottom of the page, which
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is kind of a summary, $I$ suppose. That would also go to one. If we could just walk through this and let's see what the impact of changing that from a 14 to a 1 is. If you could scroll down, please. And then here we have --

I think a little bit further, please, to the bottom. There we go.

Total groundwater pathway score. So, presumably, what would the 47 change to?
A. MR. CUMMING: The 47 would be amended by taking away that number there, and it would go down to 34.
Q. 34,47 minus 13. Okay, even I got that.

And then another page, please. And here -- okay, that's good. That's good. Groundwater. Okay. So and then there's three lines with some spaces and coloured text, and we're going to look at the blue one, of course.

So the groundwater pathway score you've just told me would go to 34 ?
A. MR. CUMMING: Correct.
Q. So what would that do to the next number, which is 58 ?
A. MR. CUMMING: So that would mean that the hazard potential score plus the groundwater pathway score would be 45 instead of 58.
Q. Okay.
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A. MR. CUMMING:

You would then need to multiply that number 45 by the exposure potential multiplier of 1.1, which remains the same; and the risk score, the final risk score, would be 49.5 instead of 63.8.
Q. And so what impact -- if we follow that change all the way through, what impact does this have on the risk score for the catch basin?
A. MR. CUMMING: The risk score for the catch basin does not change. The risk score as it's shown there with -- of 63.8 would still show a low potential risk to the environment, and with the changes that we have just discussed of bringing the risk score down to 49.5, it would remain in that low potential risk to the environment rating.
Q. So it's still in the green zone on the rainbow chart there?
A. MR. CUMMING: That is correct.
Q. Okay. Thank you very much for being patient with me to take me through that. I think we're done with that document for now.

Mr. Cumming, I'm going to move into some questions on roller compacted concrete. Can you tell us the difference between surface hardness and compressive strength?
A. MR. CUMMING: Compressive strength is the
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strength of a material when you put compressive forces onto it, and it would be -- strength would be the ultimate pressure under which that material would fail. So compressive strength of concrete, if we just choose a number, 25 megapascals as an example, would indicate that that particular mix of concrete under the conditions that are prescribed would fail at 25MPA on the low end.
Q. And what about surface hardness? Is that related?
A. MR. CUMMING: Surface hardness is a different measure. Surface hardness is just that, it talks about the hardness of the surface of a material. And materials can have different properties where the outside or the surface of them is particularly hard, but that doesn't necessarily reflect what the properties of that same material are on the inside.

A very simplistic way to consider something like that is that there are, you know, types of chocolates where they'11 have a really hard outer core and then a soft inner core, so the hardness on the outside would be greater than the hardness of the inner core. So, you know, that's just a simplistic, obviously.
Q. Thank you. That speaks my language when you talk about chocolate.

```
    If we could please have Exhibit 2. This is the
```
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decision summary. And we want page 6, please. Okay, perfect.

So starting at around the -- well, actually, the second paragraph, but definitely into the third and fourth paragraphs, you discuss a Schmidt hammer, including limitations of a Schmidt hammer. Could you please tell me, Mr. Cumming, what is your understanding of what a Schmidt hammer is and what it does?
A. MR. CUMMING: The Schmidt hammer is a type of rebound movement tool. It's going to measure the hardness of the surface of a material. It has limitations as to how it can be used and where it can be used. The information that $I$ have says that it should not be used against a rough surface, and if you are wanting to utilize it to measure the hardness, it needs to be calibrated so that the rebound shows up on a specific scale, and from that scale, you can then determine what the surface hardness of that material is.

In the report that was provided by Wood, they tested the -- they used a Schmidt hammer to test the roller compacted concrete that was placed at the Muilwijk CFO and utilized the surface hardness of the Schmidt hammer readings to provide an indication of what the compressive strength of the entire roller
compacted concrete layer would be.
Typically, $I$ would expect that if you were going to provide -- use a surface hardness -- excuse me. Use a surface hardness tool to -- to predict what the compressive strength would be for a material, then you would do some sort of calibration of that tool for that material and then be able to utilize that calibration to give you that information.
Q. Okay. On this same page, a little further down, this last paragraph on the page. Thank you.

So here you're talking about reinforcements and crack control. In simple terms, why is crack control important?
A. MR. CUMMING: Controlling cracks is a way to keep the integrity of a liner or a material together. If you have cracks, you are obviously going to allow whatever it is that you're trying to contain an opportunity to go through that material.

With concrete, it is -- has really good strength properties when it's under compression, but when it's under tension, it's a far weaker material. That is why you typically will start to see reinforcing, steel reinforcing or other types of reinforcing put into concrete mixtures to improve the tensile properties of the material and -- and therefore help to limit or
A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM

Examined by Ms. Vance
prevent cracking.
Concrete by its nature will tend to shrink a little bit once it's been placed, and that shrinkage provides some tensile forces to the material, and it will typically crack, depending on how much and how large of area of concrete is placed.

The other thing that's going to impact tensile strength is any movement of the base onto which the concrete material is placed. So any heaving or movement of that base, be it from frost heave or any other types of movement are going to influence those tensile forces within the material and potentially induce cracking and speed up the deterioration of the material.
Q. Is cracking inevitable in concrete?
A. MR. CUMMING: It -- it is inevitable, but it can be controlled by utilizing reinforcement, and there's clear guideline on how that gets done with, if I can call it, normal or regular type of concrete.
Q. Okay. And I'm just going to circle back for a moment.
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A. MR. CUMMING: So tensile strength would be when you're trying to pull a material apart and its ability to resist breaking whilst you're trying to pull it apart.

Compressive strength, on the other hand, is when you're trying to squish or squash that material and its ability to resist those forces that you're trying to squash it.
Q. For, let's call it, regular concrete, is that -- are those important, both of those important?
A. MR. CUMMING: They're both properties of the -of the concrete, absolutely. Reinforcing -- normally steel reinforcing that we see, although we do see other types of reinforcing from time to time, helps to provide additional tensile strength to the material.

MS. VANCE: Mr. Chair, I'm not sure what you're looking at in the way of a break. I probably have another 10 or 15 minutes left with Mr. Cumming. I'm in your hands.

THE CHAIR:
We started at 9:30, relatively
late, so if you've got 10,15 minutes, 1 et's finish up.
MS. VANCE:
Okay.
THE CHAIR: Then we take that break.
MS. VANCE:
Okay. Thank you. I will keep going.
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THE CHAIR:
Q. MS. VANCE:

Exhibit 2, and we're going to move on to Exhibit 3, please, if I could have that pulled up.

Okay, page 46, please. If we could just zoom out a little. Yeah, perfect. You anticipate what I'm going to say.

Okay. This page is the last page that was part of the November 6, 2020, Wood report. And in the top left, it says, "Certified Concrete Testing Laboratory." And the date on sort of the middle of the page is June 9th, 2020. At least I assume that's what that is, and the date cast is November 2019.

Take your time, and tell me what does this page tell you?
A. MR. CUMMING: The information on this page provides details of concrete specimens. And if you read the rest of the report, it's led me to believe that these were the specimens that were taken from the Muilwijk roller compacted concrete layers.

On the right-hand side of the document, it says the core location, you can see that some of them are from the shelter, that would be the covered pens. Then I referred to some of the north pens, centre pen, and south pen; those would be the open pens.
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It provides information on the length of the specimen which I understood to be the thickness of the roller compacted concrete that was placed, and it provides information on specimen density. So that's the density of that core, if I can call it that, that was taken.

In the lower left-hand part of the page, there is a block which includes some information, and it says the supplier is Prairie Stone Concrete. I don't have any information from Prairie Stone Concrete under their letterhead or signature to say that this information is correct or to -- to say that it's false. I don't have that information.

But in that box, you can see there that its strength is shown as 25 megapascals, but it does not give the time period at which that strength is expected to be seen in the material. It does show a target density of 2,400 kilograms per cubic metre, which is very similar to the specimen densities in A through $H$ above.
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So this is the beginning of a three-page, I'm going to call it a memo, for lack of a better term, provided, I think, to you by Mr. Cunningham, at least that's how it appears. In the first line, it says, Hi Andy." And then it says: (as read)
"Thank you for accepting my offer on
November 23, 2020, to provide you with a written analysis of the average calculated permeability on page 4."

And I don't have enough spittle in my mouth to read the rest of it, but my question to you is why did you take Mr. Cunningham up on this offer?
A. MR. CUMMING: So this refers back to the Wood report that was provided to support the application, and there is a number there. There's some assumptions that are made, and then the response is given. But there's no information to show how the result was actually achieved.

So Scott offered, and I accepted his offer, to calculate it, and my intention there was just to say, Okay, so long as I can understand this, then it gives me a clearer picture of what is being proposed. And when I initially took Scott up on his offer, my assumption was that they'd come out to exactly the same number.
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However, when you follow this through, and the logic that is utilized which I was able to follow very clearly in Mr. Cunningham's document, it comes out and shows that the -- we were not able to duplicate the result that was calculated by Mr. Lobbezoo in the Wood report and that we show that the -- well, our calculation indicates that the hydraulic conductivity is 4 1/2 times greater than what was suggested in his report.
Q. Okay, thank you. And I think I will probably ask Mr. Cunningham some questions about his work later on.

Document manager, briefly, you see Exhibit 97. Exhibit 97 is a document authored by John Both.

And I just have the one question for you, Mr. Cumming, on this. Did you have this report before you -- well, actually, I have two questions. Did you have this document when you made your decision on January 14th of 2021?
A. MR. CUMMING:
No, did I not.
Q. And then document manager, if we could scroll down, I
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cracking within concrete."
Mr. Cumming, please take your time, look through this list of bullets, and could you please advise the Board which factors of these that you had information on when you made your decision on the Muilwijk's application.
A. MR. CUMMING: So -- so, you know, just a little bit of clarity, it indicates that these are some of the factors. And you're right, I counted them too, and there are 20 there, but having the statement, some of the factors, $I$ would assume that there would be more.

When $I$ went through this list in detail, there is some information that $I$ have on the aggregate content in the concrete. And just in the previous exhibit or so, where we spoke about the aggregate being 20 millimetre, that is the information that $I$ have on aggregate content. There's no quantity, there's no design mix, per se. So there's some information on that $I$ would suggest that it is limited.

If I go down further through the list, the concrete mean compressive strength of 28 days, well, I don't have that, but as -- in that same document where we spoke about the aggregate being 20 millimetres, there is something there that says that the concrete strength is 25MPA; it does not say that it's at 28 days or any -- any particular time frame for that example.
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So I have some information for that.
If I go down further through this, then the information that $I$ do have is respect -- relates to unit density, and that is exactly that same report that's I've been speaking about which provides density of the core samples for that particular RCC at different locations.
Q. And that's it?
A. MR. CUMMING: That's it. I don't have any information on -- on any of the other 17 factors that are listed.
Q. Thank you. I think that I would like to ask just a few questions about the catch basin.

Now, this is not strictly part of your decision because your decision was to deny the application; however, you did suggest some -- and thank you, we're done with this document, yeah.

You did suggest some conditions in your decision summary; I believe it was Appendix D. And a couple of them relate to the catch basin.

So $I$ just kind of want to talk about those in a general way because they are not conditions. And I think -- all right. You don't need to bring this up, but in the RFR filed by the Muilwijks, Mr. Muilwijk suggested that you could have told him that his catch
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basin would be too deep, that he could have changed it back to 1.5 or 1.6 metres in depth instead of 1.8 metres in depth.

So why didn't you tell him that the catch basin was too deep?
A. MR. CUMMING: If you look at the decision summary, you will see that, in my decision summary, it's about the base of the liner of the catch basin being 1 metre above the water table, and there's a potential that it may not be.

If you have a look at the requirements in the Standards Regulation, that requirement is to be met at the time of construction.

As I hope is more commonly known, the water table can vary, move up and down a bit, depending on the time and the season, so depending on when the catch basin was going to be constructed, this may be able to be met.

Typically in a circumstance like this, we would provide a condition requiring that it be met, and that if it can't be met, that they need to contact us, and then we will relook at it at that point in time.
Q. Okay. And, you know, one of your potential conditions is a leakage detection and collection system. What is a leakage detection and collection system?
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A. MR. CUMMING: It's -- it's a system which you should not confuse with a groundwater monitoring system because it is different.

So a leakage detection system -- I need to backtrack a little bit here. What is being proposed for the catch basin liner is a synthetic liner; essentially a thin sheet of material that will prevent the contents of the catch basin from migrating into the soil and therefore into that shallow groundwater.

A leakage detection system is something that can be installed at the time of construction, and it is essentially to capture any leakage, should there be any damage to that thin synthetic material, and bring that to some sort of a sump or collection area, and that then can be sampled on a frequency that -- that the operator can look at. And you can very quickly determine whether or not you have a damage to your liner, and it is -- it is leaking. At that point in time, remedial action can be done.

So this is to be installed prior -- at the same time that everything is being constructed. Yes, certainly it adds a little bit of cost to the construction because you have to put this infrastructure, this sort of collection system in underneath the liner and into a sump, but it doesn't
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require ongoing chemical monitoring -- sorry, monitoring for chemicals and laboratory costs that are associated with things like that. It's something that can be monitored easily over time, and it's something that we -- I want to say virtually every time we see a synthetic liner would encourage to be put in, if not condition to be put in.
Q. You spoke about some of the costs associated with a leakage detection and collection system. If you don't know the answer to this, please don't guess, but how do the costs of, say, a groundwater monitoring regime compare with the costs of this synthetic liner leak detection system?
A. MR. CUMMING: I can't tell you the exact cost because I don't know what they are, but I can tell you that $I$ have spoken to quite a number of different producers who have put in both systems.

Monitoring wells, as an example, have to have special equipment come out to drill the -- drill the wells, and they have to be installed in specific locations, and there is -- and developed, and they need to be monitored and test results taken as specified in whatever permit is issued for that particular facility.

So there are unique costs to them, and there are ongoing costs associated with monitoring any samples
that get taken.
The ground leakage detection system is typically installed utilizing the same equipment that is used to excavate and prepare the bed for a liner. There is a little bit of additional time that is utilized for the equipment just to make sure that the details for that leakage detection system and how it's supposed to be installed can be met, but the cost to have that equipment is already -- on site is already borne by the construction of the catch basin of the liquid manure storage facility that's being put in there.

The ongoing monitoring costs are not there. It requires somebody to go and check and -- to make sure that the sump or the collection area that collects any -- any liquid that drains through it or is caught by the system can be sampled, and if those samples then indicate that there is some leakage, at that point in time, it may trigger some sampling. But it -- and when I say "sampling," some costs to have those samples processed at a laboratory, but not until that point in time.
Q. Would you require, you as an approval officer, would you require a leakage detection system for all synthetic 1 iners?
A. MR. CUMMING: I have as an approval officer,
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yes.
Q. Okay. And one last question on the synthetic liner. Mr. Muilwijk, I believe, the way I read the record, not just the technical document, he is proposing a 60-mil 1iner. And he's been asserting that because he has a 60-mil 1iner, as opposed to, say, a 40-mi1 1iner, that he shouldn't also have to have a leakage detection system.

For reference of the transcript, this is Exhibit 3 of the technical document at pages 26 and 27 , which compares the two sets of specs.

So is there a relationship between thickness of a liner and the likelihood of a leak?
A. MR. CUMMING: Let me go back a little bit before I come to your question, if you don't mind.

Just for context, a 40 mil is 40 thousandths of an inch, which is equivalent to 1 millimetre, approximately. $60 \mathrm{mil}, 60$ thousandths of an inch, which is approximately equivalent to 1 1/2 millimetres.

So we're talking about a liner which is, in the case of a 60 mi 1 iner, approximately 1.5 millimetres thick.

Damage to synthetic liners like that normally occurs from physical damage, and that physical damage could be from the liner material -- liner resting on
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sharp rocks or sharp objects and then piercing it -the liner over time. It could be from animals, be they domestic or -- or wild animals coming through there, and their hoofs poking holes through it. It could be something chewing a hole through it, as well as the potential for degradation through UV; although that typically takes place over a much, much longer time frame.

So we also see with catch basins and other liquid manure storages that they normally insert a pump, mechanical pump to empty -- put into the facility and then use that to empty the facility. Those pumps can also damage the liner, and we've seen that in quite a number of situations in southern Alberta and across the province.

So the -- to answer your question, is the difference between 40 mil and 60 mil for a liner thickness; is that significant? You know, it's 50 percent thicker, 60 mil is 50 percent thicker than a 40 mil 1 iner.

It is however stil1 subject to mechanical damage, and you could imagine a pump or some sort of a stirring impeller probably would slice through that really easily, irrespective of whether it was 40 mil or 60 mil.

## A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM

Examined by Ms. Vance
Q. Okay. Mr. Cumming, I have, I think, just three final questions for you. What information would the Muilwijks have to provide for you to be satisfied that the RCC they install, that they have installed meets Section 9(6) of the Standards Reg?
A. MR. CUMMING: That is a really challenging question. And when $I$ say it's challenging, a lot of that is because the material has already been installed.

So the -- there is a lack of information right now with respect to the preparation of the base onto which the material was placed.

There is a lack of information with respect to the design and mix of the roller compacted concrete, how cracking is proposed to be controlled, and, essentially, I don't have any of the -- of the specifications for that.

In one of the responses, and I don't have the -the exhibit number, but it was a response -- one of the later exhibits -- a response from Mr. Muilwijk. He indicated that the concrete provider had taken samples of the roller compacted concrete at the time that they were going to be placing the concrete. It's now over a year since that material was placed.

I would have hoped that that information would
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have been able to have been provided, but none of it has been forthcoming in the information that $I$ have been able to see.
Q. And, Mr. Cumming, as kind of a follow-up to that question, there has been some new information since January 14th of 2021, when you made your decision put before even just in this hearing.

Does the new information that has been put forth -- and this is highly hypothetical, so I apologize for that -- does that new information answer your questions?
A. MR. CUMMING: To date, I haven't seen anything in the information or material that has been submitted that would provide me with the information to show that the roller compacted concrete that was installed can meet the AOPA requirements.
Q. Is it possible -- so my last question, in your view, is it possible with the information that you have identified is missing, if you were to get that, is it possible for an approval officer, with all that
A. MR. CUMMING: I would hope so, but without seeing that material, $I$ can't say conclusively one way
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or the other.
MS. VANCE:
Okay. Those are my questions for Mr. Cumming. I obviously have some for Mr. Cunningham, as well. I'm happy to keep trucking along or?

THE CHAIR: Well, I think we'd all probably benefit from a short break, Ms. Vance. How long were you thinking you might need with Mr. Cunningham?

MS. VANCE:
It depends how wordy
Mr. Cunningham is, sir.
THE CHAIR:
I assume he's practiced or gone through this. Perhaps not, but that would be a surprise.

MS. VANCE:
I would say not quite as long as Mr. Cumming.

THE CHAIR:
Okay.
MS. VANCE:
If that's helpful.
THE CHAIR:
Slightly. Could we break until 20 after 11 , and we'11 return at 20 after 11 sharp. Thanks.

MS. VANCE:
Thank you.
(ADJOURNMENT)
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Mr. Methera1, are you and your clients ready for Ms. Vance to proceed? Perhaps you're on mute. Mr. Wiebe, are they on line? Can you tel1?
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1 MR. WIEBE:
Just give me one sec here. I'11
request that they unmute.
THE CHAIR:
Thanks.
MR. METHERAL:
Yes, we're prepared. Thanks.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure so that we didn't have to backtrack. Thank you very much.

Ms. Vance, please proceed.
MS. VANCE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Q. MS. VANCE: Al1 right. Mr. Cunningham, you'11 acknowledge that you have already been sworn in?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.
Q. If we could, document manager, please briefly see Exhibit 85 at page 9 of 17 . Thank you.

And we do not need to go through this, but I just wanted to confirm that this is your CV; correct?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Correct.
Q. Could you in brief tell me about all the different roles you've had at the NRCB?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: I started in May 2002 as an approval officer, and so that was my first position.

And in January 2015, I became a member of the Science and Technology Group.
Q. And as a member of the Science and Technology Group, what do you do?
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A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: I assist approval officers and inspectors on technical matters related to applications for confined feeding operations or if any -- any parts of their job where they're looking for technical assistance.
Q. On this particular file, tell me what your role was?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: On this file I -- Mr. Cumming asked me to do -- complete the site information forms and the risk screenings. And so we worked together on completing that and the steps as to who would complete which parts, which ended up being, as we showed already, the site information forms with both our names on it jointly completed, and I completed the risk screenings themselves with the actual scorings.

And as well I did a couple -- the memos for the protective layer, that is within Exhibit 3, and the memo for the groundwater resource and upper water -uppermost groundwater resource, also in Exhibit 3.
Q. And did you also do a memo relating to hydraulic conductivity of the RCC?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: I did. That's all -- yeah. I provided that memo as well as part of assistance to Mr. Cumming.
Q. Thank you. Have you ever visited this site?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, I have not.
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Q. How can you be confident in your assistance of the approval officer if you have not been to site?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Document manager, I believe this document can come down.
Q. Yes.
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: So I -- I rely on the approval officer for looking at the site information things. Things like, okay, distance. So with the site plan that is submitted, for example, are there things that are not documented on the air photo that have been drawn in for those types of things. Or topography, slopes. So the slopes of a particular site usually are not captured by a topographic map and require on-site eyes to -- to see and observe.

And so I -- I -- on the site information forms, the parts that $I$ could do from a computer is -- that's the part $I$ worked on in creating the protective layer and the UGR, those memos, and that input in there, as well as filling in a bunch of the -- many of them blanks on the site information forms using what was
Q. Thank you. And maybe since we're on it, we can just pul1 up one of the site information forms. As an example -- there are two, but as an example could we please see Exhibit 58.
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So the two site information forms are Exhibit 58 and 59. This one I think is the same one we looked at previously, is the site information form for the covered pens and the two barns.

If you please scroll down to -- I think the bottom of this page. Yes, perfect, thank you.

And I asked Mr. Cumming about the protective layer and the reference to the borehole AM4-19. I'm wondering if you are able to tell me, the protective layer you've identified -- or this form has identified as predominant geology being VF sandy loam, which I believe is very fine sandy loam. Why didn't you use the silty clay as a protective layer?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: So I did consider -- in this determining of protective layer, you do look at what's the best quality material that could be a protective 1 ayer.

So in my -- in my memo in Exhibit 3 -- we don't need to move to it, but in Exhibit 3, on protective layer, I did consider the silty clay layers. They were present in all four boreholes. In two of the four boreholes the silty clay was above the groundwater; in the other two the silty clay was below. And so based on that, that doesn't -- that's not protection if it's below. So then I went to the next best quality
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material, subsoil material, that was above the water in all four boreholes, which was -- yes, VF is for very fine sandy loam. Just a function of how many characters actually fit in a box is what...
Q. And the subsoil texture chosen here is coarse. Why is that?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: That relates to what's above the tier in the uppermost groundwater resource.
Q. Okay.
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: The uppermost groundwater resource memo is quite a bit longer in the -- in Exhibit 3.

But in determining -- and borehole AM4 was chosen because it was the shallowest, it showed the shallowest presence of the water. And the -- in that borehole, the sandy loam was actually where the water was. And then, in addition, above the water, there was more sandy loam but was dry. So dry. But because of all the -- like the same material, I assigned the same -so I assigned the subsoil texture of coarse for the groundwater resource portion, and then applied the same subsoil texture as coarse in the protective layer portion.
Q. Okay.

And actually, document manager, while we're talking so much about Exhibit 3, maybe we should just
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move to that. And we're looking for page 47 , which I think will bring up Mr. Cumming -- Mr. Cunningham's memo on upper ground -- uppermost groundwater resource. Thank you.

And we'11 just walk as quickly as we can through this, but making sure we do justice to it. Can you tell me what is the uppermost -- what is an uppermost groundwater resource?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, if there are -- so usually -- often you have to assess, first of all, if there are more than -- like, how many groundwater resources there are at site. And then whatever the highest or uppermost becomes the uppermost groundwater resource, which is in Section 9 of the standards, that is the groundwater resource that's specified that must be protected.
Q. Okay. And on this page, 47 of Exhibit 3, the bottom -under "Are there other groundwater resources at site," that's the boldface heading near the bottom of this page, you discuss lithology for water wel1 ID 115735. Then in the next paragraph you discuss the water well ID 115734. Where is well 115734 on this site?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: I'm not sure. It's identified in the Alberta Environment's water well database as a well for this site with this land location. In their
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database they -- if they don't specifically show a location, their GPS shows it's the centre of the quarter section, but often that's not geographically correct. It's just a matter of assigning a record somehow to a piece of property.
Q. But we can gather that it's somewhere on that quarter section; is that right?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.
Q. Okay. How do water wells with IDs 115734 and 115735 compare?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: So the paragraph above, the existing water well's groundwater resource, that was the assessment I did of what's -- for the well that -the current water well. The trouble is that what does it look like and where -- what does it have for a groundwater resource. And it shows the, at about the fourth line there, that it's the -- the hard shale and gravel that's in that -- on that lithology. So from 22.9 metres to 29.0 metres would be the groundwater resource that's shown in that water well.

With the lithology above that, the brown till surface, the 12.2 , and the blue clay, from 12.2 to 22.9 , there's nothing obvious in there about there being a groundwater resource in either of those 1ithologies.
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Q. Okay. And what about -- sorry, go ahead.
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: And then for 734, there's no lithology listed on 734. But the details of the well, it lists its depth, it's a hand-dug well and a total depth of 4.6 metres. So that made -- that's -- there are definitely some wells like that, but there's not a lot of wells at that depth that are still in use. Many of those wells were drilled back as the prairies were settled, long -- long before electricity made it to rural Alberta. Or in this case, did the other -there's no record of a well being drilled on site till 1982.
Q. Okay.

Document manager, if we can scroll down, I think it's going to be on the next page. I'm looking for Table 1. There it is.

Table 1, what does this table tell us?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: So I looked to the groundwater -Alberta Environment's groundwater database, and I looked at all the wells within a mile, so 1.6 kilometres of the site, and got the 27 wells. Using the depth in there, I -- I picked all the wells that had well depths of 20 feet or less, and some of them which were zero, and then analyzed them -- placed the information in this table and then did an analysis
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on the next page of each of those wells and with what information was there; to see if did it match the possibility of the 734 well on site of the -- of a shallow well that had been -- that had been used at some point in time.
Q. Just out of interest, why did you -- why did you go 1.6 kilometres in all directions to look for water wells?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: I did this work as part of my memo to support the groundwater resource and selection of uppermost groundwater resource for completing the site information plan. And in the companion document for filling out the environmental risk screening tool, there -- if you're going to look at wells beyond the site, it's specified to look out 1.6 kilometres.
Q. That's the ERST companion guide Version 1.2, is it?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Correct.
Q. Okay. And for the transcript reference, I believe that that is at Exhibit 73. We don't need to bring it up. I thought I would just put that out there.

And then you actually go into the chemistry on this. This is part of this table. What is the significance of total dissolved solids, which is the column that is third from the right in this table?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, the definition in the
standards of what an upper -- of what a groundwater resource is, there's basically two sub bullets to it. One is that it's water that's being used; and the other one includes a flow rate, a minimum flow rate, and a maximum total dissolved solids. And the maximum in the regulation is 4,000.

So these wells actually had -- some of them had chemistry information from the time periods reported here, and so I included that as a means of comparing to the 4,000 that was in the -- that's in the standards definition.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

If we could scroll down, I believe, to the next page. And here -- actually, it will be the following page. Yeah, Table 2.

So here we have what I -- what appears to me, Table 2, is the borehole information for the Muilwijk site. And we have holes AM1 through 4-19. You know, what does Table 2 tell us?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: So that's correct, it's those
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A couple of things. The depths were similar. The depths -- the top row within approximately a metre, from a 2.7-metre depth below grade to a 3.6-metre below grade starting depth. The textures were all logged the same, as a very fine sandy loam. Moisture, they were all logged as saturated or very moist to saturated. And three of the four had -- had additional notes with them. Two of them stating free water on boreholes 2 and 3 , and then on the first one, slough, which looks like the word slough but it's different. It's the word -- so this would be the -- when they were driliing this well, this borehole that the sides actually started to fall in, to slough in, and that's an indication of how much -- that there's water present and how much there is.
Q. Okay .
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: So we concluded that all these boreholes showed a saturated zone shallower than the groundwater resource in well ID 735. So this supported the idea that 734 was actually completed into an aquifer and that was useful for some period of time.
Q. Okay. So it appears that there -- the conclusion from this is that there were -- there are two aquifers, one shallower, one deeper, and so the uppermost one is that shallower one. Is that fair to say?
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A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes. And that said --

Document manager, if we go down a couple of lines here, please. Thank you.

Under the heading "What is the Uppermost Groundwater Resource," that's my conclusion that the -it's the same well that -- the same aquifer that 734 was completed into and the four boreholes intersected it when they were drilled. And then listed here -basically all the boxes that would be filled in on the site information form and the information $I$ was going to use as a source document, is the word it had come from.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Document manager, could we move to, the same exhibit, page 98, please.

This is -- this is a further memo from you. We saw this earlier in the morning, but this is your memo, so I'm going to ask you a few questions about this.

In the -- near the bottom of this page, you say that: (as read)
A. Darcy's Law is about the flow of liquid through a porous material. It was developed -- or discovered by
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a French engineer Darcy using water as the liquid and sand as the material, but it has since been found to apply to -- also to oil and gas through rock reservoirs, it had some chemical engineering applications, and even some biomedical, looking at flow of liquid within a body, for example, through different parts, from one part of a body to another.
Q. Okay. And the formula you have down there has four different elements: $Q$ is flow rate, $K$ is hydraulic conductivity or permeability, I is hydraulic gradient. What is hydraulic gradient?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Hydraulic gradient is a measure of the pressure. So if the -- it's the term that came from Darcy's Law. Of course pressure was known before Darcy's Law, but that's how they termed it there. And it was the piece of -- it's kind of one of the -- it made perhaps the defining -- hydraulic conductivity is a defining piece from Darcy's Law.

Hydraulic gradient is the part, well, if you want the water -- for example, in Darcy's experiments, if you want the water to flow through the sand more quickly, add pressure, and it will move faster.
Q. How does that kind of pressure work on, say, a solid manure collection area?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, it's -- that's difficult to
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measure. Or you can know which numbers to use.
So if you -- one of the assumptions in my report, I think it's.

Can we go down one page, document manager, please?
Yeah, onto the third paragraph here. Where
"Darcy's Law is valid for..."
The -- in the regulations they have used hydraulic conductivity, which quite clearly comes from Darcy's Law, but they don't -- the regulations don't give us what to use for a gradient. And in the regulations, they're specific. It's -- this is use hydraulic conductivity for solid manure. Well, it shouldn't -- some would say it should be zero, but then the whole formula goes to zero because there's no pressure. And so that doesn't really -- it's unlikely that was the intent of the regulations.

So one way we have found that works quite well to look at it is using the thickness of a layer which is specified in the Regulations, and the hydraulic conductivity, and just make the assumption that the gradient is whatever the legislature or the Minister intended it to be. And it's the same for solid manure storages.

So we can do that, and that's what I did here. It's similar -- we used this similar concept when we
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developed the guidelines, that Technical Advisor Group guideline, that 096-61, we looked at earlier. It's not an exhibit, but the comparisons in there for equivalent constructive layers and liners do not include a gradient. They include the hydraulic conductivity end of things.
Q. Okay. On this page at the top, you have assumed -you've made an assumption about overall flow. My understanding of that is you were adding the cracked and the uncracked.

Instead of an average, why use overal1 flow rather than an average?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Well, an average is -- so to average between the two areas, for example, or the average between two flows, the -- because of the way that the formula works as you change the area, an average doesn't come up with your answer directly enough. It's more because of the -- it's about the hydraulic conductivity of the cracked multiplied by the area of the cracked, and then that has to be added to the area of the uncracked and the hydraulic conductivity of the uncracked.

So it's a multi -- while you may come out with an the average in the end, it's a multistep process. It's related on two things; not just one.
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Q. Okay. And you don't average it -- you didn't average it until the end, if you like?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Until the end, yes.
Q. Okay. I think we're done with this exhibit.

So that -- that memo on hydraulic conductivity that's included in the technical document, that was based on the November 6, 2020, Wood report; correct?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Correct.
Q. Okay. If you wrote a similar memo about hydraulic conductivity based on the April 8th, 2021, Wood report, which is Exhibit 98, I believe, what might that look like?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: It would look different --
Q. Okay.
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: -- because in the April 8th report, Wood, they have included their formula that they used, which is -- it's the same formula I provided in equation 6 in my memo.

So -- and I could easily follow their calculations, and I got the same result they did. So -- when I did that calculation.

So I would have discussed with Mr. Cumming to see how much information do you want in a memo? Do you want me to go through line by line to show the calculations? At times that may be valuable for an
approval officer in -- for other parties than the engineers informed.

So it would look different, and the -- based on what I know today, I would have concluded that I could get the same answer that Wood provided in their report.
Q. The formula -- we can bring this up if you need to, but the formula in that Apri1 8th, 2021, Wood report, are you in agreement with that methodology?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes. It's the same formula I used. The -- comparing the formula that's in the Wood report and equation 6 on the last page of my report, they are the same formula. They do have different subscripts for the variables, so if you -- they -- but when you look at the details there, they are the same.
Q. Right. Okay. When I read the Apri1 8th, 2021, report, which is Exhibit 98 , to me it seems to suggest a kind of hybrid with RCC plus some soils underneath that are not bad as a kind of a hybrid.

Have you seen -- in your experience with the NRCB, have you seen hybrid kind of proposed liners before?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: I have seen some hybrid liners. Not ones that involved concrete as a hybrid, but I have seen some where they -- where they did cement soils investigation. They had part of what they needed for protective layer, but not enough, and they looked at
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proposing a compacted soil liner on -- on top of that, and the combination of the two to provide the required protection under the regulations.

And we do provide in our -- in that 096-61 guideline, there is a method for combining appropriate layers and 1 iners.
Q. Thank you. I'm going to ask some questions - - I'm going to take advantage of you being here, Mr. Cunningham, because you have such a wealth of historical knowledge, especially in relation to the environmental risk screening tool.

So I just wanted to ask you a few questions, and I do ask the Board's patience to kind of just bear with me, and the reason for this history lesson will hopefully become clear.

If we could please see Exhibit 73. So this is the environmental risk screening tool. I call it a "guide." I'm not sure that that's -- you have called it a "companion document." Version 1.2. This is the one that you and Mr. Cumming will use, especially use, for this file, LA19036; yes?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's correct.
Q. Okay. And this is the current. So if we had an application today and you wanted to run the ERST, you would use this version; is that right?
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A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Correct.
Q. Okay. And before Version 1.2, what was the version before that called?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Version 1.1, and it was issued in February of 2009.
Q. Okay. At this point, I'm going to ask the document manager to bring up a new document which is not an exhibit. It is Document Number 2. Thank you.

This is Version 1.1?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.
Q. Okay. I believe that you had a role in switching from 1.1 to 1.2. Could you please tell us about that?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yeah. So part of -- in my time at NRCB I've worked on all three versions of the environmental risk screening tools, the original, Version 1.0, the amendments to create Version 1.2, and then the changes from Version 1.1 to 1.2. And I did a bunch of the authoring of the changes of going from Version 1.1 to Version 1.2.
Q. Okay.

MS. VANCE:
And perhaps, Mr. Chair, if this is a good opportunity, I could ask this be marked as an exhibit.

THE CHAIR:
Yeah. I was going to ask you that same thing, so please do.
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Ms. Friend, what number are we at?
MS. FRIEND
Mr. Chair, that would be 103.
THE CHAIR:
Okay, thank you. So 103 for ERST February ' 09.

EXHIBIT 103 - ERST FEBRUARY 2009
MS. VANCE: Thank you very much.
Q. So if we compare, I'm going to drill -- I'm not going to review the whole document, obviously. I'm looking at -- I want to look at Part 8, which you actually excerpt in the technical document in one of your memos in there.

But I wonder if we could just look -- while we've got Version 1.1 open, if we could look at page 11 of 45, and this will take us to Part 8, which deals with uppermost groundwater resource. And the bullet that I'm interested in in particular is the second bullet. And I don't know if we're able to lay these side by side or whether we just need to flip back and forth with a good memory. Could we please look at Part 8 for the 1.2 Version, which should be at PDF page 12 of Exhibit 73. Thank you.

So the second bullet looks a bit different here. And I'm wondering, Mr. Cunningham, can you just generally walk us through why these bullets -- why they're different. What changed from Version 1.1 to
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1.2?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: So probably the best -- maybe a good place to start here is Version 1.2 on this page. So under the section bullet, there are three paragraphs. The third paragraph did not change from Version 1.1 to 1.2.

The first paragraph changed with what's within the brackets. The other one just said geotechnical hydrogeological. This one got a little more specific to what was there.

And at paragraph 2 in this one is all new. That -- there was none of that information in the previous -- in Version 1.1.

Now, this -- this -- so actually perhaps, document manager, if we could go to number -- to the new exhibit, just quickly.
Q. Exhibit 103?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes. Yeah. And so here's the -here's the information that -- the third paragraph is the third sentence. The first two paragraphs, the first two sentences here are the first paragraph in Exhibit 73, and that other information is not there.

So, document manager, if we go back to Exhibit 73, please. So this paragraph changed from Version 1.1 to 1.2 , but it only matters if it affected this site.
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And if we look at paragraph 2, the first part of that sentence, and I'11 read it up to the column: (as read)
"If the site specific geological
information shows that there may be a
shallow aquifer located above the
aquifer used on site."
So the aquifer used on site is down in the -- down below 20 metres, down 22.9 metres; that's what we see from well 735.

And then looking at the site specific geological information, might there be -- maybe is there a shallower aquifer on site? And the answer is yes. Both from 734, the chemistry well, and from the borehole logs.

So then after the comma, this is the trigger to -then the water well drillers logs from wells located within 1.6 kilometres of the facility's property boundary need to be reviewed.

So that was my trigger to look out the mile at those -- at those wells and see -- and that is part of what's in the last sentence in this -- in this paragraph 2.

So it's not just about is there an aquifer under the site of the confined feeding operation because the
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definition in the standards of the groundwater resource, it's specific to its use. It does not directly use the aquifer definition from the Water Act. And so it's -the last sentence here says: (as read)
"If you -- if an aquifer, the uppermost one, is currently in use, can we correlate it back to the specific site information, then it can be called an uppermost groundwater resource at the site."

This is broadly in place if the -- a well on site goes down deeper, like through one aquifer to it and uses a deeper aquifer, for whatever reason, there may be someone using a shallower aquifer nearby, and that aquifer, it then, because it's being used by somebody, does -- it could fit the groundwater resource definition.

So there are many sites that are assessed that this -- paragraph 2 does not apply to or doesn't change what the groundwater resources are, but in this file it
Q. And if we were to transport back into time to, say, 2009/2010, you would be using Version 1.1, not this; correct?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Correct.
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Q. Okay. A11 right. I think we're done with this document and the other one. Could we bring up Exhibit 96, please.

So the questions I'm going to ask do not relate to file LA19306 or even your work on this application; this is why I've asked the Board's patience a little bit on this.

They do, however -- this document does relate to -- this is Mr. Metheral's submission. My questions will relate to the site, however.

So one of the issues that the Board's identified for hearing is the risk to the water well associated -sorry, risk associated with the water well in the yard.

At number -- I think if you could scroll down to page 2. Right. And I think under hearing issue 4-- a little bit further. There it is, thank you -- there's a quotation in italics. This submission indicates that this quote is from permit LA10054N. I actually believe it's from the monitoring statement, but I will be asking Mr. Metheral about this just to get some clarity on that.

Could we please have up the new Document Number 5, which is the monitoring statement for LA10054N. And if you just scroll down a little bit, there's a paragraph under the boldfaced indentations that says: (as read)
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"The results of the risk screening exercise."

You see that paragraph?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.
Q. And then it says: (as read)
"The catch basin facility has over
20 metres of clay till."
Now, let's leave the catch basin part out of it for now.
The 20 metres of clay till underlying the bottom of the facility and above the uppermost groundwater resource.

Now, I'm not going to ask you about this monitoring statement in particular because you didn't write this; your signature's not on this. But I'm going to ask you a bit of a hypothetical question, although it should be grounded in history, which is if an NRCB field staff member were doing a risk assessment of a facility at the Muilwijk site in, say, December or November of 2009, using Version 1.1 of the ERST, knowing about and having access to well log for ID 115735, what might that look like?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: They would -- potentially would look at it and go, that's the only well log at the site that has lithology, and they would use that as their sole piece of information for determining what the ground water resource is at the uppermost groundwater
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resource.
Q. So in 2009 or 2011 , would this conclusion make sense for this site?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes. If we're using that one -that single well, which the direction in Version 1.2 changed as to how to do that, but under Version 1.1 and the depth to where the uppermost groundwater resource is here was in well 735. For the groundwater resource in 735 was at 22.9 metres. And you've got that well logged (phonetic). And the depth to the -- the deepest facilities on the site were $21 / 2$ metres and -approximately, so that would be the 20 -- that could be, easily, the 20 metres.
Q. Okay.

MS. VANCE:
Those are actually my questions. But before I leave you, perhaps I could ask for this monitoring statement to be marked also as an exhibit.

THE CHAIR: Number 104, I believe, Ms. Friend?

MS. FRIEND:
Yes, that's correct.
EXHIBIT 104 - MONITORING STATEMENT FOR LA10054N

MS. VANCE:
Thank you.
Those are my questions for my witness pane1. I would ask both of you to make yourself available and recognize you are still under oath to answer questions
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from the Muilwijk team, and then after that from Board staff and the Panel.

THE CHAIR: Right. So we're right at noon. We did have a short break not that long ago, but it wil1 most definitely interrupt the cross-examination, I think, because hunger and bio break will take over. So why don't we do that now.

And we're all in different spots. I mean, at times I've gone a little bit shorter, but, you know, I'm sort of thinking we're going to be quite later, maybe tomorrow. I mean, I'm guessing a bit, obviously, but rather than shorten our lunch break now, which can be a challenge for some folks to really get lunch and take a couple minutes to, you know, prepare for the next session, let's take an hour and come back at 1 , and proceed with Mr. Metheral and Mr. Muilwijk's cross-examination. Thanks a lot. We'll see you at 1:00.

And, Pane1, we can go to a breakout room. (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 12:01 P.M.)

PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED TO 1:00 P.M.
$\qquad$
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6 THE CHAIR: to go?

MR. METHERAL:
THE CHAIR:
MR. METHERAL: be very patient with us. This is our first time.

In fact, as we were establishing the team here, I was talking to Laura about the role of being both spokesperson and -- what am I?

THE CHAIR: Witness, perhaps?
MR. METHERAL: Witness, spokesperson and witness. So I will try to help the Board understand when I will be speaking as the spokesperson and then presenting some material from my own.

But I've also realized that $I$ have an engineer here with a far higher calibre and criteria than $I$ have when it comes to roller compacted concrete, and I would like to have him somehow included as a spokesperson to carry on some of the discussions when it comes to the technical review of concrete.
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Is that an acceptable thing to have, is to have two spokespeople?

THE CHAIR:
Well, yes, Mr. Metheral. In terms of direct, if you're thinking about your other engineer to give us some evidence about RCC, we can accommodate that, put him under oath, and that would be under your direct, but right now is sort of your opportunity to ask Mr. Cumming and Mr. Cunningham questions based on their direct.

So is your question you would like to ask some of those questions, but you would also like your -- and who is this we're talking about, sorry?

MR. METHERAL:
Yes. My question is, I'11 be leading the start and have some details that $I$ would ask Andy and Scott about, but when it comes time for the more technical nature of the concrete, I would have John Lobbezoo lead the concrete discussion.

THE CHAIR:
So questioning, not -- [crosstalk]
MR. METHERAL:
Right.
THE CHAIR: Questioning, okay. So that should work. As long as neither one of you are providing sort of evidence at this point, you don't need to be under oath, you just need to be asking the question. But -MR. METHERAL: Yes.

THE CHAIR: -- later on, after we've concluded
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the questioning of field services, then you'11 likely go under oath because at that point you may be performing both those roles, so fair enough. We'11 try and keep them straight when you are. But for now, it's your opportunity to ask questions.

Mr. Kennedy, do you see any issues with that kind of dual questioning there?

MR. KENNEDY:
No, I'm quite familiar with that kind of process happening in our proceedings. It's -I have to go back a few years, but clearly it can work very effectively because the questions come with a -the understanding of what answers might -- might follow.

So it can be very constructive.
THE CHAIR:
Perfect. Okay. So with that,
Mr. Metheral --
MR. METHERAL
Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
-- the floor is yours.
MR. METHERAL:
Very good. We appreciate that.
It will save us from having John having to flow those questions through me.

So... And when I perhaps address Andy or Scott, should it be Mr. Cumming, Mr. Cunningham? What would you prefer?

THE CHAIR:
We11, I think the court reporter
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particularly, we sort of started that way. You know, it's a little more formal, but the court reporter, I think that's the way she's kind of got everybody documented. So when we're looking through transcripts, we can search and look for Cumming or Cunningham. So if that rests well with you, Mr. Metheral, 1et's proceed that way.

MR. METHERAL:
THE CHAIR:
MR. METHERAL: from my previous work, so we were never so formal, but I'11 do my best today.

THE CHAIR:
We also know who Scott and who Andy are. So, you know, we'11 figure it out on the transcripts as well, but...

MR. METHERAL:
Very good.
MR. METHERAL CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. Okay. To start our opening round of questions, we would just ask for clarification from Mr. Cunningham. What -- in his opinion, what is roller compacted concrete? Sorry, my first error.

Mr. Cumming, what is roller compacted concrete?
A. MR. CUMMING: Mr. Methera1, roller compacted concrete, as $I$ understand it, is concrete that is placed on the ground and spread utilizing normally sort
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of earth-moving type equipment, it could be front-end loaders and the like, and then compacted using some sort of compacting equipment.
Q. Okay. Can you describe the type of concrete that you saw at Arie's in the -- in the covered feedlot we'11 say. Was there any evidence of concrete at that facility?
A. MR. CUMMING: I did see evidence of concrete. I can't describe it because, as I testified earlier and in my decision summary, the pens, both the covered and the open pens, had livestock in them, a significant amount of manure, and bedding materials as well.
Q. Was there any exposed concrete, say around the barns or from clean-up activities?
A. MR. CUMMING: The barns hadn't been cleaned. It appeared that they hadn't been cleaned any time recently when $I$ did my site inspection at the facilities. There were areas where I could see some concrete, but it was still covered with a smudge or a smear of manure and other material.
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A. MR. CUMMING: No, I did not.
Q. Do you think that would have aided in your understanding of what -- and your assessment of the site?
A. MR. CUMMING: Unless he could have cleaned the -- the concrete down to essentially without -- so that it didn't have any manure or bedding material on it, $I$ don't believe that it would have aided in my assessment.
Q. Okay, you've been to other feedlots with roller compacted concrete?
A. MR. CUMMING: I have.
Q. And have you seen how they clean those pens?
A. MR. CUMMING: I have.
Q. And it's your opinion that those pens can't be cleaned for inspection?
A. MR. CUMMING: It's my opinion that when I went to look at the roller compacted concrete, that even if there was -- if they had had livestock and manure on top, that being able to inspect the concrete would have been difficult. Typically an inspection of concrete or roller compacted concrete takes place prior to any livestock or manure entering or being placed on top of the roller compacted concrete, or other liner for that matter.
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Q. Is there any technical work, testing that can be done after concrete is placed?
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't fully understand your question.
Q. There -- you don't believe there's anything that we can do after concrete has been placed for testing?

MS. VANCE:
Can I just interrupt for one second? Mr. Metheral, I'm going to ask --

THE COURT REPORTER: Sorry, who's -- I'm sorry, who's speaking?

MS. VANCE: This is Fiona Vance. I apologize.

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry.
MS. VANCE: As a piece of advice, I advise that distinguishing between RCC and other kinds of concrete may be helpful in this line of questioning.

MR. METHERAL: Certain7y.
Q. MR. METHERAL:

I can ask you -- I can try to illustrate those distinctions. But let's use that then.

Thank you, Ms. Vance.
Let's use that as the next round of questioning.
Is roller compacted concrete concrete, Mr. Cunningham?
MR. METHERAL:
Sorry. For the Board, my mind is focused on Mr. Cumming here, these questions are for
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him, and I will engage Mr. Cunningham when it's -- when we're there.
Q. So the question was, is roller compacted concrete concrete, in your opinion?
A. MR. CUMMING: By its name, it is concrete. It does have cement products in there and constituents that would normally be found in concrete. So I believe that it can be categorized as a type of concrete.
Q. What would you consider the main difference to be between roller compacted concrete and concrete?
A. MR. CUMMING: I think that there are several significant differences between roller compacted concrete and what $I$ would call normal or ordinary concrete, or typical concrete, that we see. The method as to how it is placed, the method as to how it is compacted, the mixes are typically different for -- for both of them.

The roller compacted concrete, in my experience and in the literature that $I$ have read, typically does not include any type of steel reinforcement in it, whereas your normal concrete would have that included in it.

I have also seen articles where roller compacted concrete has been used to aid drainage in that it is designed to be porous, and therefore addresses some
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concerns, especially in urban centres.
Q. So you suggested that we have different designs for different purposes in concrete?
A. MR. CUMMING: Absolutely.
Q. Okay. Thank you for that. I would agree with you there.

Do you believe that the Muilwijk site, with the proposed roller compacted concrete liner, is a liner that's engineered or non-engineered?
A. MR. CUMMING: I have no information to show that it's engineered. The information -- if you have a look at the technical document, which $I$ believe is Exhibit Number 3... I will find the page for you. Page 21 of 100. If you have a look there at how it is described as: (as read)
"6 to 7 inches of roller compacted concrete to make a durable liner, professionally installed."

It does not provide any information that it was engineered or -- or anything like that.
Q. Okay. Who constitutes the level of engineering needed for an engineered liner?
A. MR. CUMMING: Are you talking about a concrete 1 iner?
Q. Engineered concrete liner.
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A. MR. CUMMING: I will refer you to Exhibit 77, which is the technical guide Agdex 096-93, and it says that if you're talking about a concrete liner, engineered means it needs to be engineered by a professional engineer.
Q. Discuss the level of engineering, please, required to -- that you would need to see -- to have something required or to be considered engineered?
A. MR. CUMMING: I would need to see something from an engineer which details the design and purpose for which the concrete is proposed, and include in it how the factors -- and I believe that the Agdex that $I$ just referred to, 096-93, for non-engineered concrete liners provides guidance as to the type of information that needs to be included in any engineering proposal for an engineered concrete liner.
Q. Is an engineer required to stamp a liner that they design?
A. MR. CUMMING: If -- if you're talking about the APEGA requirements, $I$ believe that if they're acting as a professional engineer, they do need to provide their stamp and their number.
Q. Okay. Did Mr. Muilwijk provide you with a stamped engineered submission for consideration?
A. MR. CUMMING: I have a submission after the
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fact, and it came from Wood. You were a coworker on it. It is part of a technical guide at page -- it starts at page 40 of 100 . And Mr. John Lobbezoo stamped that, and it showed that it is reviewed by yourself, it doesn't have a stamp there, and also a person by the name of Adam Johnson, who's a CET.
Q. How many stamped engineered submissions did Woods group under John Lobbezoo submit to the NRCB for this application?
A. MR. CUMMING: For this application, two. One was dated October 29th, and that was withdrawn and replaced by one which is dated November the 6th, which is the one that $I$ was instructed to use.

Subsequent to my decision, another document has been placed into evidence.
Q. Okay. Mr. Cumming, are you a practicing engineer with APEGA?
A. MR. CUMMING: No, I am not.
Q. Are you critiquing the work of another engineer without practicing with a license?
A. MR. CUMMING: I am reviewing the information that's provided to me under the Agricultural Operation Practices Act in my capacity as an approval officer. As an approval officer $I$ need to verify that an application will meet the requirements set out in the
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legislation, and that is what $I$ did with this application.
Q. Do you have any certificates or training related to concrete?
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't have certificates related to concrete, but I have been trained at various stages of my career and received input on concrete in various phases.
Q. Can you describe the training that you received over your career?
A. MR. CUMMING: It varied from when $I$ was at university, and we did courses on concrete presentations there, right the way through to having presentations and courses done on concrete testing, concrete uses in -- in different careers that I have had.
Q. Okay, are you providing a professional opinion when you submit -- submitted your decision about John Lobbezoo's work?
A. MR. CUMMING: My opinion is under my -- under
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Moving on, you were on the TAG team, the Technical Advisory Group, which is a membership -- which I understand is a membership between Alberta Agriculture, NRCB, and industry?
A. MR. CUMMING: That is correct.
Q. And I understand this issue came to your attention in a March TAG meeting. Were you in attendance at that meeting?
A. MR. CUMMING: Are you -- sorry, can you be more specific than that?
Q. I understood that the -- that the -- sorry, let me restart.

I understood that the TAG committee received information that initiated a TAG report on whether roller compacted concrete could be used as a liner. And that meeting occurred in March.
A. MR. CUMMING: Of which year are you talking about?
Q. 2020 .
A. MR. CUMMING: I have attended TAG meetings for quite a number of years, and yes, roller compacted concrete has been something that has been discussed at TAG. And you're correct, I don't have the exact date, but at a TAG meeting last year, a research -- sorry, a group was tasked with researching roller compacted
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concrete to see if there was sufficient information to develop a TAG guideline.

So this was in 2020.
Q. Great, thank you for clarifying. That's the report I'm wondering about. And just to confirm your involvement, were you at the -- perhaps the kick-off meeting for that review committee or review team?
A. MR. CUMMING: For the actual team tasked with looking at roller compacted concrete?
Q. Yes.
A. MR. CUMMING: I was never a member of that team, no. I was on the steering group at TAG.
Q. Okay, when did you first become aware of that TAG report, that a TAG review report was being initiated?
A. MR. CUMMING: We11, I was -- I was part of the TAG steering committee, and we set out the requirements for it and initiated that process to move forward. So I was aware of it in the development stages.
Q. In the development stages, okay. So that would have been at the March meeting?
A. MR. CUMMING: And -- and possibly before.
Q. And before, even before, earlier. Okay.

And when did you receive the draft classified version of that report?
A. MR. CUMMING: I received it by an email from
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Vince Murray, who is a cochair of the Technical Advisory Group. The email was dated December the 23rd of 2020.
Q. Thank you. In your submissions, and even earlier on today, you've suggested that you have no opinion about the outcome of this decision. Is that still the case?
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't have an opinion as to whether or not my decision gets overturned or if it's upheld, that is true.
Q. Okay. If I can ask the file manager to pull up Exhibit 19, December -- we'11 1ook specifically at December 12th -- 16, phone conversation. I believe it's the first page. Please help me. I understand this to be a screenshot of your database --
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes.
Q. -- that the NRCB maintains?
A. MR. CUMMING: That is correct.
Q. And can you maybe describe across the row and columns what the different entries mean?
A. MR. CUMMING: Well, the first one is a date.

The second one is from a drop-down menu and describes -- provides a brief sort of overview of what was done. The third column from the left-hand side is filled in by the person who is doing the -- or making the entry into the database. The fourth column would
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be any documents that would be attached to that particular conversation. And the fifth column allows stuff to be edited or deleted.
Q. Okay, thank you. And how do we know these are your entries or not someone -- or someone else's entries?
A. MR. CUMMING: My entries, if you have a look at the third column, will all have a -AC after them. So the person's initial, the person who made that entry's initial.
Q. Okay, thank you.

I might -- just for the file manager, I'11 be referring to this document a couple of times.

So if we look at entry, the 12th of 16 , 2020, a phone conversation, can you help us and read the first -- can you read that entry for us please?
A. MR. CUMMING: So there's an entry made on December the 16th, 2020. It's indicated as a phone conversation. What I entered into the database was: (as read)
"Had a phone call from Arie wondering if

Which would be the Agriculture and Forestry.
"... report yet. I told him that I had
not yet received it and that $I$ had
continued to process and write my
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decision so as not to delay it. I told him that if I did receive it before I was ready to issue my decision, that $I$ would take the information into account.

He asked when I would be releasing my decision, and I told him that it currently -- that it is --"

There's a word missing there.
"...currently being reviewed, and I was hoping to be able to release it early in January."

And my initials follow that.
Q. Okay. Specifically I think the document says that you would take the information into account; is that accurate?
A. MR. CUMMING: That is -- that is true. And as of December the 16 th, it was my assumption that any document coming out of that would be a public document.
Q. And, sorry, the distinction between -- how would a distinction between a classified and a public document
A. MR. CUMMING: So a public document means that it is able to be looked at by the public, and it is a document that $I$ would have shared, if I was able to, with Mr. Muilwijk when $I$ had received it and if I was
going to use it. It also then -- if I'm going to use a document and it is a public document, it is available for anybody else to have a look at.

If it's classified, as the TAG report that I received on December the 23 rd was, it means that it is not a public document. And, therefore, because it was not a public document, $I$ was not able to share it with Mr. Muilwijk, and I therefore could not take it into consideration for -- for my decision, because how would people know what $I$ was referring to and whether $I$ was referring to it accurately.
Q. Okay. So your position here is that if it was a -- if it wasn't -- if it was a public document, you would have taken the information into account?
A. MR. CUMMING: It would have been an additional piece of information that $I$ could have used when $I$ was writing the decision on Mr. Muilwijk's application, absolutely.
Q. Okay. At the start of our -- this question session, I asked you if you had any opinion on the outcome of this
A. MR. CUMMING: When you -- when you asked me at the start, you asked me if essentially I interpreted to you asking me whether or not $I$ took a position as to whether my decision was going to be upheld or my
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decision was going to be overturned, and $I$ responded to it that way.

I don't understand your question at the moment because you're now suggesting that a document which I wasn't able to use, and I was clear in my decision summary that $I$ wasn't able to use it, that somehow that -- that clouded that point.
Q. Okay. Let's move onto Exhibit -- the same exhibit, database entry May 25th, 2020. Can you read the (audio issues).

THE CHAIR:
Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. Hang on.
Sorry, I'm not sure if it's you, Mr. Metheral, but somebody with a mic got muted.

MR. WIEBE:
I fixed it, Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIR:
You got it?
MR. WIEBE:
Yeah.
THE CHAIR:
Sorry about that, but we couldn't hear you, Mr. Metheral, so please proceed.

MR. METHERAL:
Thanks.
Q. MR. METHERAL:

If we scroll down to exhibit --
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A. MR. CUMMING: Yes, so just for the record, there are a number of database entries on May the 25th of 2020. The one that Mr. Metheral I believe is referring to is the one that comes immediately after the May 22nd, 2020, note, and it's a note that $I$ wrote into the database file which says as follows: (as read)
"Spoke to Arie this morning as a
follow-up to my email from Friday. He sent an email with some very general information about how they had installed the RCC. I let him know that the information did not satisfy what I needed him to provide to support his application.

I discussed what we needed," and in brackets, "(information to show what he is proposing can meet AOPA requirements)," closed brackets, "and outlined four options for him to consider.

1, to provide the information to show how the RCC liner can meet AOPA requirements.

2 , to show how an alternative 1 iner can meet the AOPA requirements for the

A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM<br>Cross-examined by Mr. Methera1

site." And in brackets, "(e.g., a naturally occurring protective layer).

3, to direct me to process his
application with the information already supplied. I told him this would be a denial but that he could choose to appeal it if he wanted to.

4, to withdraw his application. In
discussion, he mentioned that the reason he was proposing a RCC liner was because the natural soils weren't great. He said that he would speak to his engineer to discuss what he could provide. I provided the options to him in an email.

I told Arie that I would not proceed with processing his application until he provided me with information regarding which option he wanted to pursue followed by initials."

There is also an email attached to this which would have reflected that conversation.
Q. Thank you. The Option 3 that you proposed, can you read that for me again, please.
A. MR. CUMMING: The Option 3 was: (as read)
"To direct me to process his application
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with the information already supplied.
I told him this would be a denial but that he could choose to appeal it if he wanted to."
Q. You initiated your testimony here under Ms. Vance that you had made your decision in December. Here it appears by this data entry that you also have a decision as early as May. Can you reflect on those two statements?
A. MR. CUMMING: I can. I'd actually just direct you to the May 22nd, 2020, database entry, which is a note there, and I'11 read that to your quickly: (as read)
"An email sent requesting more information on how the proposed RCC 1iner can meet AOPA requirements. Apparently not enough information on the application to show how the proposed liner can meet AOPA requirements."

Followed by my initials. So you can see that there is a conversation happening here that is included in the database to show that $I$ have gone through his application, Mr. Muilwijk's application, and determined that there isn't sufficient information in the application as it stood on May 22nd, 2020, to issue a
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permit, and -- because of the lack of information on the RCC 1iner.

Following several conversations, and the database entry on May the 25 th reflects that, I provided Mr. Muilwijk with four different options for him to consider for -- to proceed or withdraw his application.

So essentially four different options as I -- as I saw them. He chose to go with the Option 1, which was to provide information to show how the RCC 1 iner can meet the AOPA requirements.

So from that time on, I was waiting for that information, which came through in what is, I think, the October 29th report from Woods, and when I discussed that with Mr. Muilwijk, he said that he wanted to speak with his engineer about updating that, and that resulted in the November 6th document from Woods, which Mr. Muilwijk identified was the document that he wanted me to use to process his application.
Q. So to confirm, you had reviewed the file after taking -- sorry, what date did you take over the file?
A. MR. CUMMING: If -- document manager, if you could scroll down, $I$ believe the date of that is on there. It's up above that. It'11 be -- there you go. You can see one May the 4 th is -- so May the 1st was when I took over the file. May the 4 th was when I
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called Mr. Muilwijk to advise him that I had taken over the file.
Q. Okay. So we've illustrated two exhibits that suggest you have formulated an opinion and that documents were going to be -- a document that was received would have influenced your decision.

The Muilwijks have maintained that there is a biased position here and were wondering if you can see how your biasedness is illustrated in these submissions?

MS. VANCE:
This is Fiona Vance. I have to object to that question. He did not admit to a bias. In fact, I believe that the issue of bias, which was put forward in the RFR, was not a hearing issue.

THE CHAIR:
I'11 agree.
MR. METHERAL:
Let's move on.
Q. MR. METHERAL:

If the Board can allow -- or the file manager can please bring up Exhibit 10 , the Board review. Specifically focus on the four questions that the Board asked the NRCB related to their RCC experience.

Mr. Cumming, did you provide the responses to these or support the response, the submission for these questions?
A. MR. CUMMING: I'm -- I'm not exactly sure what

A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM<br>Cross-examined by Mr. Methera1

you're talking about. Are you referring to the -- the field services submission?
Q. Sorry, this is the hearing issues. I'm -- more specifically the four questions about the NRCB experiences right here. Yeah, sorry. This is the correct page.
A. MR. CUMMING: I think if you go and have a look at the field services submission, and you're going to have to help me on the exhibit number there. I think that'11 answer your question.
Q. No. Just confirming your involvement in responding to these four questions. And you're familiar with the four issues in front of us, if we scroll up. The -the focus of this hearing, perhaps, could be considered the RCC with some other considerations around potential permit conditions and the existing water well and the 1ivestock determination. Do you agree with those -that those are our hearing issues?
A. MR. CUMMING: It's clearly stated in the Board's document.
Q. Okay. The last part of this document, the Board reflects on its expectations that an approval officer follow NRCB fact sheets and pulls four statements from the working -- work submitted by professional engineers fact sheet. Can we scroll down to those points. Keep
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going. Yes, here we go.
If we were to look at these two paragraphs here, do you believe that you have fulfilled your obligations in meeting this fact sheet?
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't understand what you're -what you're trying to say. And if you read the Board's submission, that this wasn't part of the issue for the hearing.
Q. Let's move on. Exhibit Number 80, file manager, please. Page 3. Sorry, is this the right -- yes, of the -- no, sorry, I must mean the document. It's basically Question 1. Let's zoom to Question 1. I think it's the -- right here. Sorry, up a little bit, to the top of the -- whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. Part A, responses to the Board's questions.

Can I have you read the question, please, Mr. Cumming.
A. MR. CUMMING: Question, are you talking about question $\mathbf{A}$ ?
Q. Question A.
A. MR. CUMMING: (as read)
"What, if any, guidelines exist with respect to the specifications necessary for RCC liners to meet AOPA's groundwater protection standards?"
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Q. Okay. And maybe quickly, to summarize, what are your -- what was your response from field services?
A. MR. CUMMING: So field services' response to this document was prepared by Fiona Vance on behalf of field services, and it starts off with Item 4: (as read)
"Field services is not aware of any guidelines with respect to specifications necessary for roller compacted concrete 1 iners to meet the groundwater resource protection standards set out in Section 9(vi) of the Standards and Administration

Regulation under the Agricultural Operation Practices Act."
Q. Okay. So no guidelines were available was the NRCB's position?
A. MR. CUMMING: We are not aware of any guidelines; that is what it says.
Q. Okay. If we can -- can you keep this document close at hand, but also bring up Exhibit 2, the decision summary, the approval officer's decision summary, page 5.

In your decision summary, it appears like you've referenced the Agdex Document 96-93?
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A. MR. CUMMING: That is correct.
Q. And it's a -- it's quite a significant illustration. Can you describe why you used it in your decision summary?
A. MR. CUMMING: So Agdex 96-93 is the non-engineered concrete liners for manure collection and storage areas guideline.

It provides public guidance, so it's a publically available document on concrete liners, which can be utilized for confined feeding operations. And of importance in my mind here is that it provides some concrete options for the different types of guidelines -- sorry, for the different types of -category of concrete, with the exception of Category A, which has to be engineered.

And then if you read it, it says that if you don't meet those -- the criteria there, whatever you're proposing as a concrete liner would need to be engineered by a professional engineer.

I should note that this was provided to Mr. Muilwijk back in May of 2020.
Q. Thank you. How many times did you provide this document to Mr. Muilwijk?
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't know the exact number, but it was more than once.
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Q. Well, I'm getting a Number 2 signal from Mr. Muilwijk, so we'll at least say two times.

So what's your opinion of this document? Is it relevant in this decision? Is this an important part of your decision process?
A. MR. CUMMING: If you read my decision summary, you will find that $I$ used this to -- this document to help me -- help provide guidance with respect to what to expect with -- regarding a concrete iner. What Mr. Muilwijk was suggesting was a roller compacted concrete liner, which is a type of concrete liner, but he didn't provide any specifications, and what this guideline does is it says that if you are providing something other than what is shown in the acceptable liners, if $I$ can use that term, that it has to be professionally engineered.
Q. So --
A. MR. CUMMING: There's no information that I received to show that the RCC liner that Mr. Muilwijk used was professionally engineered.
Q. Okay. So this is an important document for your decision. If the applicant would have provided information that would have illustrated some of these points, you would have been more inclined to approve his application?
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A. MR. CUMMING:

It certainly would have been supportive of what he was proposing.
Q. Okay. Can you confirm how the Agdex document calculates concrete liner -- or how it illustrates how concrete liner requirements meet the regulations?
A. MR. CUMMING: I think it's fairly
self-explanatory here. It doesn't go into exact details with respect to how Section 9, and depending whichever subsection you're looking at, can be met, but what it does do is it provides an option for non-engineered liners to be used if they are meeting the requirements of those non-engineered concrete liners in Table 2.
Q. So this document doesn't actually calculate how one would achieve or meet the regulations using concrete?
A. MR. CUMMING: No, that's not the purpose of the guideline.
Q. How would an approval officer use it, then, to determine that concrete meets the guideline?
A. MR. CUMMING: Typically what we see from -- in
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A. MR. CUMMING:

THE CHAIR: I'm not sure, but as you're talking, if the papers are really rustling, it's difficult for us and probably difficult for the court reporter, as well. It sort of overdrives the mic, so I think that may have been you. I'm not certain, but just folks with the mic unmuted, if you could just be conscious of that. Papers aren't helpful. Thank you.
A. MR. CUMMING: I apologize if it was me, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIR: No problem.
Q. MR. METHERAL:

Sorry, the question was how does one arrive at the calculations required to show concrete meets the requirements using the Agdex guideline?
A. MR. CUMMING: I think I answered your question already, Mr. Muilwijk. The purpose of the guideline is not to walk a person through the -- the requirements. That is why the requirement is to -- to have that designed by a professional engineer.

The purpose of the guideline is to show applicants what they can do if they're wanting to utilize concrete as a liner but do not want to have it engineered. And then it provides -- Table 2 provides details of that.

A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM<br>Cross-examined by Mr. Methera1

We -- I went on to say that we very seldom see in applications applicants who are proposing a concrete liner, which is different to that which is in Table 2.
Q. Again, where are the calculations that come from this guideline that illustrate how an applicant can show he meets the liner requirements? I just want the calculations. Please illustrate from this document where the calculations are.
A. MR. CUMMING: Again, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the guideline is not to provide a step-by-step design of -- of the calculations made. In fact, if you go to the front page of that guideline, it tells you who the audience is for that.

I'm doing my best not to rustle papers.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you.
MS. VANCE:
This is Fiona Vance. The guideline is Exhibit 77, in case anybody is looking for that.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. I was just going to text to see if I could find that. Thank you very much.
A. MR. CUMMING: That's correct.

MS. VANCE:
I believe so.
Q. MR. METHERAL: Mr. Cumming, does the -- now that this document is up, does this document illustrate any
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calculations at all?
A. MR. CUMMING: I -- I -- I've answered the question before. The answer is no. But if you have a look at the purpose statement here, it's: (as read)
"To provide guidance for the design and construction of non-engineered concrete liners used for manure collection and storage areas."

And then if you can scroll down to page 3, I believe it is, Table 2. Thank you very much, document manager.

Here you can see the details of the non-engineered concrete liners, including depth from the bottom of the 1 iner from the water table, the cement type, concrete strength, crack control, and leak control.
Q. And if Arie would -- Mr. Muilwijk would have submitted information following this guideline, he wouldn't have needed to provide the calculations to illustrate he meets the groundwater protection requirements?
A. MR. CUMMING: If Mr. Muilwijk had provided the concrete details specified in Category C and Category D for the open or covered pens, then -- and he had chosen these specifications in there, then that would have met the 1 iner requirements.
Q. Please explain how you came to that conclusion as an approval officer that these requirements meet the liner
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requirements in AOPA.
A. MR. CUMMING: I have to go back quite a long way on that one and refer back to the Technical Advisory Group who hired consultants, as well as had in-house professional engineers work on developing equivalency guidelines for concrete liners to meet the requirements set out in the legislation.

The guideline that you have here provides the result of those -- that detailed work that had been carried out.
Q. So as an approval officer, you wouldn't have had to do any calculations on your end should Mr. Muilwijk have submitted based on categories D?
A. MR. CUMMING: We11, two categories are applicable for Mr. Muilwijk. One is Category C; one is Category D. So depending on the facility that is being looked at, the -- either Category C or Category D, if those specifications were provided as his application, and he chose to use a concrete liner that met all of that for his facilities, the -- the -we've simplified the process by allowing the applicant to use this and -- knowing that this would meet the AOPA requirements.

If an applicant wants to use something different than these pre-approved, if you will, concrete designs
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and mixes, then the onus is on the applicant to have what they're proposing designed by a professional engineer, and it would then be the responsibility of that professional engineer to show how the concrete that is being proposed can meet the AOPA technical requirements.

MR. CUNNINGHAM:
Mr. Chairman, may I supplement Mr. Cumming's answer?

THE CHAIR:
Please proceed.
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: So on this document, document manager, if we go to page 1. And show the introduction please, both paragraphs. Yes, thank you.

So in the first paragraph, the last sentence, the second sentence, it says: (as read)
"This technical guideline describes specifications for concrete liners that can be used to satisfy the requirements of the Agricultural Operations Practices Act and its regulations."

So perhaps that's what you're looking for, the direction to an approval officer as to how it would -- what they can rely on in this document to say, yes, the table says this; therefore, it meets the regulations.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.
Q. MR. METHERAL: So then, Mr. Cumming, this is an

A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM<br>Cross-examined by Mr. Methera1

important document for you. You sent it to Arie twice. You illustrated it in your decision summary. Is this still your opinion that this document can be used to calculate concrete requirements? And can it also be used to calculate roller compacted concrete requirements?
A. MR. CUMMING: It's my opinion that this guideline, Agdex 096-93 provides some -- I'11 try not to rustle papers -- provides some information for applicants and provides guidance to them as to the concrete mixes that can clearly meet the AOPA requirements.

It also provides guidance to applicants that if they choose not to use this, and they want to use a concrete liner, that the responsibility and the onus is on them to have a professional engineer design the -the concrete that they're proposing to use for the liner that they're proposing.
Q. So help me understand. You were aware Arie was submitting an application for roller compacted concrete, yes?
A. MR. CUMMING: That's what it says in his application.
Q. And you provided him with a document that illustrates traditional or more plastic concrete?
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A. MR. CUMMING: Yes, it provides information on more -- the traditional concrete, which is acceptable, and it also provides guidance to say that if you're not going to use one of those pre-approved concrete mixes, that you need to have whatever it is that you're proposing designed by a professional engineer.
Q. Okay. And so this would have worked for Arie, for Arie's submission.

Okay, let's -- let's move to Article Number 4. It's the Muilwijk submission, page 10: The Muilwijk submission suggests that this document was not intended to be used for roller compacted concrete or else the criteria in the document would illustrate the proper placement and curing.

Do you agree or disagree with that position, with that statement?
A. MR. CUMMING: I'm just trying to find where the statement is written.
Q. "However --" or sorry --
A. MR. CUMMING: On page 10.

MR. METHERAL: If we can screen scrape it.
THE CHAIR: to?

MR. METHERAL: Muilwijk submission, page number 4.
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1 THE CHAIR:
MR. METHERAL:
But which paragraph?
Exhibit 4. Muilwijk's RFR. Yes.

Page 10. In middle of the page there, bottom
paragraph: (as read)
"It's the Muilwijk's position that this guideline was not intended to be used for roller compacted concrete, otherwise the document would also illustrate the criteria for proper placement and curing of this material."
A. MR. CUMMING: It's the -- it's the Muilwijk's statement. That's their opinion.
Q. It's our opinion that roller compacted concrete guidelines is not applicable to this application.
A. MR. CUMMING: I -- I've been clear, I think, that we don't have a guideline specifically on roller compacted concrete, so I'm not sure. You've just referred to a roller compacted guideline.
Q. Okay. Can we now move to Exhibit 84. This would be the field services submission, page 3 , for Walter

Can you please help the Board understand who Walter Ceroici is?
A. Walter Ceroici is a director of our science and
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technology division within the operations division of the NRCB.
Q. And why has he submitted something for this?
A. MR. CUMMING: One of the questions that was raised, and you raised this earlier in the Board's review, was the Board had asked what experience the NRCB has had with respect to roller compacted concrete. And three of us, the three managers of the three different divisions within the operations division, myself, Kevin Seward, and Walter Ceroici provided responses, and those are the responses that are included there.
Q. Thank you. Can you read bullet three for?
A. MR. CUMMING: The third bullet starts with: (as read)
"Sci-Tech staff were involved in the preparation of the TAG concrete guideline. TAG considered including RCC in the June 2015 guideline, but chose not to and to address RCC as a separate issue."
Q. Thank you. So just to confirm, Walter Ceroici does not believe that roller compacted concrete should be used -- can be referred to in the TAG guideline. The Muilwijks do not believe that the TAG -- sorry, the

A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM<br>Cross-examined by Mr. Methera1

Agdex's guideline is appropriate. Is it still your opinion that the Agdex's guideline is an appropriate tool to assess roller compacted concrete?
A. MR. CUMMING: It is the best tool that we have at the moment and the best guideline which is publically available to show the sorts of information and what we would expect for a concrete liner. And for roller compacted concrete, it is not included as a pre-approved, if I can use that terminology, liner in Table 2. And anything that's not included in Table 2 would need to be designed by a professional engineer, as included in that guideline. And that would be true for roller compacted concrete.
Q. I'm going to move on.

MR. METHERAL:
At this time I would ask
John Lobbezoo to participate in the cross-examination.
THE CHAIR: Do we need this exhibit up or can we take this down now?

MR. LOBBEZOO: That one can be taken down.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you.
MR. LOBBEZOO:
It's John Lobbezoo. Just a few questions --

THE CHAIR:
You may have to -- Mr. Lobbezoo, perhaps you can -- yes, perfect. If you have the mic, that will be great.
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5 MR. LOBBEZOO CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
6 Q. Mr. Cumming, I just wanted to follow up on some of these RCC questions just to -- and I'11 be shorter and more concise, I think.

Let's just cover off some of your earlier, where you described Schmidt hammer testing and those sorts of things. So I just want to ask you, do you have experience using an impact hammer to test concrete strength?
A. MR. CUMMING: I have watched people do it, and it is something that I've seen information on, and we were led through courses.
Q. Would you know -- so in your document you described a concern with a texture of the surface not providing accurate results. So my question is this, if the surface is not smooth, if you will, or compromised in any way, do you know what effect that would have on the test results?
A. MR. CUMMING: No, I don't. I --
Q. [Crosstalk]?
A. MR. CUMMING: I didn't hear the last part of

There it is.
Much better, thank you.
Al1 right.

A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM<br>Cross-examined by Mr. Lobbezoo

your question, sorry.
Q. Would they be lower or higher is the basic gist of the question?
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't know the answer to that question. My gut tells me is that the results would be variable, depending on how and exactly where the Schmidt hammer was used on the surface of the material if it was not smooth.
Q. And we'11 talk about that later during the other part of this.

Let's talk about crack control. Will
reinforcement of the subject concrete for the pen liner eliminate cracking is the yes-or-no question?
A. MR. CUMMING: It will not totally eliminate cracking, but it will certainly provide a significant amount of control of cracking.
Q. When you say "control of cracking," can you describe what "control of cracking" -- what you mean by "control of cracking"?
A. MR. CUMMING: It's -- as I was referring to -in testimony that I provided earlier, when Mrs. Vance was asking me questions, it's to do with the tensile strength of the concrete. And your internal reinforcing, be it steel or some other type of reinforcing, will help to increase the tensile strength
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in that concrete material, and thereby help to minimize and control cracking.
Q. Okay. Thanks for that. So my next question pertains more to -- to how we apply the AOPA in the engineering process.

So the Agdex that we keep referring to, Exhibit Number 77 --

MR.
LOBBEZ00: Maybe -- can we pull that up again? It's probably very handy. On page 1 of this document -- right there. Beautiful. Let me look.
Q. MR. LOBBEZOO: (as read)
"Professionally engineered designs may
differ from the specifications outlined
in this guideline."
I think that's important to note.
There's another reference to -- to engineered, and that's on page 2 , and $I$ just want to move to that. And this -- and this is key. A little bit lower, please. A little bit lower. Right there, okay.

So Category B, C, and D 1iners, and we already talked about this site being $C$ and $D$. So as far as this Agdex goes, this is where we are.

Mr. Cumming, I'm not going to ask you to read in all this stuff, but $I$ just want to high1ight here that "engineered by a professional engineer or if not
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engineered..." So my question is this, you're clear on the term in between Number 1 and 2, "or"; correct?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes.
Q. My question is this, why do you keep referring to this guideline as guidance for engineered 1 iners as well? So you -- I think that's a concise question, okay.
A. MR. CUMMING: Because, in my opinion, it provides guidance to an applicant to say that if you're not going to be using the specifications for the concrete liners which are set out in Table 2, that you need to have whatever you are proposing as a liner engineered by a professional engineer.
Q. Okay, good.

Cody asked this --
And you can put that down, we're done with that exhibit. Yeah, thanks.

Can we reflect once again on who -- in terms of an engineered 1 iner, an engineered concrete liner, who would develop the criteria that establishes whether this is engineered or not? Who would develop that
A. MR. CUMMING: I'm not sure that I understand your question.
Q. Okay, let me rephrase that. And I don't want to be out of line in all this stuff, but $I$ would submit that the
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engineer doing the design of the 1 iner in the context of AOPA here would, at least at the outset, outline what constitutes the level of engineering required for this particular liner. Would you agree with that?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes. Yeah, I would hope that would be included, yes.
Q. Okay. If the level of engineer -- so in your role, you've said you're not practicing engineering, I appreciate that, but you do reserve the right to request more and more information to satisfy yourself in your capacity as director?
A. MR. CUMMING: No, negative. As in my capacity as an approval officer, I'm responsible to make a determination on an application that comes into us under AOPA. It's not my role as a director. So I just wanted to be clear about that.
Q. And that's what I meant, so yes. The difficulty that I have here is that there was no line of -- of detailed requests for more information. After an engineer provided a stamped opinion that the 1 iner meets AOPA,
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kind of what you say to Arie, but as we -- you know, once we get to the decision summary, you list all these other things that you're looking for.

So why would you have not provided this information as we were going through, the level of information that you would require to satisfy yourself is my question?
A. MR. CUMMING: Document manager, can I get you to call -- pull up Exhibit 44, I believe it is. Can I get you to go down to the bottom of that document, please. It's the second-last page. There you go, right there.

So, Mr. Lobbezoo, to answer your question, back on May the 22nd of 2020 I provided Mr. Muilwijk with some details that $I$ was looking at, and you can see those details are set out in that particular document.

As an approval officer, $I$ have to walk a very fine line with respect to telling people exactly what $I$ need from them and being able to make a decision on the information $I$ receive.

But to answer your question, $I$ went into a fair amount of detail right there back on May the 22nd of 2020 with respect to the sort of information that $I$ was looking at. I trust that answers your question.

Thank you, document manager.
Q. Okay.
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Can we pull up Exhibit Number 2, page 5, please.
And as we're doing that, Mr. Cumming, can you explain the Agdex's, the one that we keep looking at, what sort of regulatory authority it has, if you will? Is it the law or is it to provide guidance?
A. MR. CUMMING: It's called a technical guideline. It provides guidance. The law is set out in the $\operatorname{Ag}$ Operations Practices Act and its regulations.
Q. Okay. And I would agree with that, and I appreciate that.

So the top line, the Standards and Administration Regulation, line -- subsection 6 , we keep referring to this, simply says: (as read)
"A 1 iner referred to in subsection (1)
if constructed of compacted soil or"
etcetera, "steel or other synthetic or manufactured product..."

It includes concrete in there.
"...must provide equal or greater
protection than that provided by
compacted soi1."
And number (c) provides for solid manure storage.
So would it be reasonable, as a starting point at least, for an engineer to provide a report that describes a liner and provides an engineering opinion
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that that 1 iner meets this regulation, which we would agree is the law; right?
A. MR. CUMMING: The regulation is the law, yes. The problem that I have with your assertion is that it's an opinion of an engineer; it's not a -- it's not an engineered design.

So I think that there is a difference there, as opposed to providing an opinion versus a design.
Q. So where in the AOPA would it differentiate between the engineer providing his opinion or actual design?
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't believe that it actually specifies that in AOPA. It says that you shall meet these, you need to meet these requirements. And it places the onus on the approval officer to make that determination.

MR. LOBBEZOO: I don't think -- we probably don't have the AOPA on our list of exhibits, but would I be able to read?

THE CHAIR:
Yeah, I think we're pretty safe using the AOPA. That's why we're here.

MR. LOBBEZOO:
Al1 right.
Q. So Section 2, subsection (3) is pretty much the only reference to engineering that $I$ can find in the AOPA, and it simply says an approval officer, which is you in this case, may require the documents filed under
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subsection 2, that's application submissions, be prepared by a professional engineer and may, if applicable, require that the documents be stamped. So would that not be consistent with an engineer providing an opinion that this existing liner, if you will, or proposed liner, whatever it is, meets the AOPA? Those two would jive, would they not?

MS. VANCE: Mr. Chair, this is Fiona Vance. I think we want a little bit of clarity, for the record, as to $I$ don't believe Mr. Lobbezoo is actually talking about the Act. Correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Lobbezoo. You might be talking about the Administrative Procedures Regulation. Just so we are on the same page, I want to be clear about that.

MR. LOBBEZOO: That's correct.
MS. VANCE:
Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you.
A. MR. CUMMING: Sorry, I was about to make the same question. Could you repeat your question, Mr. Lobbezoo.
Q. MR. LOBBEZOO: Okay. So taking into consideration the Board Administrative Procedures Regulation, that would be Section 2, subsection (3), would it not be consistent for the engineer, just based on what it says here, to be able to provide an
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engineered opinion to satisfy the requirements to -for -- for, you know, the liner thickness, subsection (6) that we have posted up here?
A. MR. CUMMING: Absolutely, the approval officer has that authority to request the engineer provide that information, absolutely.
Q. Would that not be consistent with all of the other reports being provided to support site characterization in terms of natural occurring liner, which -- and I don't think we have it here, but the subsection (9) right above that, in subsection -- in Section 8 I think it is, talks about existing -- that would be consistent, would it not, in your -- that's actually 1isted wrong, isn't it? Section 9, subsection (6). Oh, no, that's correct. Okay.
A. MR. CUMMING: I'm not exactly sure what you're referring to, so if you can pull it up...
Q. Yes, okay. Let me clarify. And I appreciate you bear with me, all, because this isn't my forte.

Subsection (5), right above subsection (6),
outlines the requirements for natural occurring liner. And it is standard practice -- and, Mr. Cumming, you're the director, so you would know that I have submitted many, many of these. It's standard practice for the engineer to provide his opinion, his engineered
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opinion, that the site meets the natural occurring -the criteria for naturally occurring liner.

So would -- my question is this, would it not be consistent that we would use the same approach for this? And I do appreciate that there would be some back and forth as to the amount of information that you would require to support that, but that is my question?
A. MR. CUMMING: Okay. So we're actually talking about the Standards and Administration Regulation, I believe, and not the...
Q. That's correct.
A. MR. CUMMING: -- previous regulation that we were talking about before. And you were talking about subsection 9 , sub (6), and then (a), (b), and (c) is my assumption.
Q. I was actually talking about subsection 5 .
A. MR. CUMMING: 5 .
Q. Where it says that the protective layer.
A. MR. CUMMING: Okay. A protective layer referred to in subsection 1, okay. The -- we have typically seen a lot of that -- reports from your engineering company under your signature, as well as from others under their signature, come to us. Generally the reports list a lot of testing that's been done in the field, together with sometimes laboratory testing,
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sometimes in situ hydraulic conductivity testing, and then the calculations as to how -- what is being proposed as a protective layer can meet the requirements of the legislation.

So I think that that answers the question that you were asking me.
Q. Yeah -- and okay. So it is an engineering opinion. And as you are also aware, it took some time back and forth between the approval officers and myself, and probably the other engineers that do this, to come up with the amount of background data, testing, calculations that they would be comfortable.

So my question is -- I don't even know if I have a question anymore. But what $I$ just want to point out is the engineering opinion under subsection (5) should be consistent with the engineering opinion under subsection (6), rather than coming up with some other scheme of what does "engineered 1iner" means when the AOPA says, you know, your engineer can provide his opinion that the 1 iner meets AOPA.

MS. VANCE: Mr. Lobbezoo, this is Fiona Vance. I have given you a lot of latitude in your questions, but, please, if there is a question, I would want to hear it. There will be a time, I believe, for submissions.
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MR. METHERAL:
Thanks, John.
5 MR. METHERAL CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
6 Q. If we can return to Exhibit 80 , page 6 , the question reads: (as read)
"What resources did the approval officer
rely on in assessing RCC liner
suitability?"

Mr. Cumming, can you comment on the submissions $16 ?$ This comes from the AOPA regulations, does it not?
A. MR. CUMMING: Is that going to be up on your screen?
Q. I have it on my screen. Is it on yours?
A. MR. CUMMING: Sorry, it's different to -- okay, sorry.

THE CHAIR:
Is it working?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yeah, I can see it up here. So question (b)?
Q. MR. METHERAL:

Yes, question (b).
A. MR. CUMMING: And you wanted my comment on this?
Q. Yes. This is the regulations we're looking at. And it specifically talks about two items that you'd be looking for for us to address, and they are liner
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thickness and permeability; is that accurate?
A. MR. CUMMING: That is -- that is accurate because that is what's set out in the 9 sub (6) of the Standards and Admin Regulation. So that's what you need to end up with, but that doesn't necessarily mean that those are the two items that need to be provided.
Q. But, sorry, clarify what you mean there. We need at least these two, but perhaps more detail, is that what you mean?
A. MR. CUMMING: So -- so what is being proposed is -- fits in with a liner that is set out, and it could be constructed of material other than compacted soil or naturally occurring protective layers. And the equivalency would be to show how what is being proposed can meet that equivalency to the -- I believe it's the compacted soil requirement.
Q. Okay. So these are the two key indicators. And then when you did your assessment, you relied on some of the submissions. And I'm assuming that's where you would have found the calculations that worked towards addressing these two key points?
A. MR. CUMMING: Document manager, if you could scroll down the page, please. So you can start to see there the resources that $I$ relied upon in my decision.
Q. Very good. Let's have a quick look at the -- I've got
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it as Number 2 here. It's the November 6th submission. Okay. That's the revised Wood report. That's the document you looked at in making your decision?
A. MR. CUMMING: That is correct.
Q. Okay.

THE CHAIR:
Did you want a document up here, Mr. Metheral?

MR. METHERAL: No, I'm just clarifying the answer to the question which --

THE CHAIR: Oh, okay.
MR. METHERAL: -- what resources did the approval officer reply on -- or rely on. And he's listed quite a few, but $I$ want to draw attention to the November 6 entry and the protective layer calculation from Mr. Cunningham.
Q. MR. METHERAL:

So in those -- in the first document, November 6, John Lobbezoo provided calculations that looked at roller compacted concrete, hydraulic conductivity, and the liner thickness and attempted to equate that to the 1 iner requirements. Is that what you were looking for, some sort of calculations and supporting information, that way?
A. MR. CUMMING: It is part of what I was looking for. I was also looking for the design of the concrete liner and everything that went into that; because
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roller compacted concrete is a type of concrete liner. I would expect to see design requirements set out there. And there's been no information to date from the people who actually made the concrete or even the people who placed the concrete that has been provided to me.
Q. Yes, great, thanks for clarifying.

So there is this exercise where we would look at the theoretical numbers related to roller compacted concrete and determine if it can be done in theory, and then I think I heard from you that we would also want to know if Arie's site meets that requirement too. Is that what $I$ heard right?
A. MR. CUMMING: The theoretical numbers, I think, is what has been included in the Wood report. Certainly there's -- there's not a lot of information on actual -- what was actually placed there.

The -- the information that $I$ was looking for is the actual design and how the applicant and their chosen 1 iner could meet the AOPA requirements. And I'd refer you back to the technical document, and their application in particular, that $I$ referred to earlier and read earlier, where they provided just the absolute minimum information, apart from saying that it's going to be placed by professionals and going to be this
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thick.
Q. Okay. And then in order to perhaps assess or better understand John's report, you asked Mr. Cunningham to assist in re-creating those calculations?
A. MR. CUMMING: That is correct. And if you go to the record, you will also see that I provided -- I think it was the previous report to Sci-Tech for their information. No, sorry, not for the information, for their comment to come back to me and share with me if -- if the proposed -- what was being proposed and included in that report could show that it met AOPA. That is included in one of the exhibits.
Q. Sorry, I don't see it in your list here, that review, or did Sci-Tech provided you with their feedback?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes, they did. And it's an email and it's included as one of the exhibits.

MS. VANCE:
This is Fiona Vance. It is
Exhibit 48, I believe, if that's helpful.
A. MR. CUMMING: Thank you.
Q. MR. METHERAL: Okay. So would that exhibit be added to your list here as a resource that you used?
A. MR. CUMMING: I think it actually referred to the earlier document, and so the October -- I need to go back and have a look at it, please excuse me. I apologize about the paper noise.
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THE CHAIR:
Q. MR. METHERAL: bogged down with that document itself. But, to confirm, you're suggesting that the science tech crew reviewed Mr. Lobbezoo's first submission and provided feedback?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes, they did.
Q. Okay. And then Mr. Lobbezoo provided an updated draft November 6th. Did you forward that document on to the science tech team for review?
A. MR. CUMMING: No, I didn't. It was my opinion that the information, the response that they had provided me, and the revised report, so the differences between the revised report and the October 29th report, I believe that's the right date, were not significant with respect to the RCC component.
Q. Okay. What was the differences between John's -Mr. Lobbezoo's two reports, and how was it initiated?
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't understand your question.

You're asking --
Q. Why -- [crosstalk]
A. MR. CUMMING: -- differences?
Q. Why did Mr. Lobbezoo submit two reports?
A. I would have to make the assumption that it was at the request of Mr. Muilwijk, because when I met with
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Mr. Muilwijk, I asked him and reviewed some of the information in the report that had been submitted with him, and asked him if he was certain that he wanted that included in there or if he wanted to amend the report. He said that he would speak to his engineer and get back to me. And when he did get back to me, the provision -- it was just a couple of days after I had met with him. The provision of the November 6 report was -- accompanied that, and I asked him if that report was going to replace the earlier report, and he said that it was.
Q. Okay. And the items from the report that were removed or changes that were made, what were they about?
A. MR. CUMMING: I didn't go into any details on those items that were removed because, as far as I was concerned, I was no longer considering that document.
Q. Okay. You didn't provide any feed -- sorry, did you provide feedback to Arie on those -- what should be included in those revisions, that Version 2?
A. MR. CUMMING: We had a general discussion. I didn't go -- I don't believe I went into specifics. Again, I come back to my earlier answer, as an approval officer on the file, $I$ need to be extremely careful about what $I$ am asking and requesting as information because $I$ will be the person reviewing and issuing a
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decision on that application.
Q. Okay. So to confirm, you didn't ask Arie, or you didn't ask John through Arie, Mr. Muilwijk through -you didn't ask Mr. Muilwijk through Mr. Lobbezoo to change his report. Did I say that right?
A. MR. CUMMING: I never spoke to Mr. Lobbezoo about Mr. Lobbezoo's report. I'm assuming you're talking about the November 6 report.
Q. Yes. Okay. The feedback you were -- the feedback you received from your science tech crew, was that passed on to Mr. Lobbezoo?
A. MR. CUMMING: No.
Q. Let's pull that - - let's have a look at that, then, and see what your science crew was asking on their end.

If the file manager can help us find that submission. I believe this is it.

And just to confirm timelines, John --
Mr. Lobbezoo presented his material on October 29th to you? His first report?
A. MR. CUMMING: I believe that's -- was when Mr. Muilwijk forwarded it to me.
Q. Yes, okay. And let's have a quick look when you forwarded the information on to your science team, science tech team, October 30th. And their response appears to be quite quick. At the top of the document,
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I believe it says they returned their information on November 3rd.

And so, again, this is Walter Ceroici, Stephanie Fleck, Mike Iwanyshyn, and Scott Cunningham, provided you with their thoughts on what would be important in the document, and they are questioning or asking for specific information about sources and provided the methodology and the calculations.

And if $I$ understood you right, you said you did not provide Mr. Lobbezoo with this information?
A. MR. CUMMING: Is that a question?
Q. Yes. Did I understand you right? You didn't provide Mr. Lobbezoo with this information?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes.
Q. Your science tech team asked for resources, the calculations, and the methodology that Mr. Lobbezoo had in his report, and you chose not to push this or send this information request on to Mr. Lobbezoo?
A. MR. CUMMING: That's true.
Q. Why is that?
A. MR. CUMMING: Well, I -- a number of reasons. I was trying to get my head around it, and secondly, within a very short matter of days, $I$ had a revised report.
Q. You met with Arie on November 4th in person. This
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email arrived November 3rd. You had an opportunity to provide this email and information request to Arie in person, and you didn't give Arie this information at that time?
A. MR. CUMMING: I did discuss the report. I don't believe -- no, I did not pass this email on to Mr. Muilwijk.
Q. One of your key pieces in your decision summary was lack of information and resources and calculations to he1p you understand where John Lobbezoo -- how he arrived at his determinations. Your science tech team asked you for this information or suggested it would be an important piece to solve the puzzle, and you didn't send it to him.

Do you think a proper explanation of the resource -- of John's decisions would have helped you in your decision process?
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't know what you mean by "proper decisions."
Q. Do you think these questions, John's answering these questions, Mr. Lobbezoo answering these questions would have aided your decision process?
A. MR. CUMMING: It may have. I don't know what his answers would have been.
Q. After November 6th submission from Mr. Lobbezoo and

A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM<br>Cross-examined by Mr. Methera1

before your decision-making -- before your decision was released, did you ask for any other information from the applicant?
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't believe I did.
Q. And the difference in time there is approximately two months?
A. MR. CUMMING: That's probably about right.
Q. About two months. Do you think in those two months, if Mr. Lobbezoo would have been provided an opportunity to report on his findings or clarify his information, he
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't know.
Q. When you received Mr. Cunningham's assessment of Mr. Lobbezoo's calculations, did you forward that, those calculations on to Mr. Lobbezoo for clarification?
A. MR. CUMMING: No, I did not.
Q. Do you think Mr. Lobbezoo deserved the opportunity to clarify his calculations?
A. MR. CUMMING: My assumption is that a professional engineer, when they are providing all of this information, is going to provide that clarification and the clarity and walk you through the steps that are going to be able to be understood and
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show how they're going to make -- make whatever confusion that they conclusion that they come up with. Mr. Lobbezoo has chosen not to do that in his report.
Q. Scott Cunningham came up with a calculation that did not reflect Mr. Lobbezoo's. You don't believe there is any obligation for Mr. Lobbezoo to add comments or clarify his work?
A. MR. CUMMING: I didn't ask for additional clarification from Mr. Lobbezoo. I don't know how many times I have to tell you that.
Q. Your technical -- your fact sheet suggests -- your fact sheet when working with professional engineers suggests that it's appropriate to provide the opportunities for open discussion and allow for errors and omissions and changes and modifications and clarifications to be made. Did you choose to ignore your fact sheet?
A. MR. CUMMING: At no point in time did I stop any communication with Mr. Lobbezoo or yourself, for that matter. The -- the communication is a two-way thing, and certainly there was an opportunity for a professional engineer, such as yourself, and Mr. Lobbezoo to pick up the phone and find out what sort of resources and what sort of information should be provided.
So it's -- I don't believe what you're suggesting
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is sort of one-sided. I believe the communication should be two-way.
Q. So Mr. Lobbezoo should have reached out to you again to see if he -- if you understood his report?
A. MR. CUMMING: Mr. Lobbezoo, when he was -- I'm not sure if I'd call it questioning, but he gave -- he gave a little bit of a-- an open section there where he said that when they were originally looking at preparing reports for applicants for compacted iners and naturally occurring protective layers, that there was some iteration that went backwards and forwards.

I am -- would be highly surprised if he didn't think that the same would be done at this point in time, but at no point did he contact me to find out what sort of information we would potentially be looking for.

In fact, if you go back to that May 22nd email that I sent to Mr. Muilwijk, I believe I went further and outlined information. That Mr. Muilwijk didn't pass that onto his engineer, I cannot comment on.
Q. Okay. File manager, can you please pull up Exhibit 64. This is an email correspondence between Arie Muilwijk and Andy Cumming, and it's an information request. Can you please scroll down a little bit.

I think this is at January 1st. Arie specifically
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asked you, after some consultation in the -- in November, and catching -- reaching out to you, he specifically asked you if there were any changes to the report needed.

If we look at the last paragraph, it says:
(as read)
"Is there any information or data that I might have missed or that's not complete that would support your decision?"

Is this not an attempt to reach out to you from John Lobbezoo, Arie Muilwijk's side, to clarify his report?
A. MR. CUMMING: I can't comment from John Lobbezoo's side. It comes from Arie Muilwijk. It's sent on New Year's Day, and I had essentially completed my decision at that point in time.
Q. So you weren't prepared to accept any more information?
A. MR. CUMMING: No information was -- was being provided there. It was a question that $I$ saw being asked. I wasn't certain at this point in time whether any additional information that Mr. Muilwijk would provide would change my mind or my decision.
Q. So just so I'm clear, you were given a request for information from your science tech team, which you chose not to provide to John -- Mr. Lobbezoo or
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Mr. Muilwijk? You had a report from Mr. Cunningham that created some uncertainty about Mr. Lobbezoo's calculations, and in the two months that you had that -- between your decision time, you chose to not reach out, as you expected Mr. Lobbezoo to reach out to you. Is that a clear assessment?
A. MR. CUMMING: That sums up some of the information, but some of the other information, which I anticipated would be coming -- would be actual information on the concrete and that was used there, the preparation of the site and everything else, and even in Mr. Lobbezoo's report, he acknowledges that he wasn't at the site at the time that the RCC was being placed; that he relied on photographs to give some sort of opinion with respect to whether or not compaction was being done correctly or if the roller compacted concrete was -- was being placed appropriately.

So there was no information forthcoming from Mr. Lobbezoo, and it was certainly my understanding, based on his report, that he wasn't on site, he didn't have that information, and it wasn't going to be forthcoming.
Q. Does the Agdex document require a professional engineer to be on site?
A. MR. CUMMING: The Agdex document does not
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specify that a professional engineer has to be on site, but it doesn't -- it doesn't specify anything about the conditions that might be included in a permit.
Q. Why do you believe it's important that an engineer has to be on site in order to assess an engineering project?
A. MR. CUMMING: If I go back to the Agdex, it talks about the roller compacted concrete being designed by a professional engineer. We would be looking at having that same engineer go on site and supervise the construction and placement of that -that liner to be able to provide sign off. That would normally be a condition of a permit if a permit was being issued.
Q. That's for Category A. Category B, C, and D do not require a professional engineer assessment in that manner.

How did you arrive that Mr. Lobbezoo needed to be on site for the inspection as a requirement?
A. MR. CUMMING: I point you back to the -- the guideline. And it's -- the guideline points out that you could utilize the concrete specified in Table 2, and that is shown to be able to meet the AOPA requirements.

If you're going to use something different, so
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something that is not included in the specifications in Table 2, then it needs to be professionally -engineered by a professional engineer. It has been our practice that if somebody is going to be professionally engineering something so it's different from the standard, if I can use that term, that we would require that they ensure that it is appropriately constructed. So concrete being placed but mixed properly, the correct mixes, et cetera.
Q. And you don't --
A. MR. CUMMING: That supervision -- if I may just finish -- and that that supervision be undertaken by the designing engineer, the professional engineer.
Q. And you don't believe that the product installed at Arie's had any sort of engineering support behind it?
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't have any information to show that it does.
Q. Did you ask for the documentation prior to issuing your decision summary on whether an engineer had been on site or designed the RCC mix or understood what was being built at the Muilwijk site?
A. MR. CUMMING: There's several questions in there, so I will attempt to answer them. If I forget some, please remind me.

But you asked me whether it was my opinion that an
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engineer had been on site at the time that the RCC was being placed. In Mr. Lobbezoo's report, he is the professional engineer designated by the Muilwijks. He clearly states that he was not on site when the RCC was being placed.

There is no information to show how any of the RCC was designed or any of the specifications for the concrete, and I've forgotten the third part of your question, if you wouldn't mind repeating it.
Q. Prior to issuing your decision summary, did you ask what components of the site had been reviewed by an engineer or had engineering design?
A. MR. CUMMING: I didn't ask that specific question, but it's fairly clear from the report that Mr . Lobbezoo provided that he only came to the table after the fact, and that the RCC had been placed prior to his -- his knowledge and that his observing -- his opinion was based on photographs.
Q. Great. We'd like to address some of that in the future here shortly. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Mr. Methera1.
MR. METHERAL:
Yes.
THE CHAIR: I just want to do a quick little, I guess, canvass of potential time. And this is not to rush you at all. This is your time, but, you know, we
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need to have direct from the Muilwijks yet. We have to finish cross-examination of field services, including Board staff, and then cross-examination of the Muilwijks.

So, you know, my sense is, you know, it's possible maybe by 6 , but it doesn't look, you know, hugely likely, so it may look like we might want to convene tomorrow morning.

It's just -- it's kind of close, Ms. DiPaolo, and we discussed at the break trying to figure this out, but to me it's looking like maybe tomorrow morning.

Mr. Metheral, how much more time do you think you have for Mr. Cumming? And did you have questions for Mr. Cunningham? Because we -- I don't think I've heard any yet, so if you have questions there, just a rough idea.

And if you're not totally sure -- you know, you're new to the process. You know, I don't want to -- I'm not trying to tie your hands here, but just get a feel for the court reporters because they may want to switch over, or we may just want to decide to have our end time and then start tomorrow morning.

So Mr. Metheral?
MR. METHERAL:
Yes. I only have a couple more questions on the concrete piece and submissions piece,
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and I do have some questions for Mr. Cunningham.
THE CHAIR:
Right. And I know the Board and Board staff, you know, will have some questions, and there may be, Ms. Vance, probably a redirect; is that fair?

MS. VANCE:
At the moment, I have two questions on redirect.

THE CHAIR:
Oh, okay.
MS. VANCE:
So far.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. So, Ms. DiPaolo, when do you need to know by? I mean, it's -- you know, I think we'11 be -- to finish today, we would be going past 5, for sure. And it may be just -- if everybody is available tomorrow, it may be just as well, even if we didn't push it late tonight, then -- but we need a natural break, of course, and then come back tomorrow morning. Is that -- just to hear from parties, Ms. Metheral and Ms. Vance, your thoughts?

MS. VANCE:
Thank you, Mr. Chair. I understand that my witnesses are -- have set aside tomorrow, as well.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Mr. Methera1, is your preference to try to push late tonight and finish? Or tomorrow morning, does that work for you and your clients?
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MR. METHERAL:
THE CHAIR: you need to know by? I wouldn't mind taking a - we'11 take a break now, but when do you need to kind of know by in terms of switching over?

I'11 tell you what, you know, let's come back after break. Let's come back at quarter after 3, and the Panel can caucus a bit, too, and see what -- you know, I'11 get some views in terms of what might work best.

But to be honest, my opinion is it's looking like we might all be a little fresher if we carry on tomorrow morning, so that would be my sort of initial thought, but I'd like to canvass the Panel as well.

So let's break until 3:15, and then we'11 make the decision on whether we finish tonight or tomorrow. Thank you.
(ADJOURNMENT)
THE CHAIR:
So, you know, it's looking an
awful like we'11 see you tomorrow morning, but what we would like to make sure of, if we can, is to finish up cross-examination by you, Mr. Metheral, and -- but also the Board and Board staff, and -- because we also have some questions.

So, you know, I'd ask you, you know, if you've got
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a bit of a framework in mind that would take us forward a little more quickly, you know, we've shown you lots of deference.

There seems to be a little bit of crossover made, perhaps, to some of the bias claims that you've made that we -- you know, really we're looking to entertain at the hearing, but we get that. We understand. We appreciate that you wanted to get some of that on -- in front of the Board despite, you know, our Board decision in terms of focus on four issues.

But, you know, I think it would be really useful if you can kind of get your thoughts together and your questions a little more focused on the issues that we do have at hand.

And, you know, with that, we'11 1et you continue, and then we'11 see if we can get -- you know, I guess Ms. DiPaolo, you know, I'm still hoping by a regular 5 we would be complete, and then it would be kind of a natural break for us for tomorrow morning to start with Mr. Muilwijk's and Mr. Metheral's direct.

Okay. So with that, Mr. Metheral, please continue.

MR. METHERAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Yes, I appreciate the Board's patience as we work through some of our thoughts. There's quite a lot of
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information to collect and filter through, and so your guidance is appreciated.

I would shift gears a little bit; same topic, though, and we do have a couple quick questions for Mr. Cunningham.

It does relate to this position that the Muilwijks take that would be a normal courtesy and obligation to talk to Mr. Lobbezoo, and it would have eliminated some of the, perhaps, communications questions that would have arose from his information.

So I ask -- I would ask Mr. Cunningham if he's aware of his APEGA requirements to communicate with the engineer when critiquing his work?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: So thank you, Mr. Methera1. I am aware of the obligations under the APEGA's ethics, and aware that those are -- that portion of them are largely focused on an owner/engineer relationship where an owner hires an engineer, gets a design, and then, subsequently, the owner decides to get another engineer to review it. That second engineer must contact the first engineer because they're both working for the same owner.

Regulatory does not fit underneath that same -the review by regulatory does not fit under that same viewpoint and -- from my discussions with APEGA.
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Q. So it's your position you fulfilled those requirements and were not obligated to reach out?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: That's correct.
Q. Are you aware of the NRCB fact sheet regarding the work with engineers?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.
Q. Do you believe you followed the NRCB policy, that NRCB policy working with Mr. Lobbezoo?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: The policy is largely focused on approval officers and what approval officers will do. So I did not do what an approval officer may or may not have done, but I provided my input back to the approval officer for how they would administer that policy in relation to -- to the consulting engineer they were dealing with.
Q. Okay. So it's your position that it would be Mr. Cumming's responsibility to follow the policy, the NRCB policy?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.
Q. Thank you.
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I understand we saw quite a bit of information -and, sorry, this question is directed to Mr. Cumming. We saw exhibits included for review that included the inspectors, approval officers, and a science tech team, including CVs, but one thing we didn't see in this submission is any references to what we consider would be important, is the approval officer's experience around the current permits -- current permitting. So if I can ask the file manager to pull up Exhibit 94.

Mr. Cumming, how many approvals has the NRCB issued for roller compacted concrete as a pen floor liner?
A. MR. CUMMING: As -- as the best of my knowledge, it's just the two that we have there.
Q. Your field submission suggested that you were only aware of one.
A. MR. CUMMING: That is correct. When I -- when I was -- when I provided input to that, I did not know about the Spring View Colony decision.
Q. How is that not possible? Are you not expected to review decisions as they -- prior to them being released?
A. MR. CUMMING: Typically, I do. I do take vacation from time to time. Sometimes I'm not
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available, and so some of those decisions just get reviewed by approval officers, and sometimes our legal support, as well.
Q. Did you ever ask your -- the approval officers that work with you how many sites they've permitted with RCC as a liner?
A. MR. CUMMING: I -- I did. It was a while ago, and the only thing that we could come up with at that point in time -- and Ms. Weisbach was not on that particular call at the time -- was just the one.
Q. Okay. File manager, if you can scroll down. Let's have a quick look at what NRCB has developed for permit conditions. One more. A little bit more. Yeah, right here.

Andy, can you describe this permit and the structure of it and what a permit condition means to the operator?
A. MR. CUMMING: Well, a permit condition is a condition of -- of the permit, obviously, and it's a requirement that the permit holder would have to follow in order to be in compliance with that particular condition.

In this example here, the new feedlot pens it's referring to as a construction completion report, and the -- the information that -- for the liner is set out
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there in several different bullet points.
Q. Okay. Let's have a quick look at bullet 3: (as read)
"The RCC product was placed on a bed
with an even thickness of at least
7 inches and at least 6 inches when compacted."

That appears to me to be very similar what was submitted by Arie in his Part 2. Would you agree?
A. MR. CUMMING: Are you talking about his Part 2 application?
Q. Part 2 application. And in your decision summary and in your letter to Walter Ceroici, you suggested that 6 to 7 inches was what the applicant put in his Part 2; is that correct?
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't -- I don't disagree with you. The -- what's in the application is very clear. It's also included in my decision summary.

This is a permit condition. This material has not yet been placed at the time that the permit was issued, so that there's a whole lot of other stuff that you're not reading into this particular document that probably took place prior to the permit being issued.

I was not the approval officer on this particular application.
Q. Right. I'm aware of that. But you would have reviewed
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this first application. I believe this is the Stronks. Let's find --
A. MR. CUMMING: No, no.
Q. -- the Stronks application.

MS. VANCE: For clarity - this is Fiona
Vance. For clarity in the transcript, there's a number of Stronks applications, so I would ask, for the transcript's sake, that Mr . Metheral just be crystal clear about which one he's talking about.

MR. METHERAL: Sure. If we can just scrol1. On this document -- file manager, on the this document, if we can just move to the top of this document, it'11 tel1 us -- yes. So it would be LA18053B.

This is the first roller compacted concrete approval that the NRCB issued; it was issued by Carina Weisbach. Mr. Cumming, are you suggesting -- or maybe I'11 ask, have you reviewed this, or did this document come across your table?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes, it did come across my table for review.
Q. So you were aware of it as a -- as a NRCB permit, and yet you did not include it in your submission for NRCB -- as a NRCB article or a technical experience, your technical experiences?
A. MR. CUMMING: I'm not sure what you're meaning
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by the second part of it. I am aware of it.
Q. Okay.
A. MR. CUMMING: I'm not sure what -- the second part of the question.
Q. It didn't -- the Board has asked you specifically what experiences does field staff have related to technical requirements. I'm pointing to you -- pointing out the technical requirements that were in the first NRCB permit. Why weren't they added to your experiences -your experiences submission?
A. MR. CUMMING: I think if you go to that submission that you're referring to, you will see there that we said that we have limited experience with roller compacted concrete.
Q. Okay. So is that an acknowledgement that the NRCB recognizes there's two permits, being limited experience?

Let's move on to the approval officer's submission, Exhibit Number 87.

Okay. For the Board, this is an enforcement order
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factors for the NRCB in issuing an enforcement order. Can we scroll down to the -- I think it's the third page.

MS. VANCE: Mr. Chair, it's Fiona Vance. I trust Mr. Metheral's going to get to something that actually touches on one of the hearing issues.

THE CHAIR: I'm waiting for it. If it's going into enforcement order, in terms of debating it, that's not where we're going, but just let him get to this spot and see.

MR. METHERAL:
Yeah, absolutely. If you'11 take my word for it. We can keep -- let's keep going. Let's find it. The point being the enforcement order conditions are identical to the conditions that were issued in the permits. The point being the NRCB is prepared to both -- to use these permit conditions for both the approvals and inspections for livestock facilities in Alberta.

MS. VANCE:
Mr. Chair, is there a question coming, please?
Q. MR. METHERAL:

Is Mr. Cumming aware that his staff or the staff in field services are applying these for both approvals and inspections conditions?
A. MR. CUMMING: So I'm struggling a little bit. I think in my testimony earlier on, $I$ mentioned that the
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role of the approval officer and that of the inspector are separate. I think if you refer to the field services submission about this, that will add clarity to that.

The other document that I would refer you to is marked as Exhibit 88, and halfway down the document, this is a response, I believe, from Mr. Ivarson. I understand, though, the correction -- yes, it is from Mr. Ivarson, and it says: (as read)
"Whether or not these liners meet the
requirements of AOPA is not the
determination issued in this document." So I think Mr. Ivarson is clearly stating that the best information they used was to look at the -- at the risk, and they provided what they provided in the enforcement order, and that's followed up in the June 29th, 2020, letter which was sent by email to Mr. Muilwijk which includes that, and what $I$ just read to you is in bold type approximately halfway through the document.
Q. Yes. And I think the piece there was that -- your
A. MR. CUMMING: Again, this -- this is a compliance document. I had no part in this -- in the
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development or writing of these documents.
Q. The point being there have been two approval officers that have provided NRCB technical data, technical permits, technical information, for two facilities and Mr. Muilwijk's facility. The approval officer is referring to the technical -- NRCB's technical details in their enforcement order to deal with immediate risk.
A. MR. CUMMING: I believe that you have that incorrect, Mr. Metheral. I believe you're talking about early one approval officer and two permits; not two approval officers.
Q. Let's pull up Exhibit 19. This is the database, 9/25/2020 - or 2019. It's in reference to

Mrs. Snowdon. 925. I'11 make this a bit easier, I'11 perhaps read for you here, or summarize. The key point is in the middle: (as read)
"Arie has suggested he would like to move forward with RCC."

The second sentence, Mrs. Snowdon said: (as read)
"I emphasize that it would be up to his

I can't see that far. (as read)
"I emphasize that it would be at his own risk as a permit is never guaranteed, and if the RCC is constructed in a way
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that does not meet our requirements, we would not be able to permit it."

Mrs. Snowdon is apparently referring to what would be NRCB requirements. So in fact there are two approval officers referring to what would be NRCB technical data.

Is Andy -- is Mr. Cumming aware that approval officer agent Snowdon was promoting this material also?
A. MR. CUMMING: I can't comment on -- on the -what she did or didn't say. I was not party to that phone conversation.
Q. Mr. Cumming, you took over the file from her directly. In it she would have had her notes and discussions. You're saying there's no information in that file that would have direct suggested she was promoting NRCB technical data?
A. MR. CUMMING: The information that would be in the file is essentially what you have in this database record.

MS. VANCE:
Chair, it's Fiona Vance, I do -- I do apologize for interfering so often, and to you, Mr. Metheral, as well. I just -- I'm hoping that when you ask questions, you can actually use the evidence that's before us. I don't see the word "promote" and I don't see "NRCB technical material." So I'm just hoping that you can stick to what's there.
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MR. METHERAL:
You're right. I think everyone can come to their own conclusions about what Mrs. Snowdon was suggesting.

So this would conclude my cross-referencing. I'm going to ask Mr. Lobbezoo if he would like to engage in any further questioning.

Mr. Chair, we would conclude our cross-examination.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, thank you very much. Oh, sorry, am I -- you're done, Mr. Metheral?

MR. METHERAL:
I'm getting some feedback from Mr. Lobbezoo. Sorry, I apologize. Mr. Lobbezoo brought forth some pieces that I had forgot. I was quite excited to talk about roller compacted concrete, and I forgot Mr. Cunningham's environmental risk screening tool report.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. And who's going to be asking these questions?

MR. METHERAL:
I will be.
Q. MR. METHERAL: Scott, I think we can move through this quite quickly. We provided some work -- or some suggestions that some of the key pieces in your calculations weren't quite where they needed to be.

So I do appreciate the update that you made to the catch basin risk score; that was one of them. We do --
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we would have identified that piece.
We would question, though, why you would chose to pick borehole Number 4, 004. You suggested it was for consistency. Would it not have been more appropriate to select boreholes that were closer to the facilities that you were assessing?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: So when choosing a borehole, part of how the risk screen tool works is to choose a reasonably conservative assumption. And so I looked at all four boreholes. They all had the same -- similar water bearing zones throughout all four of them, and I picked the shallowest of the four. The consistency was not because borehole 4 was more consistent, $I$ chose to use borehole 4 across all facilities across the site for consistency in determining the risk screening tool scores.
Q. That's interesting. If we were to have a quick look at that technical guideline -- I believe it is in Exhibit 3, technical document -- sorry. Yeah, Exhibit 3, page 88. I believe these are similar to what you -- I'm not sure if this is the document you used, but it is -- it does summarize with the photo here, site photo.

So are you aware that borehole 4 is actually down gradient of these other boreholes? And there's a
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significant elevation difference and soil difference with borehole 3 -- or sorry, borehole $4 ?$
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Document manager, can you scrol1 down a little bit, please. Thanks. Just to include the entire table on this screen at once.

So there was nothing in this information about this difference in surface elevations between the boreholes. So in the absence of that, and that's quite common when we get information, we just consider them as being all the same -- at the same elevation across the site because this is risk -- it's risk screening. This is not an assessment. It's not where people go out. It's not where the NRCB is requiring separate drilling with measured elevations above the boreholes. So I used that -- so you assume them all to be the same for elevation at ground level, the four boreholes. And then I looked at what information is here for soils. And so the soils information in borehole 4, there's less than in the other boreholes. But that's a11 I had to rely on. There was nothing about how it was different or just simply that - as to what it was -- why some of those are blank, I don't know, and so I did not speculate.
Q. Yes, that's interesting. There are no remarks on borehole 4. We see more clarity in boreholes 2 and 3,
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and perhaps a little less in 1.
Would you say that if you had more information or more prox -- or more accurate information, that would make your decision tool more accurate?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: A little bit. Potentially. It depends what the information is.

For example, had we used borehole 3. That's one with lots of information there on the soils. And so the same very fine sandy loam that's shown there from 3.0 to 4.1 , shown as saturated. That's the part that says free water in it.

So had we used that as the top -- had I chose that as the top of the groundwater resource during that consideration, then it would have ended up 3 of a metre -- 0.3 of a metre deeper than using borehole 4.

Now in -- I know from my experience in the risk screening tool the scoring -- that the differences are between -- the points that change the scores for risk to the -- from the bottom of the facility -- or for the thickness of the protective layer is at 2 and 5 metres. And that's where those -- they change. And then in the uppermost groundwater resource, it's more or less than 8 metres.

And so from the depths to the uppermost groundwater resource, it's -- it doesn't matter which
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boreholes was chosen, it was going to be less than 8 metres. With a protective layer, it may have made a minor difference from one choosing between one or the other. It may have taken one that was showing at 1.5 or 1.7 or something and made it 2.5 or 2.7 .

So it could have made a slight difference in the score, in the calculated numerical score.
Q. Right.
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: The calculated numerical score is just to find the number of which category you're in: low, moderate, or high.
Q. I think you can appreciate, though, the magnitude of your decision-making in that eventually the ERST results, the risk screen tool results, dictate perhaps potential change for action. So do you think Arie should have more of a precise assessment because of the long-term effects of what this decision could have?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: In -- so part of when the screen tool was being developed, the idea was to base it on available information. And once those scores were determined and provided to an operator/owner, then they would have the opportunity to provide additional information if they chose to pay someone to get more information on the assessment of their site.

So it's a measured -- the scoring risk of
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what's -- what's shown there and the numerical score and the scores, they're based on the information we have now. If Mr. Muilwijk decides to drive more information in the future, that may or may not reduce his score. It's unknown at this time.
Q. Okay. There is another piece of data that was submitted by Chilako Driliing. If can we can keep this sheet close, the email that I'm looking for is -- I believe it's Exhibit 22. Chilako Drilling -- Scott, did you receive this email?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, I did not.
Q. Okay. Chilako Drilling has established the water level between 3.6 and 3.9 metres. How should we address this piece of information in this hearing?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: I did not include it in my -- in the site information forms that $I$ filled out, nor in the information in my memos supporting to that.

But perhaps we could go look at the memo as to how I determined the groundwater resource and look at this -- and look at this relative to that. So that would be Exhibit 3.

MR. METHERAL: In the interest of time, would you be interested -- is it possible that Scott and I can sit down and have a quick look at these numbers for the Board?
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1 THE CHAIR:

No, not off the record. We're not doing that, no. I mean, it might be more time efficient, but it probably isn't more transparent or fair, so sorry.

MR. METHERAL: Okay. Then I would simply ask the Board to consider directing the approval officer to ensure that his pieces are accurate using accurate water table information.
Q. MR. METHERAL: The next piece is a little more vital, if we go back to Exhibit 3, page 88. It's the determination of the -- I guess the texture that's used. Scott, you reflected that you used the very fine sandy loam and arrived at a porous texture?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.
Q. How did you determine if it was a medium textured soil versus porous textured soil considering the scale of this -- of this guideline here?

## A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: I believe --

Document manager, could we go down a couple of pages, please. I'm looking for a table that's from the
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description of materials for the -- and I think it was the silty sand and the clean sand both overlaid nicely with the coarse at the bottom. And so we chose coarse.
Q. Certainly the coarse assessment versus medium assessment adds significant numbers to the Muilwijk score. Do you think it would be appropriate to ensure we're not overscoring him based on what is really just a desktop review?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: It makes more of a difference for the Muilwijks on their protective layer determination. That's where there's more of a change in the score than on the -- than on the groundwater resource, is how I look at it.

The -- I guess it does change on both. But the tool's been designed to be -- so it would be reasonably conservative. We use what information is there. It is not designed to be used -- or if there's livestock or near there, therefore it's high, that's not good enough. It needs to be information that supports the -- that supports any choices throughout the entire
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results for all the facilities. That includes the --
THE CHAIR: Mr. Metheral, you may have a question coming, but it sounds like sort of a commentary and a concern, as you expressed, which is absolutely valid, but perhaps more appropriately placed in your direct when -- which would be tomorrow, rather than, you know, now, when really it's time for asking Mr . Cunningham or Mr. Cumming questions.

So it's not that I don't think you should do it, it's just $I$ think the timing may be wrong. So if there's some commentary that you have, I would ask you to perhaps wait for your direct tomorrow.

MR. METHERAL:
Yeah, fair enough. Although I am saving you some time for tomorrow.
Q. MR. METHERAL: Specifically then, Scott, the borehole logs indicate -- I'm going to call it a texture, very fine sandy loam in number -- if we scroll up to the logs. Let's have a quick look at the logs themselves. I think it was 88. Borehole 1 describes very fine sandy 1oam, and the remarks here say they call it silty. And that is from 0 to 2 metres. And very fine, sandy clay loam from 2.1 to 1.3. And then I think we've kind of established that the water table starts somewhere in here, perhaps at 3.5. So we'11 -at least in borehole 1 we've got a -- more of a silty

A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM<br>Cross-examined by Mr. Methera1

material.
Borehole 2, very fine sandy loam. The remarks are that it's silty. And then from 2.9 to 3.6 , silty clay loam, which is sandy. And that is again at the water table.

So what I'm suggesting here is, would you agree that we might have actually a silty loam at surface? And then if we were to correlate that down into the graph, moving down to the page, then we would actually have medium risk? Sorry, medium soil texture and not coarse assessment?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: If it's possible that the -- if you change the texture to either looking at the information that's here, if you change and include the various remarks as part of that assessment, I think you would change the texture that you look at. But I also 10ok --
Q. Thank you.
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Okay.
Q. That's all I need on that. We'11 have more for that

MS. VANCE: Mr. Chair, it's Fiona Vance. I would just ask that Mr. Cunningham be allowed to finish his answer.
Q. MR. METHERAL:

Sorry, Scott you're --
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A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: The remainder of my answer is that normally in logs, and it's not identified how they were logged here, relation from the texture and the remarks, but that the texture is that's dominant, and then the -- so for -- on borehole 1, the texture is very fine sandy loam. The sandy is a modifier to the loam. And the remarks of silty would be less important than the sandy of the loam.

So that's how I interpret it, this information, in the absence of information that -- in a report that provided me other direction.
Q. Thank you, Scott. Or thank you, Mr. Cunningham.

And, secondly, a quick question on uppermost groundwater resource. When you're -- and we don't need to pull any of this material up. I'm just confirming, when you did your research on the water wells, did you confirm if any of the water wells were abandoned or in use?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: I did not access any sites. I did review the water well database to see if there were any decommissioned reports for any of those water wells, and the wells $I$ used did not have a report of being decommissioned. However, I'm aware that doesn't necessarily tell the entire story, that that's not always an indicator of whether a well is still existing
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or not.
Q. Right. Did anybody from -- report to you that they'd done -- had done field reconnaissance, where they looked at those wells that you identified to determine if they were actually in use or not?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: No, no one provided that information to me.
Q. Okay. If those water wells were identified as abandoned, what would that do to your risk assessment? Because I understood it would change your uppermost groundwater resource classification?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: It might. If the -- the definition of the uppermost groundwater resource does depend on usage. And so whether wells continue to be use or not, it can be a factor in that. They're -over the last decades things have changed as to what's enough water out at a site, even simply for a household.
Q. Right.
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: But it's tough -- it's difficult to speculate how what -- how those changes would be applied and what the answer would be.
Q. Okay.

MR. METHERAL:
Very good. Thanks for your time, Scott.
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Mr. Lobbezoo, anything to add? Very good. I'11 check the end of my document. I am at the end.

THE CHAIR: Okay, thank you, Mr. Metheral and Mr. Lobbezoo.

We'11 move onto Board staff and Pane1.
Mr. Kennedy .
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'11 make sure I turn on my microphone.

MR. KENNEDY QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. I'm going to start in --

Document manager, if you can pull up Exhibit 94, pdf page 19. And this is the Stronks decision. It's been referenced extensively already. What I'd like to do is just go through some of the items that were important in that decision and get an understanding from you, Mr. Cumming, as to whether, you know, there is sufficient information to understand the various factors. And if there isn't sufficient information, perhaps what additional information might assist and how accessible that additional information might be.

So with that --
And if we can just go down to pen 1 iners at the bottom. Yes, please, thank you.

MS. VANCE:
Mr. Kennedy, this is Fiona Vance, and I hate to interrupt you even more, but I just
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wanted to be clear. I believe that page 19 is from LA17038. If that's what you were intending to refer to.

MR. KENNEDY: It is, it is. And this is -- it is one of the Stronks decisions. I just - I picked it because it has this listing of various factors.

MS. VANCE: Thank you.
Q. MR. KENNEDY: So, Mr. Cumming, the first sentence under "Pen liners" identifies the need for a 6 -inch thick roller compacted concrete 1 iner. And the first question that $I$ have of you is -- and I don't know that I've heard this to date, but I think I've heard a lot around it, is it possible that an applicant could apply for pen 1 iners using roller compacted concrete and get an approval at this stage?
A. MR. CUMMING: I believe it is possible. They would need to provide information which clearly shows how they can meet the AOPA requirements.

In the decision that $I$ was the approval officer for, so 19036, my determination was that information had not been provided.
Q. Okay. So the first element identified is in that very first sentence under "Pen liners," and it's 6-inches thick roller compacted concrete. Is that a reasonable thickness?
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A. MR. CUMMING: I was not the approval officer on this particular site. When you start to talk about the thickness of a concrete liner, many other factors would come into play, including what equipment would be placed on the preparation of the bed onto which this is placed. So I can't comment that this would be generally acceptable. I think you have to look at the design that is proposed for that particular application.
Q. I thank you for that. And we're going to go through a number of those other factors as we move forward.

So what can you tell us about an understanding of the thickness of the Muilwijk RCC liner? Do we know the thickness?
A. MR. CUMMING: We do know the thickness. That was in the report that was provided by Mr. Lobbezoo under the Wood letterhead. And it ranges -- it's approximately 6 to 7 inches. He's got the details in millimetres. I think they go from -- I stand under correction here, but about 150 something, 160 through to right around 200 millimetres.
Q. And so moving down, and I'm looking at the penultimate sentence in that paragraph, and what it talks about, you know, it makes a simple statement that RCC meets the Standards and Administration Regulation. Is it
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your understanding -- or do you have any understanding whether that would include a calculation for the presence of cracks in the RCC liner?
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't know how that statement came about. As I had said, I was not the approval officer on the site, and the approval officer's responsible for that decision.
Q. Okay. And then we get to the middle. I'm moving down to the next paragraph, and this is a point in time, and a point in time coming up three years ago, where it states: (as read)
"...the investigations conducted by an engineering company in cooperation with AF --" Agriculture and Forestry -- "show that the product is suitable."

Does that remain a true statement in 2021?
A. MR. CUMMING: It's an interesting statement. I can't comment on what it's actually referring to. I'm assuming that you're meaning is it suitable as a liner. And, as I mentioned earlier, I was not the approval officer. I did not see the details on this particular application, so $I$ can't comment specifically on that. What $I$ can do is I can point you to the Technical Advisory Group report that is now part of the record, and it's -- it's -- their conclusion was that it's not
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clear that you -- roller compacted concrete can meet the AOPA requirements, and it's not clear that it can't meet the AOPA requirements.

So I take from that that the devil is always in the details, and it depends on what the design and the specifications of that roller compacted concrete might be for that specific application.
Q. Thank you, that's helpful.

Now I'm moving into the paragraph (a) just at the bottom of that page. And in relation to the Muilwijk application, what information would you have, understanding the record that you had when you made your decision, and perhaps even some of the subsequent filings that we've seen from Muilwijks, about the uniformity of the liner?
A. MR. CUMMING: The only information that I could -- that I'm aware of is the information which was done when Mr. Lobbezoo had either himself or a member of his team do coring of the already placed roller compacted concrete. And those core samples that are referred to just now show a depth range in the 150 , 160, up to about the 200-milimetre range.

So that's the -- that's the only information that I have with respect to consistency of the thickness of the RCC liner.
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Q. And paragraph (b), what information might you -- what's your understanding about the proper water content of the RCC when it was applied?
A. MR. CUMMING: So the water content of concrete is critical to ensure that it can actually meet design criteria and design strength. I have no information with respect to what the water content was supposed to be, nor what it actually was. None of that information is available to me, even now.
Q. And now I understand you were at the site, and I think both Ms. Vance and Mr. Metheral asked you questions about inspections. So paragraph (c) talks about properly compact the product around transition areas. In your inspection, were you able to observe any of those?
A. MR. CUMMING: I could see that there was -- that there were fence posts and the like that penetrated through the roller compacted concrete liner. I could not determine whether or not that material had been properly compacted.

There were some photographs that were shared, and they form part of the exhibits, where it does show some compaction, but whether or not that compaction is sufficient is unknown to me.
Q. And is there any way at this point in time to confirm
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whether or not proper compaction was -- was in fact done?
A. MR. CUMMING: There's always an opportunity to take samples and have those samples tested through destructive testing, that they crush them and they see where they fell. That would give you an idea of the compressive strength of the material in that location.
Q. And can they specifically do that in these kind of narrow areas around fence posts and bunk aprons?
A. MR. CUMMING: The samples are normally taken. So, so long as they can take the samples in those areas, they would be able to take those through to the 1 aboratory, where they have the equipment to do the compressive strength testing.

The nondestructive method would be something like a rebound hammer. And as I set out in my decision summary, I don't believe that the rebound hammer is the appropriate tool to be utilized in this circumstance.
Q. They talk about testing the concrete strength at 28 days, and obvious 1 y we're beyond that 28 -day period now. If cores were taken now, would those provide use -- would that answer all the questions necessary to understand the concrete strength at site?
A. MR. CUMMING: You also have to have the correlating strength curves, so the strength versus
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time curve. Concrete does cure over time and will continue to get stronger, or the compressive strength should increase over time.

In the one report which was submitted by Mr. Both, and I forget the exact exhibit number, rock solid concrete, which was provided by Mr. Both, he does provide some information with respect to compressive strength versus time.

He also does refer to some graphs, but I noted that those graphs are not part of the record and weren't included with the report.

So some information which would be specific to the design of that RCC and how it would be expected to cure and therefore harden over time would be needed in order to correlate the information.
Q. And is that a difficult - is it difficult to collect that information?
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't know. I've never tried to do it.

The one thing that $I$ can say is that it's far difficult to do it after the fact than it is to do it at the time that things are being done for obvious reasons.

The other piece of information which was in one of Mr. Muilwijk's submissions is that, apparently, the
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contract -- sorry, the concrete supplier took some samples for testing. What -- I don't know what that means. I don't know what tests were done or not done, but none of that information has been available either.
Q. Okay. And there is some -- some evidence that after this -- I'm moving onto paragraph (d) at this point. There is some evidence about the application of straw at surface after the roller compacted concrete was set down. Does that address paragraph (d)?
A. MR. CUMMING: I think it goes somewhat to show that some attempt was made to try and cure it, cure the roller compacted after it had been cured. I am aware of the photographs; they are part of the record, which shows a layer of what $I$ assume to be straw placed over the RCC.

What I don't know is whether it was wetted down or if there were any other measures taken to assist with the curing and minimize the drying out of the surface.
Q. And then I'm moving down that page under the first bullet. And what do we know about compaction? So we
A. MR. CUMMING: Are you talking about the roller compacted concrete, or are you talking about the base on which the roller compacted concrete was placed?
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Q. Ah. So what -- I got ahead of myself. So what do we know about the compaction of the bed under the roller compacted concrete?
A. MR. CUMMING: The only thing that I am aware of is in the Wood report where he refers to looking at -Mr. Lobbezoo as he refers to looking at photographs and makes an assumption based on looking at the photographs. More information than that, I am not aware exists.
Q. Okay. And what information do we have about the installer who installed the product? Would it qualify as a trained installer?
A. MR. CUMMING: The only information that $I$ have, again, is included in the Wood report which references the name of the company that mixed the concrete, and the name of the company that placed the concrete and compacted it.

THE CHAIR: Is somebody -- I'm not sure what that was.
Q. MR. KENNEDY: And the -- and just moving on to the next bullet. And I saw in the PowerPoint presentations that were filed in advance of the proceeding that -- that there appeared to be GPS employed as the roller compacted concrete was laid down and moved -- moved about on the surface. That's really
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what's called for by this bullet, is --
A. MR. CUMMING: Not only that, to the -- the -what I understand this bullet to refer to is that not only does the base need to be properly levelled, but then you also need to provide the -- place the right amount of RCC material on it and compact it down to a certain level using a laser technology. Sometimes they are linked to -- a GPS system, as well, can assist with that.

I -- information that has been shared suggests that that was carried out at this site. I don't know for certain.
Q. Okay. And in terms of the RCC, we have some strength information. Is that sufficient to address the fourth bullet in this list?
A. MR. CUMMING: The only strength information that we have is on that one report which shows that it was -- had a design strength of 25MPA. It doesn't tel1 you what the -- at what time that strength should have been arrived at, and we don't have any -- I don't have any information about when $I$ made the decision as to the actual strength of the concrete that was placed.

So again, there's nothing from the concrete -- the person who mixed and developed this concrete mix and took it to site to say what was actually done. We have
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information at the bottom of that testing report which suggests that the design strength was going to be 25MPA, but $I$ don't have any other information on compressive strength of that concrete.
Q. Okay. And if we had a complete description of the formula that went into the RCC, would that go a long way in addressing this question?
A. MR. CUMMING: I think it would. It certainly, if you had -- if I can call it "the recipe," where you have the amount of -- of concrete powder that goes -and the cement powder that goes in there, all of the different aggregates that go in there, including their sizes and strengths, et cetera. The water ratio and all of that information, that would go a long way to helping to be able to assist whether or not the concrete mix can meet some sort of design criteria.
Q. And when they're referring to the minimal strength, that's compressive strength?
A. MR. CUMMING: That would be correct.
Q. Okay. And that -- if cores were taken, we could get at
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes.
Q. And part of the recipe is, the next bullet deals with moisture content at the time of application. Is that
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part of the recipe that normally would be provided?
A. MR. CUMMING: It -- it would normally be that way because that moisture content might be something that is much easier to measure so that you can either accept or reject the concrete that is being brought to the site to be placed.

So it certainly is a very good data point to show that when the design was done, it was done under these criteria, and this material needs to meet those criteria in order to reflect what was actually designed and, assuming, approved for use.
Q. Now, these core samples, they attributed a compaction associated with these core samples. Is this the very same compaction measure, this 92 to 95 percent? And I think the core samples suggested 99 to 100 , something over 100, which -- I never understand percentages that go beyond 100 but...
A. MR. CUMMING: That would be my understanding.
Q. Okay.
A. MR. CUMMING: If I can just add to that, the --
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moving down the page a little bit. And we can go through these individually, but maybe there's not a need.

I'11 ask you the general question first, is I think I've read in the materials that the proponent has said they've done all of these things, and they've met all of these things. Would you agree with that statement? And if not, where would your opinion depart?
A. MR. CUMMING:

So I think on the first bullet where it talks about the bed of the liner is level and compacted before the RCC is installed, the information that is included with the application essentially says that they did level it.

The part about compaction talks about it, the material being compacted in -- by livestock in the -in the areas of the -- what they called "two existing pens," and it should be noticed that -- noted that these pens only appear to have been developed around about 2012 or so. You can check the Google Earth photographs which have a time stamp on it for that information.

But if you have a look at the covered pens and at the third pen, which wasn't one of the two existing pens, it's not clear how any compaction was carried out
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there. It essentially shows that the soils in the area were levelled. And that's the only information that - that I have on the bed liner preparation.

Again, Mr. Lobbezoo, in his report, indicated that he made an assumption based on looking at photographs about the level of compaction. It's something that intrigues me that you can make that categorization based on a photograph.
Q. And compacting the liner bed, that's -- am I right in assuming that that's to protect the integrity of the RCC overtop, prevent cracking?
A. MR. CUMMING: It's - - certainly that's one of the primary functions. It's to level off the surface, provide a uniform base on which to place roller compacted concrete or anything else that you're wanting to place on it. And that can have a significant influence and the performance of what -- that liner.

One only has to look at how roads are compacted. Roads are constructed, and the amount of effort that's placed into developing the bed of the road before they actually put the top wearing layer on the top, to know the importance of having a properly prepared base for some sort of a final layer.
Q. And just to confirm, so I've - - a lot of my questions I think have already been asked, and I think this is one
that was asked, but I'm going to ask it again. Is the -- what you've called the recipe for this RCC. It was never provided to the NRCB?
A. MR. CUMMING: I do not have any record to show what -- any recipe might be for the RCC. As I've pointed out earlier, the only information that $I$ have on that is at the bottom of the report, at the back of the Wood report.
Q. Okay. And in terms of measuring compressive strength, why does compressive strength matter?
A. MR. CUMMING: Compressive strength is one of the ways of measuring the performance of concrete, and it's a non-quantity; it's a non-standard.

Compressive strength will also have an influence on the durability of the product.
Q. And not being an engineer, is it fair to say that if there's a problem with RCC as a medium, it's not associated with the RCC where it isn't cracked; it's the cracks that are the problem?
A. MR. CUMMING: Generally it's the deterioration of the RCC product. When we talk about liners -- I mentioned this earlier, in the reading that I've done, and I've done a fair amount of reading about roller compacted concrete over these last number of years, there are articles that $I$ have read which talk about
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having what $I$ can call porous concrete for use in large parking lots. This is typically done in the States, the United States.

So it's areas where they're wanting to use roller compacted concrete for its abrasion resistance, for its properties as a pavement for driving upon, as opposed to a liner.

But where they have designed the roller compacted concrete so that it is quote, unquote, "porous." In other words, it allows rainfall and water to pass through the -- through the roller compacted concrete layer and be absorbed into the earth that way, and by doing that, minimizes the amount of storm water attention that needs to be constructed for capturing storm water drainage for those types of facilities.
Q. But to be fair, I don't think there's any suggestion that it's porous, RCC, that we're looking at in this instance.
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't know whether it is or it isn't. Again, the Devil's always in the details, and a lot of that information is based on the aggregate that is utilized and the different ratios.

So again, it comes down to the recipe and the quantity of the various materials and their properties.
Q. Well --
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A. MR. CUMMING: My point in raising that is that you're able to utilize RCC for a multitude of different purposes; not just as is being proposed here as a liner to meet AOPA requirements.
Q. Well, when I -- and this -- this is dangerous for me to -- a path for me to start down, but when I look at the calculations of the permeability of the RCC liner as applied, the concern seems to be focused on the cracking rather than the uncracked portions of the surface. I mean, the uncracked portions seem to easily meet the AOPA standard?
A. MR. CUMMING: The information, as I understand it, is based on information that -- that's not specific to the site. So in other words, it comes out of some sort of a reference manual, and that reference manual obviously has certain criteria to allow it to get to that point.

As I mentioned earlier, the actual data which is specific to the site is limited at best.
Q. Well, this -- this becomes an important question. Are
A. MR. CUMMING: I think that the Panel needs to consider all of the information before it, and my
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understanding is that the Panel has an expert who is -who knows about concrete to assist them with any questions that they have there.

So I'm sure that that expert could provide them with the information that they're looking for.
Q. In terms of identifying cracking, so are you aware of any evidence of inspection that once this concrete had an opportunity to cure and before -- before it was covered, perhaps either with straw or 1 ivestock, to assess and respond to cracking, what would appeared after the RCC was applied?
A. MR. CUMMING: I am not. The only evidence of that is some of the photographs that were submitted in the most recent submission from Mr. Metheral and Mr. Lobbezoo, which apparently -- well, it's my assumption, and I'm sure that they're going to provide information on this in their testimony tomorrow -- it's my assumption that they had cleared off the manure, scraped the manure to try and determine what cracks were there. That's the -- that's the only information that I'm aware of with respect to cracking and evidence with respect to cracking.
Q. And in terms of responding to cracking on a longer term basis, what inspections might be appropriate, and what response to cracks is feasible? And second,
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appropriate, and what results might be expected from -from whatever program is available?
A. MR. CUMMING: That's -- that's a difficult question. If I make the assumption that the Board overturns the decision and approves the roller compacted concrete for use as a liner, I would -- and as part of -- part of what $I$ have recommended as potential conditions is $I$ have recommended that there would be some sort of an inspection program carried out where they could identify cracks and identify damage to the roller compacted concrete and have a method of repairing that damage or cracks.

From what $I$ understand, in the feedlot industry where they have utilized roller compacted concrete, and this is typically -- it is where it's not been as a liner, it's been put on top of an AOPA liner, that - I understand that they use regular plastic-type concrete to -- to fill any cracks and damage that is either created by the cleaning equipment, the livestock, or some other -- something else that's damaged the liner.
Q. And these questions may be for Mr. Cunningham, but I'11 put them out and, please, either of you can respond.
In terms of the permeability calculations, is there a substantial agreement as to what might be anticipated for how you factor in the presence of
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cracking? You know, size and number? And when I say some agreement, between your approach and Mr. Muilwijk's engineer's approach?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: I think perhaps it's best if I take that one in forwarding (phonetic). And we've looked at Exhibit 3 , PDF. If we can bring that up, please.

Document manager, that would be Exhibit 3 of PDF, please. Yes, PDF, page 100. Thank you.

So Mr. Kennedy, yes, the cracking is the hydraulic -- the crack percentage $I$ used in this analysis here, I used the same percentages that were provided by -- by Mr. Lobbezoo in his November 6th, 2020, report, and I did not do another assessment of them.

And in his April 8th, 2021, report, he provided a -- different values for the -- the cracks within that 10-metre size.
Q. But is the main difference between your approach and the approach by Muilwijks that you calculated values for the RCC uncracked area and the RCC cracked area and then added those together and then averaged them over the site, whereas they may have averaged the two permeability factors and then carried it out over the site? So it's the time that the average was
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## calculated?

A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: We both started with the same equation that $I$ have here on this page as equation 6 . The -- so that's in the Apri1 8th edition from Mr. Lobbezoo. They provide their answer. When I used this same methodology here with their updated numbers, I got the same answer they did in their April 8th, 2021, report.
A. MR. CUMMING: I could perhaps add a ittle bit to it, and I'm not sure if I totally understood your question, but one of the things that your question triggered in my mind was the assertion in the November 6th report that the cracks would be filled and compacted with manure, bedding material, soil, whatever was essentially in the pen by the action of the animals' hooves and that it would be equivalent to what is termed a "glade layer," which would normally be found in an earthen-lined storage, where it is continually compacted by animals' feet.

And I don't tend to agree with that because the only time that that might be true is if the cracks were large enough that the animals' feet could actually fit inside them and compact them, at which time you might have a much bigger problem than is being suggested in the document.
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So the -- if you have a narrow crack, the animal's hoof cannot get down into that crack and compact the material in that crack. So that level of compaction I do not believe could be attained as suggested. So is that the simple explanation?

So I'm going to the second-1ast paragraph, where you say, Mr. Cunningham, you were not able to duplicate the Wood result. And is it simply the fact that they were using a different value in terms of permeability through the cracks?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: They provided the same permeability through the cracks in both their November 6th, 2020, report and their April 8th, 2021, report. So I'm not -- without having seen their calculations for November 6th, 2020, their formula with the inputs they put in and how they arrived at the answer, I don't know what the difference was.
Q. I'm getting close to being done. I just want to...

I do want to confirm, and I don't need the exhibit pulled up, but much was made of Exhibit 77, which was the engineered concrete or non -- yeah, it was for non-engineered concrete, I think, but it's that guide. And that's -- that whole Agdex piece, that's dealing with traditional concrete, not roller compacted concrete. So it's dealing with traditional concrete with rebar. Is that fair?
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A. MR. CUMMING: If I can respond to that. The Table 2 in that document provides -- I apologize for the noise of the paper -- provides the minimum requirements for non-engineered concrete liners, and that is what we would call "traditional" or "regular" type of concrete. It does have rebar, so some sort of crack control in -- bolts into it. It is not roller compacted concrete. So the recipes in the -- or the specifications, if 1 can call them that, in Table 2 are not for roller compacted concrete. And hence why I kept on going back to the point that if you're not going to be providing one of the concretes that are set out in Table 2, it needs to be engineered by a professional engineer.
Q. That was - I think you answered my next and -- a final question on -- that is my final question on concrete. I simply had a question related to the water well. And the fact that you said, "I cannot grant an exemption because the facility already exists and the water well is there." I'm assuming that an assessment can be done and -- in terms of assessing the risk with the facilities in place; and if not, why not?
A. MR. CUMMING: That's a great question. I'm glad you asked it.

So if you have a look at Section 7 sub (2) of the
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Standards and Administration Regulation, sub (a) of sub (2) says that subsection 1 doesn't apply, 1(b) doesn't apply, so that's less than 100 metres from a water well, if the owner/operator demonstrates to the approval officer, or the Board, before the facility or area is constructed. So key there is before it's -it's constructed. So it has to be done prior to construction. So at that point in time there could be an exemption granted under this section.

Because the facilities have been constructed, you can no -- I can no longer utilize that. So you have to then look at what other options are there. And that's where you have to look at a variance. So a variance is in the Act, so the Act itself.
Q. That's Section 17?
A. MR. CUMMING: 17, correct.
Q. And, to be fair, you made no assessment that would kind of start down that path, a Section 17 variance, so that -- or do you have an opinion one way or another on the potential for that variance to be granted?
A. MR. CUMMING: There's -- there's always a potential for a variance to be granted. One would have to get into the specifics of that and what is being proposed and requested by the applicant seeking that variance with what they're wanting to do.

## A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM

## Questioned by Mr. Kennedy

Typically when we're talking about an exemption, so prior to the fact of a water well, we're looking to make sure that the water well is going to be protected and not impacted by the manure storage facility.

So if you were to translate that to a variance, then it would be an assumption of mine that you want to achieve at least same protections for that -- that water well through a variance, as opposed to through an exemption.
Q. And then my final question is this: In terms of a site inspection of the roller compacted concrete as set down, is it feasible; and, if so, how would that be undertaken?
A. MR. CUMMING: As I mentioned earlier, and if you read all of our decisions, we require an inspection prior to livestock or manure being placed in whichever facility has been permitted.

The reasoning behind that is to allow for the actual liner to be inspected prior to it being covered with manure or livestock or a combination thereof.

The challenge doing an inspection at this late stage, you know, over a year after the liner has been down, is going to be having the liner clean enough so that an inspection can actually be carried out.

It's not impossible, but, again, it just adds a
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huge burden to being able to get it to that state where you can inspect it.
Q. And is the effort worth -- worth it? Is it warranted?
A. MR. CUMMING: If -- if the Board believes that the -- my decision should be overturned and they want to approve a roller compacted liner, then it would be warranted at that point in time.
Q. Thank you.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you, pane1; thank you, Mr. Chair; thank you, Ms. Vance. Those are my questions.

THE CHAIR:
So, Ms. DiPaolo, we mentioned we're going to be going tomorrow, so we wouldn't be too late today, but we are not done and we won't be done by five. How much more can your mind and fingers take? I mean, $I$ hate to break this in the middle, but $I$ also need to be a little bit respectful here and we had a plan. So how much longer can you go?

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm okay.
THE CHAIR:
You're good?
THE COURT REPORTER: Yeah.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Wel1, thank you very much. We really appreciate you accommodating.

And, Pane1 members, I guess -- you know, I do have a number of questions, as you may as well, but let's do
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what we can, make them snappy. And I guess we'11 hope that Mr . Cunningham and Mr . Cumming give us snappy answers. So Ms. Maharaj.

MS. MAHARAJ: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

## MS. MAHARAJ QUESTIONS THE PANEL:

Q. I have a couple of questions with respect to -- along the line of what can happen next, and I'd just like to add a little bit of precision on a couple of points for myself, following up on Mr. Kennedy's questions.

For point of reference, if we go to Exhibit Number 94, pdf page 13, where Mr. Kennedy started to take you through the list of bullet points that were criteria or indicators of an assessment for the RCC. I don't know, document manager, if we could pop that up on the screen.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. And, Ms. Kaminski, I spoke with the court reporter. I forgot to ask. Thankfully you're still there and you're still able to provide document management. So you're able to stay 1ate?

MS. KAMINSKI:
THE CHAIR:
MS. MAHARAJ: summary for LA17038, and it's page 13 of that decision, rather than the pdf page because I printed mine, and so
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A. MR. CUMMING: I too printed mine, so I'm in the same boat.
Q. It will be under Appendix C.
A. MR. CUMMING: There you go, you got it.
Q. There we go. Okay.
A. MR. CUMMING: We can carry on.
Q. So just a couple of short snappers. With respect to the application of straw and/or water to ensure that the curing of the -- of the concrete happens correctly, your information and evidence so far has been that we can't tell but for the photographs what actually occurred.

My question to either one of the panel is whether there is a method available to us today to test whether or not successful curing did occur?
A. MR. CUMMING: I think that there probably is. I'm not sure how easy it would be to accomplish. And I have to apologize. I've just looked at my picture here, and I see that the sun's moved, and I now have a very bright background, so I'm tending to get a little darker. So my apologies if you can't see my face correctly.

However, when we talk about the curing of the concrete, it's more detailed with respect to how that
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was achieved and how long it was on there. I think that there might have been a reference to it being kept on for a week or so, but $I$ stand under correction on that. And then once that material had been removed, one would hopefully inspect the concrete to see what sort of cracking had occurred.

So the idea about curing concrete, and hopefully your expert will be able to provide more detail on this, is to make sure that you don't get drying occurring which is non-uniform throughout the material that's been placed.

So if you get a drying that is not uniform, you're going to start to get scracks -- excuse me, cracks and spalling occurring in different types of concrete in different places, which may degrade the material.
Q. So I appreciate that we can't go back in time, but -and we may be lacking some clarity around what actually did occur.

So would it be a fair summary of your -- of what you've just advised us, that the only way to really determine whether curing was successfully done would be, ideally, to have that information, but, in the alternative, to conduct some kind of a physical examination to determine whether there has been inappropriate or excessive cracking and/or spalling?
A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM
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A. MR. CUMMING:

Yes, I believe you're correct with that.
Q. Okay. All right. And then I would have the same type of question with respect to the moisture content. We have no information, that I have put my finger on in the evidence yet, to identify the amount of moisture that went into the original product that was installed. Is there a means by which we can, without that information, determine whether or not an acceptable amount or an ordinarily expected range of moisture was incorporated within that recipe for the product?
A. MR. CUMMING: So I'm getting sort of to the fringe of what I would consider to be my experience with the concrete, and your expert may be able to provide more insight into this. But my experience has been that when you have a material -- concrete material that you're concerned about, that you can potentially test it by doing destructive tests and measuring the properties afterwards to figure out whether or not the -- the design requirements were -- were actually met.

To do that, as I discussed with Mr. Kennedy, especially at this late stage, one would have to know what the -- what the design requirements were and know how that changed over the -- over the course of time or
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how it was expected to change over the course of time.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And then I just have one question for Mr . Cunningham with respect to the environmental risk screening tools and the results of those particular tools.

We talked a little bit about the fact that the one well may have been either upslope or downslope, but in your assessment you -- because you only have the desktop information you made the assumption that all four of the cores were at a similar elevation. And there was the adjustment that you made with respect to the one well.

If you could just take a look at Exhibits 60 through 63, with respect to that adjustment, and if you can let us know which one of these particular exhibits changes and whether it changed out of the range. I think that's the question, is did that -- did that correction change your assessment out of a low potential risk into a medium potential risk.

And I might have just missed it. So if you can --
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: So I think those would be the exhibits. So if the document manager could start pulling them up. Exhibit...
A. CUMMING, S. CUNNINGHAM
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Q. Starting with 60?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Sure.
Q. Yeah, right. So was -- is this the one that had the change? And if not, is there anything that changes the range here, because it seems quite within the low risk when I look at it?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: So let's -- let's -- first let's clarify what the change is because there is the -- so there were the four boreholes --
Q. Yeah.
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: -- which I can show as the shallowest. And then Mr. Metheral showed me the water table information from 2019 that was deeper than the numbers that $I$ chose. Is that the change that you're referring to?
Q. Yes.
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Okay.

Document manager, I believe it would be page 3. Actually, page 2 would be a better place to look.

So there are six lines in the middle of the page, and to the right of them there's (a), (b), (c), (d), $(e),(f)$. These all come from the site information forms from those various facilities. So if we -instead of using for (e), the depth of UGR below grade as being 2.7, but use the 3.5 metre that was provided
by the -- by the applicant as a water table, that would change the depth below the bottom of the facility by less than 1 metre.

So the facility -- so it would be 2.3 metres would be the depth to UGR, or to the bottom of the facility.

It would also change the -- potentially the thickness of the protective layer to that same thickness of 2.3 metres.

So for the scores on this page, on page 2 of this document, that would be -- continue to be less than 8 metres for the depth to UGR from the bottom of the facility. So no changes here.
Q. Okay.
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Go to the next page, please, document manager, page 3.

So if it changes the protective layer thickness from what -- the floor was less than 2 in the table at the top of this page, to now between 2 and 5 -- 2 and less than 5. The score for both of these barns on this point would go from scores of 20 to scores of 16. So we've reduced the score by 4 -- the overall score by 4 points.

Document manager, if you go down to the next page, please. Now, these were not the -- this is a -- the distance -- so the relationship of the well, well to
the facilities, this was discussed only in relation to the catch basin as it being upslope. So I would then make no changes to these scores.
Q. Okay.
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: The next page, please, document manager. The infiltration potential would not change. The total groundwater pathway score, instead of being 54 would be reduced by the 4 points that we reduced a couple of pages ago, and the score for each of these facilities would be 50.

The next page, please, so page 6. So those are -become the -- on the two rows, the groundwater pathway scores would now be 50 . When you add the 50 to the 21 of the hazard potential, you come up with 71. And times and exposure multiplier of 1.2. I need a calculator for that.
A. MR. CUMMING: So 85.2.
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM:
85.2 for both risk scores. So they were -- they were scored at 90 as a moderate. Because high is greater than 90 , not equal to 90 . And so these would both remain as moderate risks to groundwater. The same as with this change.

Since -- I won't go through the surface water part, but $I$ believe we can go next to the Number 61. And again on page 2. So you would be looking at
similar changes here. So change -- the depth -- so the line (e) that is now marked -- it's 2.7.
Q. Yeah.
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: If we change that to 3.5. Then the depth of the storage below grade would now be 1.0 for both of them instead of 0.2 . And the thickness of the protective layer would be the same as well. That would be 1.0 as well.

So the scores on this page, the -- in the table, the uppermost groundwater resource, the 1-metre depth is still less than 8 . So there are no changes to the score here.

Next page, 3, please. In this one we have -- we went from a 0.2 thickness of protective layer to 1.0 . So there would be no changes to the scores for -- on the protective layer under the top of this.

The next page, please. Actually, there would be no other changes throughout.
Q. Okay.
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: It's down to the page 6, please. So none of the scores changed on that one. There would be no changes. It would still be a 95.7 .
Q. Okay.
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Document 62, please. Page 2. Using again 3.5 instead of 2.7 for 1 ines $C$ and $E$,
we now have -- the thickness of the protective layer would be 2.5 , and the depth to UGR from the bottom of the facility would be 3.5 .

So from the table, the scoring on this page, the 3.5 below the bottom of the facility for the UGR, there would be no change to that score.

Okay, next page, please. The protective layer score, where it would now change is greater than 2 metres, so it should be as a 16 instead of a 20. And that should be the only change.

So we can go to page 6, please. So the groundwater pathways will be 4 less, because of the change in the protective layer. So that would be 5 plus 60 equals 65 , and multiplied by an exponent potential of 1.2. It would be 78 . So it would still be within moderate.

That's all on there.
So document -- or Exhibit 63, please. Page 2. Because there are three facilities in this one, $I$ would perhaps go through it twice. The first two facilities are for the open pens, the one -- the existing ones and the new ones. So that's the red column and the green column, the left column and centre column through the A, B, C, D, E, F rows.

Over here, the depth to -- for $C$ and $E$ would
become 3.5. We would have a thickness of protective layer of 2.5 , and a depth to UGR below the bottom of the facility in $F$ of $\mathbf{3 . 5 .}$

Now, for the scoring for those two facilities, it's still the 3.5 would be less than 8 . So there's no changes to those scores on this page.

The next page, please. And on this one, the -for the two facilities, the thickness of protective layer would have gone from less than 2 to now 2.5. So the score instead of going being a 20 for those two facilities will be 16.

That would be the only changes down. We could go to page 6, document manager. So then the groundwater pathway scores for the first two facilities here, they state 62 now, would be 4 points 1ess. So they would both be 58. 58 plus 5 is 63 , times 1.2. So 75.6 for a risk score to the right. Again, it's currently moderate, is 80.4 . To reduce to 75.6 would remain moderate.

Document manager, if we could go back to page 2 , please. Actually to page 1. This is the catch basin. So the catch basin we've discussed a little differently. So page 2, please. Thank you.

The depth, again, for $E$ and $C$ would be 3.5 metres. Subtracting -- I'11 use the same depth of the storage
below grade that $I$ used here at 1.8. There was discussion about that today, so $I$ won't change that.

But 3.5 minus the 1.8 metres there would be 1.7 , so that's what $D$ would be, is 1.7 . And it would be the same for $F, 1.7$.

So for the table and the score on the right column of this for uppermost groundwater resource, the 1.7 would be less than 8 , so no changes to the score here.

And next page, please. Page 3. The protective layer here, it would still be less than 20 for the thickness of the protective layer. So no change on this -- on this page.

Next page, document manager, please. This is the change that Mr. Cumming described earlier today in how that score would come up with -- how that would be changed.

Do you want me to continue through the scoring for that one?
Q. No, it's okay. I got that one.
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: Yeah. There would be no changes
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1 MS. MAHARAJ:
2 THE CHAIR:
Mr. Graham?
MR. GRAHAM : time. I've got some questions, but I'm not sure they're ones that I can ask them.

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Stuart?
MS. STUART:
MS. STUART QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. I wonder if the document manager could bring up Exhibit 2, which is the approval officer decision, page 8, Section 9.

I appreciated the discussion this morning with respect to the water well calculation given a score of 1, you know, on the up gradient versus the down gradient -- down gradient assessment. And I -- but I note in -- if we've got the right -- if I've got the right thing here.

So in -- keeping this document up, document manager, in Exhibit 96, the applicant comments that an installation of a leak detection system below the catch basin is not warranted because the site determination as per the NRCB's ERST indicates the site is a low risk to groundwater and surface water.
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And when we look at the decision summary, we see the description that does say in that first sentence that -- in the last sentence, rather, the second paragraph under Section 8, the catch basin scored low risk to groundwater and low risk to surface water. Despite the above, I am of the opinion that the additional groundwater protection measures are warranted.

So just to help -- help us understand, you know, recognizing some of the detailed discussion we've had around soil types, from an approval officer's side, Mr. Cumming, how do you walk down that path to apply discretion, in general, when you are -- when you have the ERST that says, you know, it's a low risk to surface water, low risk to groundwater, moving down that path to conclude that -- that there'd be a requirement for a leak detection system?
A. MR. CUMMING: Thank you very much, Ms. Stuart. The -- I've tried to lay it out in my decision summary, as you point out here. What we established is that there is a shallow groundwater table at the site. It is literally, you know, a metre or so below the bottom of the catch basin.

The soils in the area are coarse. In other words, if you poured a liquid onto them, the liquid would
permeate those soils pretty rapidly.
The synthetic liner, and I think I did this in part of the testimony when Ms. Vance was speaking to me this morning, and I indicated that the reason for a leak -- leakage detection system is to determine if the liner is failing and to be able to address that prior to any significant contamination of groundwater by any leakage or leachate from the -- from the catch basin.

The leakage detection system that we have seen installed and done at other feedlots where they have put synthetically lined catch basins in essentially consists of some sort of a collection system underneath the synthetic liner of the catch basin, which gets directed into a sump or collection well, which can be easily sampled either by visually looking or by putting a probe down into the well.

If you detect any leachate from there, you can then take a sample of that leachate and determine whether it's manure constituents or potentially groundwater.

So the design of that system is best done prior to the installation of the synthetic liner, and as I mentioned earlier today, the ongoing costs, as well as the installation costs of such a system are -- are typically lower than if you would consider a
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groundwater monitoring system.
A groundwater monitoring system would tell you when you had a problem with contaminants in the groundwater, but it won't tell you -- it won't give you as quick a response as a leakage detection system if you have mechanical damage.

As was mentioned earlier, the synthetic liner that is being proposed here is either a 40 mil or a 60 mil , so either -- 40 mil would be about 1 milimetre thick; 60 mil about $11 / 2 \mathrm{millimetres}$ thick. And they can be damaged by the likes of improper installation or a rock going through it, animals walking on it and puncturing the liner, by mechanical damage from equipment used to empty the facility, amongst others.

So being able to ensure the integrity of the liner I believe is important in this -- in this situation. The reason that it shows that it's low is that they have a liner that could meet AOPA requirements.

I hope that answers your question.
Q. It does. Thank you, Mr. Cumming.

Can -- document manager, can you bring up Exhibit -- I think it's 44. It's the May 22nd, 2020, email. So, Mr. Cumming, you referenced a lack of information. You know, we've heard lots about that available due to the RCC already having been installed,
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and in addition to what $I$ believe you characterized, my words, deficiencies in terms of what was submitted. When we look at this -- this email that was referenced, I think, by you and Mr. Lobbezoo, and if Mr. Cunningham is the appropriate person to answer this, as well, I'm wondering, if you look at this particular list of items recognizing you're walking that fine 1 ine in your position of an approval officer versus providing, you know, technical information, in this list, can you specify which -- which of this list has not yet been satisfied, and if there are remaining items, what would be required to satisfy them and, you know, methodology, given that we are kind of where we're at in terms of it's already installed?
A. MR. CUMMING: I also can try. There are five bullets on the list that's on the screen right now. The first bullet is the preparation for the base onto which the RCC will be placed. We have very limited information on how that base was -- was prepared.

The strength of the concrete he proposed as the second item there, again, this was provided in the report, which was attached to the back of the Wood report, which essentially just gave a little square that said "25MPA." It didn't tell us what sort of age that 25MPA was, but that's the only information that we
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have there.
I don't have anything from the concrete designer or supplier to -- to support what the proposed strength of the concrete was that they proposed to use.

The type of sulphate protection that's proposed, this is important because of the nature of the soils that we have here as well as the nature of the manure will degrade concrete over time if it does not have sulphate protection in there. And there are a couple of ways of doing this.

If you refer to that -- and please don't bring this up again. It's the same concrete liners, Exhibit Number 77, the Agdex 096-93. That gives some information on sulphate protection. I do not have any of that information with respect to the RCC that was installed at the site.

How cracking of the concrete will be controlled is the next bullet, and I don't have any information on that with the -- the application.

The how joints -- the last bullet of the five is how joints, posts, and other protrusions through the liner will be sealed. The only information that we have on that is that they are -- they used a hand pecker around where they had posts and other protrusions, but there wasn't any information in the
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application to specify how that would be achieved.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Cunningham, just a follow-up on that. And, you know, I may have this incorrect. I thought Exhibit 44 stated that posts were poured in place with concrete; is that not correct?
A. MR. CUMMING: Let me pull up 44.

THE CHAIR:
We're on 44 , aren't we?
A. MR. CUMMING: Oh, sorry. Then go further -- if you could go further up, please, document manager, and if you could make it a bit smaller, that would be great.

This is essentially, from what $I$ understand, if you can scroll to the top of this page, it appears to be something that comes out of the decision, and I can't see the decision number there, but it's LA180 something rather. So it would not be this particular site that it was referenced to.

That -- that was the information that was provided to me. Is that what you were referring to?
Q. MS. STUART: You know, I'm just going to double-check, if you can give me one moment. So I'm looking at, if we can go and -- because of the way that -- that screenshot works in the document, I appreciate it's difficult to see, but I think now I can find it.
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So document manager, I think -- can you scroll below this photo that you see. And the very top of that next page with the concentrated text, if you can enlarge that. And so above that list, it'd be right there. And I'm going to just make this bigger so I can -- I can see it. Kind of halfway down this email in the middle, it says: (as read)
"Any posts that came through the RCC
liner were poured in place with concrete."
A. MR. CUMMING: So that would be the only information that we have.
Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Cumming.

And I'm wondering, in addition, then, to that list of -- of items that you've identified, are there any other outstanding questions other than those listed that -- you know, in addition to the ones that Ms. Maharaj identified that would be outstanding to determine whether the RCC satisfies AOPA?
A. MR. CUMMING: I think it's been covered off by my responses to questions from all of the other panel members, legal counsel, and in my testimony already.
Q. Okay, thank you. That's al1 I have, thanks very much.

Thanks, Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIR:
Okay, thank you. Just the spot I
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 Questioned by The Chairwant to be, after a long day, the last guy between you and getting supper and heads fed, and the kids, but I do have a few questions, and I guess I would really indulge, Mr. Cunningham and Mr. Cumming, short answers. If I feel the Pane1, we need more detail, I'11 ask you. So short and snappy, if we could.

## THE CHAIR QUESTIONS THE PANEL:

Q. There's been a lot, and included in your decision summary, Mr. Cumming, you indicate that it would have been -- it would have been a benefit if a professional engineer was on site when the RCC was laid. And because he wasn't or she wasn't, you don't have information from a P.Eng. Is that routine for the NRCB, do we typically require P.Eng. on site for construction of liners, whether they're clay or RCC?
A. MR. CUMMING: It depends on the liner that's being proposed. In this instance, if -- and all of the discussion that's happened with respect to that concrete liner, it is my perspective that the roller compacted concrete should have been designed by a professional engineer. And in order to verify that the design was carried out and done in accordance with the specifications, they should be on site to do that evaluation.
Q. So for clay liners, we don't require that?
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 Questioned by The ChairA. MR. CUMMING: It depends; sometimes we do. It depends on what is proposed as a compacted soil liner. We can have the engineer, design engineer who's designed the liner out on site doing testing to ensure that the liner meets the specifications that they have put forward.
Q. So we can have that, but that is -- is that it, was that an approval policy? We don't need to look now, but that could even be an undertaking. But in our approval policy, do we have anything to direct approval officers in terms of the sort of minimum requirements that -- or their requirements they would be looking for for asking for professional engineers to be present during construction?
A. MR. CUMMING: I'm not sure if it's on the approval officers. It's the end of a long day, so please forgive me.
Q. That's fine.
A. MR. CUMMING: The direction is the approval officers have the discretion to ensure that the permit that they are approving can get constructed the way that it's been approved. And there is guidance to -to suggest that they can have the inspections carried out by the appropriate professional.
Q. I understand. So I mean they've got discretion to do
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it. I guess my question is really do they do it, and is there some baseline -- it doesn't sound like there is.

Stronks, the other two RCC 1 iners were professional engineers. Were there conditions on those permits for professional engineers to be present during construction?
A. MR. CUMMING: I wasn't the author of those; I didn't go into great detail about them.

Of the two liners that you referred to, that Mr. Metheral referred to, only one has been constructed. The other one was actually amended, and a regular concrete liner was put in its place.
Q. Okay. I don't believe it was, and I think you were reviewing this, Stronks. So I was just wondering if that may have come up under your review in terms of providing that guidance to the approval officer?
A. MR. CUMMING: Again, Mr. Chairman, if I can, and this is what was covered by Mrs. Vance in the testimony that I gave earlier on. The guidance that I would provide as the director of field services to an approval officer in the decision is information that they can take to assist them with their decision. They are not obliged to incorporate that in their decision-making process.
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So they still hold control over the decision that they issue under their signature.
Q. I understand. So we can, you know, I could I guess add that as an undertaking. I'm just sort of curious about the approval policy because my understanding is that approval officers are asked to follow policy, and when they don't, provide reasons which is a reasonable push forward I would expect.

MS. VANCE:
Mr. Chair, this is Fiona Vance. If you would like that as an undertaking, perhaps we can just have it spelled out really clearly so we can do our job.

THE CHAIR:
Yeah, so the undertaking, if there is any reference in the approval policy for or any guidance provided for approval officers as to when professional engineers should be on site during construction.

MS. VANCE:
Thank you.
UNDERTAKING - TO ADVISE IF THERE IS ANY REFERENCE OR GUIDANCE IN THE APPROVAL POLICY FOR APPROVAL OFFICERS AS TO WHEN PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS SHOULD BE ON SITE DURING CONSTRUCTION

THE CHAIR:
Sorry, I know I'm asking questions fairly quickly and moving on. I hope this doesn't come
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across as being rude. I'm just trying to get through the day and then let our folks go home, and we'll reconvene tomorrow. And also, being last, of course, my well-organized questions, I'm all over the place because a lot of them have been answered, which is great, but it makes my job a little bit slower.

Yeah, so there's -- on your conditions, if the Board were to overturn your decision, Mr. Cumming, you suggested, you recommend that any inspections be carried out by a professional engineer once again. But after the 1 iner has been thoroughly clean with a signed report listing our observations and findings provided to the NRCB.

I guess my question there was, you know, thoroughly clean for the entire surfaces of all RCC facilities at this operation; you know, depending what that cleaning looks like could be extensive.

In your view, is random, you know, and again, back to some other experience, crop insurance, you throw hoops, do your counts; there's other ways to find out I guess what damages might be. Do you view a sampling so that as an alternative, and depending on what that sampling turns up, more extensive cleaning and inspections might be warranted, or do you view the only way path forward perhaps, you know, with your condition
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is all surfaces at the facility that have RCC be thoroughly cleaned and inspected?
A. MR. CUMMING: Mr. Chairman, that's an interesting question. And the challenge with this particular application is that the liner was constructed prior to permit being issued and put into use.

Typically, as you will note in the decisions that we issue, we have a requirement that the site inspection take place prior to any livestock being placed on a -- in a -- in a pen in a livestock facility or manure on a manure storage facility.

The -- there are obviously times when that is not able to be done so that the approval officers do the best that they can to do that. Each situation is slightly different.

So in this situation, as my testimony has been and as my decision summary states, there has been a significant lack of information in my opinion to show that the requirements of AOPA for groundwater protection can be met.

So if the Board were to choose to say that in their opinion, in your opinion, the -- the RCC, which has been placed there, can meet those, then certainly that's within -- within your power. And you could then
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decide what level of inspection you would deem appropriate for that.

It's -- it's with -- you have experience, as you've shared about doing random things. Random is always -- can lead you down a path where --

THE CHAIR: Sorry, yeah.
A. MR. CUMMING: -- you miss different things, SO...
Q. Mr. Cumming, I should have been a ittle bit more clear.

Perhaps if it is overturned, the first inspection ought to be the whole thing. You know, I guess that's a decision that, you know, we don't even have to make yet because we don't know where we're going in terms of the permit.

But your condition says "ongoing monitoring inspections." So sorry, I really meant over time, let's say this was overturned, we get inspections done. But this says "ongoing," so I guess I was envisioning every year sort of a pressure washer cleaning of all the facility, just wondering then perhaps after the initial inspection, random, some sort of random inspections would be sufficient?
A. MR. CUMMING: My apologies for misinterpreting your question.
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Q. Well, I probably wasn't clear enough.
A. MR. CUMMING: So the ongoing inspections that I would recommend are because we don't have sufficient information on the performance of the RCC.

So I believe in situations like that, a coordination between the operator and whoever was going to do the inspections so that the facilities could be appropriately cleaned so that you could identify if there was damage and what the extent of that damage might be and then provide a report on that.
Q. Okay, thank you.

And I was trying to handle on this cracking; we talked about that quite a bit. Mr. Kennedy addressed it and will likely be addressing it tomorrow. But in my mind, I just wanted to get some clarity around this. So I'd like to do this quickly, and it's sort of online of going through some numbers that similar to Ms. Maharaj but in a different sort of context.

The Wood report, and if you've read that, you'd be familiar that the estimated -- the estimates they used for the permeability for cracking was based on -- well, it turned out to be a 10-metre-by-10-metre area would have .15 metres squared of cracking, and that's their assertion; I'm not asking you to agree with that or not. But under that assertion, on 100 metre by 100
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metre, $I$ think that works out to 15 metres of -squared metres of total area that would be cracked, and if we had, say, 400-by-100 metre surfaces, I didn't go and add them up precisely, but there's a number of facilities, most of them are either that, about that or less, that would work out to if we had four of those facilities, according to my calculations, 60 square metres of cracks, and that's approximately 8 by 8 , or if you go into feet, 645 square feet.

So -- and I believe I've got those numbers right. Do they sound right to you? I know I've kind of thrown that out there in a hurry, but .15 square metres for a 10-by-10 square area?

MS. VANCE:
Mr. Chair, it's Fiona Vance. I just want to make sure that we're all talking about the same Wood report. I wonder if you could just be more specific.

THE CHAIR:
Yeah, it's Exhibit 98.
MS. VANCE:
So it is the April 8th.
THE CHAIR:
Yes.
MS. VANCE: 2021 one, okay, thank you.
THE CHAIR:
Yes, thank you. I should have mentioned that at the start. Thank you, Ms. Vance.
Q. So we multiply that by 100 because 10 by 10 square metres to get up to 100 by 100 , multiply it by 100 , so
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that's 15 square metres per 100 by 100 metres square. And if we had four of those relatively 100-by-100-metre pens, that would be 60 square metres, 8 by 8 . And if you converted that to feet, it's about 645 square fee, and I thought okay, so how big is this?

And it would be, you know, if we think about pen sizes for even a registration-size facility or that would be just under registration, in other words not requiring any permit, that works out to, you know, you're just under 149 finishers at 200 square feet per anima1; you'd need about 29,000 square feet.

And so that's almost 45 times larger, that one pen, than the total amount of cracking as of today, if that's -- if the Wood report has it right.

And so if those numbers are -- we can -- I can have you check those, and if I'm wrong, we can correct that perhaps tomorrow. But if I have that right, does that number seem about right, in terms of total cracking, 645 square feet? And in relative size to just a small pen, it's, you know, it's quite small, so is that something that we should be concerned about, and is that something that $I$ mean over time, if they keep expanding or if we have more cracking, then obviously they get bigger. But what weight should that be given perhaps in terms of the average?
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And I'm wondering if perhaps Mr. Cunningham could answer this as well, as you went through some of the calculations. But was it a weighted average based on that small amount of total area of cracking to the average permeability that you calculated and the Wood calculations?
A. MR. CUMMING: I will try to be brief.
Q. And it took a while to get through that, I understand. But it's been an important issue, so I'd like to get a handle of how big of a deal it is in terms of risk.
A. MR. CUMMING:

So the simple answer to your question of can you scale the 10-metre-by-10-metre area and the amount of cracking within that 10 metre by 10 metre to larger areas and more calc -- absolutely, that would be absolutely fine and fair.

Subject to checking the calculations you verbally said, they sound about -- about right as to what they would be for those -- those differing areas.

The -- how big is that area relative to another feedlot, how important is it. I think that really shows up in that $I$ was able to show it in my analysis, so in -- don't bring up this document, document manager, but it's in Exhibit 3, pdf 100.

So this is -- so this is using the numbers from November of 2020 , but I went line by line as I changed
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or as I did the calculations to show that as you go through that, it's the -- the area of the cracks and the hydraulic conductivity of the cracks that govern the total seepage and leakage through the entire -through the overall.

If you change the pieces of the hydraulic conductivity of the uncracked of the RCC or the area, it doesn't really change that -- the overall outcome at al1; it's all about the cracked area, like the percentage of cracks, and about the hydraulic conductivities through there.

So then that ties in with -- generally with the concrete guideline which we've talked a lot about the details of it, but there are parts of what are in the concrete guideline for regular plastic concrete are how are you going to control cracks, which is often by rebar, and another method that's listed in there is using expansion joints. Neither one of those have been proposed, nor been any information that they've been installed here at this site.
Q. So if we're talking about an area that is -- you've agreed with me the numbers sound about right, about $1 / 45$ th of one pen, so 645 square feet, which is only would support two, three animals, so we're talking about a very small area. If that is left just, you
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know, and in terms of permits or operations don't need a permit, they're small, they have two, three animals on a small area, that would be creating a potential risk to the environment under -- or is it because the cracks are gathering potential nutrients and effluent from the entire surface of these pens, and that provides a conduit down; is that the issue?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: It's -- the question is more about permitting it as a liner than the risk to the environment. So the permitting of liner is -- as much to do with the two things specified in there are the thickness and the hydraulic conductivity.

And so the -- the -- to change the area of cracks to get it minimized to the point where it's similar to the flow that would be through the uncracked RCC takes -- it's gotta be changed by orders of magnitude. So not by a factor of 10 , but by a factor of 100 or more less cracking than has been what's been proposed by Woods in their April 8th memo or their report.
Q. So in other words, what matters is that the entire liner can demonstrate 10 to the minus 7 , not that the entire 1 iner, but for 600 square feet out of some big gigantic number, say, is much more permeable, that's of no matter?
A. MR. CUMMING: That's -- the permeability
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difference is between what Wood has used for the uncracked and cracked is five orders of magnitude, so that's a factor of 100,000.
Q. And typically the concrete's used for liquid manure storage typically, I mean not always, but if you're going to a traditional concrete reinforced expensive high value, and is that potentially the basis of that or it doesn't really matter? It's does the entire 1iner meet or not is really the question, whether it's solid or liquid?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: And that's how we -- in the guideline for concrete and in any designs, we would expect it would be under Category A with plastic concrete. We would expect that the explanation of their -- how they're going to control cracks with some rebar or something else and/or expansion joints or other methods that may not be as typically used but may be perfectly appropriate.
Q. Right. And this -- this next question came up I think with Mr. Metheral's questioning, but -- and it relates back to the -- the water wells used for assessment and ERST changes that say if you become aware, and I'm not sure if it matters how, of potential of shallower groundwater resource, then you need to use that one, not the one that is in use currently on the site. So I
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believe that's what you've done. So it was a shallow well, but it hasn't been used for many, many years.

And the reason $I$ mean this is a bit intriguing because this is something that it's a connection that we had the exact situation on the farm that I grew up on. And I never really thought about its connectivity to neighbouring parcels or quarter sections.

How confident are you that in the shallow aquifers with a moderate variability that you see, even in the boreholes, there's a lot of discussion about borehole variability and which one to use, how confident are you that that groundwater that is on the Muilwijk property is actually connected, the shallow groundwater we're talking about, is actually connected to those other users? In other words, if there was contamination there, would it get to them anyway?
A. MR. CUMMING: How connected is it? Is it -there's a lot of unknowns about that.

If -- to go beyond the screening level into an assessment level, that would be the time to try to find that out and do some testing and some current water qualities and some actual multiple installed monitoring wells with water level elevations to determine what's the direction flow.

A look at the topography map showed that you don't
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have to go very far west of Mr. Muilwijk's place, and the elevation rises substantially and quickly. And so -- and we're not very far from the O1dman River, there's a couple of the regional things that may be at play, as well.

So it's difficult to say with certainty based on the information, but it's directly connected. But also there's enough information there, including at least one of those properties, they have no record of a water well ever being drilled.

And so while they may -- and if they got to the ' 80s without having drilled one, they may not have drilled a subsequent one and may still be using that same one.

So with the reasonable -- reasonably conservative nature, making reasonably conservative assumptions in the risk screening tool felt it was appropriate with the information that we had had at this point in time.
A. MR. CUMMING: If I could just add a little bit of information to that, and this is just based on observations at the site, is that there are a number of gravel pits, relatively shallow gravel pits in the area close to where the CFOs is located, one of which is just a little bit west -- sorry, correct -- it's a little bit east of the proposed catch basin. And there
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are several others further east from there too.
Q. So the gradient from the -- well, you don't know where the well is, you don't know what the litho of the well 734 is, and you don't know where it was located. But let's assume it was located -- well, obviously it was somewhere on the quarter section. Would the gradient flows to -- which well's that? There are wells being used that are downgraded from this -- this facility?
A. MR. CUMMING: The other wells that $I$ saw in -in -- are to the south, so on the quarter section to the south and then the next quarter section south of that. So that was the three quarter sections that I found wells that matched -- matched close enough to say this looks like it could be the same thing.
A. MR. CUMMING: And that is in the direction of the Oldman River from the confined feeding operation. So it would tend to be more downslope from the operation than upslope across.
Q. And you don't have to get this up, but we've spent a fair amount of time on Exhibit 94 and others, but 94 I think had the most detail sort of guidelines for the RCC; it was in another permit. They sort of look like our guideline, I mean the way they're written out there.

And Mr. Cumming, when you were initially
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processing this application or when Ms. Snowdon was, did you have any communication, did Ms. Snowdon ever come to you and say, "What do I do with this RCC?" You know, she was relative a new member of the NRCB, but were there any conversations between you and her in terms of the approach that ought to be taken at that time at least?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes, there were conversations that I had with her, and I understand that she would likely have had conversations with other approval officers as well. And we had had several meetings with all of our approval officers together prior to that to essentially provide direction to everybody to make sure that everyone that's having a consistent approach and that that approach would be for the applicant to show how they could meet the AOPA requirements.
Q. So do I have it clear, then, you had really dropped that guideline that you had, then, in terms of install at 7 inches and uniform depth, that was dropped. And what you went to in different model which was had the operator demonstrate that they could meet AOPA, so our guidelines were no longer in use then when --
A. MR. CUMMING: There was no guideline which you relate to which said it has to be whatever thickness and stuff like that, we did not have a guideline to
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that effect.
What we had was an example where an approval officer had done research and processed an application that proposed roller compacted concrete, and that was the conclusion that they came to with that and how they believed that it best be addressed.
Q. I'm sorry, I called it a guideline, and you were right, it was not. It was sort of a guide that was given in the -- there was guidance given in the approval on how to do it. So that is essentially no longer in force, and it was not -- not really at play with Ms. Snowdon or with you; it was always going to be sort of a process where the approval would be granted if the operator could come and demonstrate equivalency because you presumably -- is it fair to say you presumably didn't have confidence in the conditions or the guidance given in the previous two RCC approvals?
A. MR. CUMMING: We had gone to Agriculture and Forestry. We had taken the information through the PEG (phonetic) and said that this is a trend that we're starting to see in the confined feeding industry, especially the feedlot industry, and we're starting to get requests about used -- utilizing roller compacted concrete as a liner or a pen amendment on top of an existing liner in the feeding industry for various
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reasons. And that information is included in some of the research projects that are included in the evidence that's before you.

Based on that, and there was some information a little earlier, and $I$ can't remember who gave it, but it was about the potential of -- when the original concrete guideline 096--93 was developed about having some sort of a standard mix for -- for roller compacted concrete, and at that point in time, there wasn't enough information to -- to do that.

And through the technical advisory group, again, we approached this over the last couple of years, and the result of that investigation is the report which was made public, I think it was earlier in March of this year, and -- which is part of this.

And as previously mentioned, that report says that there is there isn't enough information to generate a guideline, but there's also enough information to say that RCC can't be used as a liner.
Q. Right, okay. Thank you. I have two quick final questions, and I'm sure I missed something, and I'm sure you won't mind if I missed something, but RCC -well, RCC or some other medium, and I think I just want to be clear about this. I think I got the answer right, but I'm not 100 percent sure.
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You can use a combination of liners to meet AOPA. So if someone proved to us or to you or to an approval officer that concrete or a RCC or a layer of compacted clay came to 10 to the minus 4 , but then there was certain materials naturally occurring underlying materials in addition to that, and it all added up to meet the Reg, that would be sufficient? Is that an option?
A. MR. CUMMING: Mr. Chairman, it was one of the documents that Mrs. Vance had this morning, and I can't remember if it was entered as an exhibit or not; I don't think it was.
Q. I think we did not. I think that's right. That may be useful to enter, actually.
A. MR. CUMMING: This is Agdex 096-61, which says -- the title of it is determining equivalent protective layers and constructed liners. I think that this is the document to which you're referring.

And if I can just read the purpose statement on here. The purpose statement says: (as read)
"To provide a consistent method for calculating the hydraulic conductivity of naturally occurring protective layers and constructed earthen liners in order to determine if a liner is equivalent or
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greater to -- greater than the requirements set out in the Agricultural Operation Practices Act." So it's specific about earthen liners.
Q. Okay. But does that mean one or the other? Does a compacted liner meet AOPA, and -- or does a naturally occurring setting meet AOPA? Can you have some of one and some of another to meet AOPA, is really my question. Is that possible?
A. MR. CUMMING: I'11 let Mr. Cunningham respond to this. He did so earlier today as well.
Q. And I ask -- I think you know where I'm going. I mean, that might be what we are we have here. I don't know, but I would like to have you -- in terms of -- is that even possible? Is that a possibility?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: So this equivalency guideline is written -- well, it talks -- it directly talks about naturally occurring protective layers and compacted soil liners as its intended purpose and provides examples as to how you could use a thinner, for example, of a compacted soil liner or a thinner or thicker protective layer. Or if you've got a single material, how that might equate to the Regulations.

It also provides methodology of how you would do that if you've got multiple, multiple layers that you
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want to -- that potentially will work. And they could be both -- both, like, two protective layers, for example; there's a possibility. But it's also possible you can use it for a protective layer that has compacted soil on top it. It doesn't get into Andy's read of the purpose statement or what it's for is absolutely correct.

But part of what the guideline does is it introduces a methodology in a guideline, and it could be -- could it be used for other types of products like concrete or others? Potentially. If the case was made by somebody designing -- providing a design, then it should be used for that.

My advice to any approval officer would be to listen to the case that's made in the application as part of an engineering report. Here's what the guidelines says. And if the design engineer provides here's how it could be done and used in this manner, whether it's within conjunction with something else or not, that that's within -- as long as it's something you can measure permeability on, then you can -there's -- the action they can make the argument that this guideline would have brought.
Q. Okay. Well, thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Vance, you used that in
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your -- in your direct as sort of an aid to direct, I guess. If there's no objections, I wouldn't mind having that entered as an exhibit. I think we've spoken to it enough that it's worthy of getting in the exhibit?

MS. VANCE:
If the Board wants to do that, that's fine. I would just be clear that it is not our evidence, for whatever that matters.

THE CHAIR:
I'm not sure, but it works for me. If you want to make that clear, that's fine. So, Ms. Friend, what number will that be?

MS. FRIEND: That will be Number 105.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you.
EXHIBIT 105 - AGDEX 096-61
THE CHAIR: I thought I had another question here, but $I$ can't seem -- oh, and I think this is my final question, so -- and thank you for everyone's patience.

So -- and this was a follow-up to my earlier question of Mr. Cumming, so, sorry, I should have asked it then.
Q. So in your opinion, Mr. Muilwijk was aware sort of from the get-go that it may not be that the previous permit conditions as a guide for what would be suitable to meet requirements for the NRCB. He was basically told,
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You need to prove to us the equivalency of the liner or RCC as a liner that would meet AOPA. Is that fair? Is that your understanding?
A. MR. CUMMING: And I apologize, I see I've gone really, really dark.

So when I read the CFO database input that was provided by Adria Snowdon, that is my assumption from one of the inputs. And we had it up on the screen, I think it was September of 2019, thereabouts. You can see where she has detailed that he's proposing RCC and everything else, and there's some -- there's mention of risk, and it would -- there's no guarantee that any permit would be issued based on what was being done.

That is my interpretation of that based on my understanding and my recollection of what took place at the time.
Q. Okay. But when you took it over, it was clearly your intent that it would be -- even before you discovered when it was revealed to you that it was already constructed, it was your view that Mr. Muilwijk would need to demonstrate equivalency, as opposed to using those permit conditions that we've been talking about quite a bit?
A. MR. CUMMING: I contacted him, and I believe this is in the -- I can't remember if it's the May 22nd
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or May 25 th email that $I$ sent to him, and it was very specific about his application only providing very limited information, and that's more detailed in the decision summary, and me seeking information from him to show, demonstrate how the AOPA groundwater protection requirements can be met by what he's proposing.
Q. Right. But that was when? May what, sorry?
A. MR. CUMMING: I believe it was May 22nd or May 25th. I think it's included in the Exhibit 44, if I'm not --
Q. But wasn't the didn't he already by then -- maybe I have my dates wrong. When did you find out? When did he contact you? Mr. Muilwijk, sorry, and say, I've already placed this stuff. I thought it was early May, was it not?
A. MR. CUMMING: It's right around the same time that you can -- you can see that. The database reflects the exact dates; $I$ don't have them right in front of me at this point.
Q. And so I guess really my question was before you knew that the RCC was already placed, was it your intention that -- and you were thinking that the permit conditions that have been used by NRCB in the past were is not what you were going to go with. It was really
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having Mr. Muilwijk demonstrate that he could meet the requirements of RCC.

And then you found out, we11, he already built it, and you continued on with that mindset. Is that a fair --
A. MR. CUMMING: So you're referring to permit requirements. I hadn't even at that point in time even come to whether or not $I$ was going to issue a permit or not. So permit requirements wouldn't -- wouldn't be part of my thought process at that point in time.

Taking the application on, I would be reviewing the application to determine whether or not there was enough information there for me to process the application and move forward with it. I quickly determined that there wasn't sufficient information to show how the groundwater protection requirements under AOPA were going to be demonstrated to be met for the roller compacted concrete being proposed. And I communicated that with Mr. Muilwijk and gave him the different options. I think the different options are in that May 25 th email.

And then he chose the option to provide additional information.

THE CHAIR: Okay, thank you. Those are my questions.
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Now, we have redirect. Now, Ms. Vance, it might be somewhat unusual, but maybe not crazy if we did that tomorrow morning, but depending on how much time you needed, depending on whether Ms. DiPaolo would quit on us or Ms. Kaminski.

MS. VANCE:
And I am ultimately at your
direction. I have -- as the time has marched on, I have crossed a few questions off; I'11 be honest.

THE CHAIR:
Okay.
MS. VANCE:
I do have three, and the reason I
would beg to be allowed to ask them right now is that if $I$ do not ask them now and we wait until tomorrow, I cannot speak to my witnesses overnight, which -- which it is what it is, but $I$ might require a break tomorrow that I might not otherwise require.

So I'm in your hands.
THE CHAIR:
Ms. DiPaolo? How long do you think -- sorry, go ahead.

THE COURT REPORTER: Do you think maybe 10,15 minutes? Would that cover your questions?

MS. VANCE:
THE COURT REPORTER:
THE CHAIR:
MS. VANCE: would make things a bit awkward overnight if I couldn't
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talk to my witnesses.
THE CHAIR:
Ms. Friend will be sending flowers to our document managers and our court reporters, or chocolates or something. Okay.

MS. VANCE RE-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. Okay. Question Number 1, and I think either Mr. Cumming or Mr. Cunningham can answer this question. Exhibit 77, of which we've talked, this is the Agdex 096-93 non-engineered 1 iners; we all know which one that is. Are professional engineers among the intended audience for that?

And we can bring it up, if that would help.
A. MR. CUMMING: I can read very quickly: (as read)
"The audiences, operators, consultants, and contractors constructing concrete
liners for manure collection and storage areas at confined feeding operations." Professional engineers, in my opinion, would be considered to be consultants.
Q. Okay. Second question, this is for -- probably for Mr. Cunningham. Mr. Metheral had brought up Exhibit 22, which is a September 17th, 2019, email that had been forwarded and may be forwarded again, but originally it was from Chilako Drilling.
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And I wonder if document manager could quick1y bring up Exhibit 27. Exhibit 27 you will see is -- the first page of it is an October 1, 2019, email. And below that, it appears that somebody, I'm guess -Mr. Muilwijk had forwarded another message from Chilako dated at the end of August 2019. And if we could just maybe scan to the next page.

And, Mr. Cunningham, perhaps you could just confirm that this is the same printout that we've been looking at all along?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: It looks like it to me, I believe the date on it is the same, August 9th, 2019.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And my last question, I suppose, could be for whoever wants to answer this. There's some question about wells on other quarters, which is part of what you did in your 1.6 kilometre exploration, if you like.

If wells were on other quarters that was land owned by people other than the Muilwijks, how easy would it be to go and check those to see if they are in use?
A. MR. CUNNINGHAM: So as -- maybe I can answer that from a risk screening tool perspective. The risk screening tool is laid out that we don't access sites other than the ones of the operator of where the actual
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operation is.
There can be -- there are definitely Albertans that are very protective of their private property, including where their water wells are, and they are -and even more so when it's someone from the government asking.

So part of -- all of those things played into that we would rely on the Alberta -- the water well information database and for looking at what is happening in surrounding -- in surrounding quarter sections.

MS. VANCE:
And those are my questions.
THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Vance, and thanks for having those ready.

And thank you, pane1. And, as well, to the Muilwijks and Mr. Metheral, thank you for your contributions today. Mr. Lobbezoo. We'11 see you tomorrow morning, but I don't know if we had concluded on a time or if that was sent out.

Ms. Friend, was the starting time the same in -and if so, was it - and if not, we need to find a time that works for everyone tomorrow.

MS. FRIEND: Mr. Chair, the Zoom invite starts at $8: 30$, so you know, we could start at 9 , give the people half an hour to --
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THE CHAIR: 9:00 is perfect. Any objections to 9:00 start tomorrow morning? The only objection we'11 have is if it's a 9:00 p.m. finish, I think. So 9:00 tomorrow morning.

Ms. DiPaolo, are you going to be with us tomorrow morning, then?

THE COURT REPORTER: I think so.

THE CHAIR: Okay. We promise -- well, I should be careful with that. We will try our best to be finished much earlier tomorrow.

So thank you, Ms. Kaminski, Ms. Taylor, as well, and Ms. DiPaolo. We really do appreciate you folks sticking around and assisting the whole process. It was -- you know, we got through the day for field services, and it's an appropriate time to conclude. And I wish everyone a good night, and we'11 see you tomorrow morning.

But if the Pane1 -- I'11 just give you a quick invite afterwards so we can let Mr. Wiebe go home. Mr. Graham?

MR. GRAHAM :
Another invite will be sent out?
THE CHAIR: Yeah. I'11 -- we can send a text just to arrange that, but just hang on after we end the cal1 before --

MR. KENNEDY:
I think -- I just want to be
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clear, the hearing invite, I think, has already gone out, so that was for both days. Peter's going to send an invite to the Panel, so you people can --

THE CHAIR: I'm sorry. It's just the Panel. We just have to --

MR. GRAHAM: It was for two days?
MR. KENNEDY: I believe so.
MR. GRAHAM:
Okay.
MS. FRIEND:
Yes, that is correct.
MR. WIEBE:
Yes, I did send it out for two day. Sorry, Laura. Yes.

THE CHAIR: If not, we'll get you another one, Mr. Graham.

MR. GRAHAM:
Yeah. And it's easier if I go through my own email. For whatever reason, I'm not sure, I always -- it always struggles when I go through NRCB.

THE CHAIR:
Okay.
MR. GRAHAM:
I don't know why. I haven't figured that out yet.

THE CHAIR:
All right. Yeah, we'11 let everybody get on their way for the night. Thank you very much. Oh, sorry, Mr. Cumming, are you just waving, or do you have something to --

MR. CUMMING:
No. I just have one question,

Mr. Chairman, thank you. And that is whether or not Mr. Cunningham and myself are now completed, and we can stand down from the panel and we can then speak with our counsel?

THE CHAIR:
MR. CUMMING:
You are.
Thank you very much, sir.
Yeah, you bet. Take care.
(PANEL STANDS DOWN)
MR. WIEBE:
Mr. Graham.
MR. GRAHAM:
Yes.
If you want to email me through your email account that you like to use, I can send you the Zoom invite, and then tomorrow morning, you can just click on the link in there. Does that work?

MR. GRAHAM: Yeah. I'11 get that to you tonight. You bet.

MR. WIEBE:
Okay. Do you have my email, or does Ms. Friend want to provide that to him?

THE CHAIR:
So, Ms. DiPaolo -- just excuse me one sec. We're off the record, Ms. DiPaolo. You're good.
(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 6:05 P.M.)

PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED TO 9:30 A.M., APRIL 21, 2021 skill and ability.
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