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THE CHAIR: Good morning, and welcome. My name is Sandi Roberts, and I'11 be chairing this Panel of the Natural Resources Conservation Board to hear a review of Decision LA21011 for the Hutterian Brethren
briefly introduce the Panel. For your reference, complete Board member biographies are on our NRCB website.

Pane1 members, if you'11 please wave your hand when I introduce you.

We'11 start with Page Stuart. Ms. Stuart was the general manager of a large beef feedlot in central Alberta, chaired the Alberta Cattle Feeders Association, and has championed multiple environmental sustainability initiatives in agriculture.

Next Earl Graham. Mr. Graham has extensive experience in municipal politics, including serving as the deputy reeve of Clearwater County. For three years he was central zone director for AAMD\&C, now RMA, and he was a member of the Subdivision and Development Appea1 Board.

And myself, Sandi Roberts, I'm an agricultural engineer. I was an approval officer with the NRCB until 2010, have been a municipal councillor for the Town of Carstairs, and was an instructor at 01ds College.

And to help you identify the Panel in this Zoom virtual hearing, we -- the Panel members all have a Zoom background with a mountain scene.

Assisting with the Panel today are Bill Kennedy,
the Board's general counse1, and Laura Friend, manager of Board reviews.

If you have technical difficulties during the hearing, please phone or text Ms. Friend. And if you don't have her number, I'11 say it slowly and I'11 repeat it again so that you can get it down. Her number is 403-620-8294. So, again, that's 403-620-8294. And you can phone or text her and she'11 help you out.

And depending on the issue, it's possible that we may have to pause the hearing until everyone is again fully connected.

We have a number of NRCB staff here today, including Field Services staff, Fiona Vance. The chief legal officer for operations is here, as is Andy Cumming. Andy is director of Field Services applications.

We have staff members who will be doing the virtual onscreen document management.

Sylvia Kaminski -- okay, Sylvia is our primary Document Manager -- and Carolyn Taylor. Carolyn is also here, and she's backing up Ms. Kaminski.

When you want a document shared on the screen, please clearly say the exhibit number and the pdf page number, and then give the Document Manager a
few moments to get the document loaded.
I would like to introduce our Zoom host, Justin Wiebe.

MR. WIEBE: I don't have video.

Okay. Thanks, Justin. Justin is with MNP, and he will be overseeing all of the technical matters related to this virtual hearing.

Also present is a court reporter from Amicus Reporting, who will provide a transcript of today's hearing that will be posted on the NRCB's website. Welcome, Ms. Gerbrandt.

During the hearing we ask that you identify yourself and speak slowly and clearly so that the court reporter can ensure that we get the transcript right.

The NRCB has also provided a YouTube link on its website for members of the public to observe the proceedings. The link is on the NRCB's main website page.

If there are members of the media on our YouTube feed and you have a question regarding today's process, please contact Janet Harvey, NRCB communications. She can be reached at the email address janet.harvey, H-A-R-V-E-Y, @nrcb.ca, or by telephone at 780-720-2317.

Your participation in this hearing is very
important to the Panel. We look forward to the information that you will be providing and recognize that our decision will have a significant impact on your community.

The process that we follow is inherently formal. This is a quasi-judicial proceeding, and so a certain level of formality is necessary. However, we do try to minimize formality to the extent possible so that participants are comfortable presenting their information to the Panel.

The Board encourages you to ask questions if you aren't sure about the process or if you're unsure whether you are allowed to interject. And please do this at any point. I'11 do my best to answer your question, or will direct Mr. Kennedy to help out. If we need to take a short break so that Mr. Kennedy can spend a few minutes to help you understand, that's fine as well.

The purpose of this hearing is to review Decision LA21011 dated May 4th, 2021, issued by Approval Officer Joe Sonnenberg.

The confined feeding operation, or CFO, is located at the east half of 32-14-25 west of the 4 th meridian in Vulcan County. The Municipal District of Willow Creek and the McDougalls were granted directly
affected party status, but chose to not participate in the hearing today.

A Field Services email dated June 10th advised that the approval officer is not available to attend the hearing. However, both Ms. Vance and Mr. Cumming, who we already have introduced, are here and are available to answer process questions.

The approval officer denied the Hutterian Brethren Church of Little Bow's application to expand an existing multi-species CFO. The application was to construct the chicken layer barn with attached manure storage and to increase chicken layer numbers from 25,000 to 10,000 .

A request for review, or RFR, from the operator, Little Bow Colony, was received by the filing deadline of May 26,2021 . No rebuttals were received by the deadline of June 2nd, 2021.

The Pane1 met on June 3rd, 2021, and in its RFR decision Number 2021-04 advised that it had made a decision to grant the RFR and hold an oral hearing. That decision report provided the reasons for granting the appeal and for questions that the Panel will have regard for at this hearing.

The Panel advised that a virtual hearing, using the Zoom platform, would commence at 9 a.m. on

June 29th, 2021. The Panel directed that written submissions by directly affected parties should be filed with the Board no later than June 18th, 2021.

A submission was received from Vulcan County on June 18th and a rebuttal was received from Little Bow Colony on June 24th, 2021.

NRCB's Field Services advised parties on June 10th that it would not be filing a submission.

Al1 Panel members have and are familiar with the complete set of documents that parties have submitted as evidentiary materials for this hearing. Given this, there is no need for you to reread the entire record materials already submitted.

In order to make the best use of time, we request that each party use their presentation time to highlight or clarify the important points that are relative to your written submissions.

I would now like to provide a brief overview of the process for the hearing. First, all parties will be registered. Then each participant will have an opportunity to address any preliminary matters they may have. We'11 then begin with the evidentiary or direct evidence portion of this hearing.

In this hearing, the Board believes it is beneficial for Little Bow Colony to present their
direct evidence first, followed by Vulcan County. When it is your turn to provide evidence, you will be sworn in or affirmed by the court reporter.

Once sworn in or affirmed, any new written evidence that you want us to consider may be entered into the record on request. We'11 then give you a chance to highlight or expand upon any points in your submissions that you feel are particularly significant.

After each party has presented their evidence, they will then be open to questions by the other party, NRCB Field Services, and NRCB Board counsel and Pane1 members.

Once questioning is complete, the party that presented evidence will have an opportunity to introduce redirect evidence. Essentially we give you a chance to submit any further evidence or comments to address areas raised in the questions posed to you where you believe there is some additional information that the Panel should have.

Once we've completed direct evidence and questioning of both Little Bow Colony and Vulcan County, Little Bow Colony may provide rebuttal evidence.

If rebuttal evidence is provided, Vulcan County, NRCB Field Services, and NRCB Board counsel and Pane1
members will be given the opportunity to ask questions.
Last, each party will have an opportunity to provide a final oral argument. Little Bow Colony will present first, followed by Vulcan County. Little Bow Colony will have the final word with reply argument. This is your opportunity to address any issue raised in Vulcan County's final argument.

I know that was a lot, but are there any questions with regard to the process we intend to follow today? We will be taking breaks during the day, including a lunch break. I'11 try to pause in a natural spot in the proceedings so we won't set a specific time for breaks. We hope to be done by 4:00 today. If we need to go later than that, a question that $I$ have is, are all parties available?

Vulcan County? Vulcan County, would you be available if we need to go beyond $4: 00$ today?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Sorry about that. Just a technical issue on muting there. I guess if necessary, yeah, we will have someone available.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, thank you.
Little Bow Colony?
MR. HARRISON:
Yeah, we would be available.
I will just note -- and it's Richard Harrison -there's a lot of lag on our end. So I just query
whether it would be possible for those not speaking to perhaps cut their camera feed, just so we can see better in terms of bandwidth on our end.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you, Mr. Harrison. So if you're not on camera, if you would please stop video, it may help that lag. Thank you.

Ms. Gerbrandt, if we need to go later than 4, would you be available?

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, I would be.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.
Mr. Wiebe?
MR. WIEBE: Yes, absolutely.
THE CHAIR:

So we'11 now proceed to register participants. And it may be helpful as well to please spell your names, your last name, anyway for the court reporter.

So we'll start with Little Bow Colony. Who will be representing Little Bow Colony?

MR. HARRISON: Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you, Pane1 Member Stuart and Pane1 Member Graham.

My name is Richard Harrison. I'm counsel from Wilson Laycraft. I act for Little Bow Colony.

We'11 be presenting three witnesses for the Pane1 today. Our first witness will be Mr. Sam Hofer, who is the CFO manager for Little Bow Colony. Our second
witness will be Ashley Kozak, who is a partner with MNP. And our third witness will be Mr. David Tschetter, who is with Shady Lane Colony near Grande Prairie.

And I'11 spel1 those names for you. Sam, S-A-M, Hofer, H-O-F-E-R; Ash1ey, A-S-H-L-E-Y, Kozak, K-O-Z-A-K; and David, D-A-V-I-D, and Tschetter is spelled T-S-C-H-E-T-T-E-R.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Harrison.
Next on to Vulcan County. Who will be representing Vulcan County, and who will be giving evidence for the county?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Jason Schneider. I will be representing Vulcan County. I'm the reeve. That's J-A-S-O-N S-C-H-N-E-I-D-E-R.

Our manager of development services will also be providing evidence.

MS. ERICKSON:
Thank you. My name is Anne Erickson, manager of development services for Vulcan County. And it's A-N-N-E E-R-I-C-K-S-O-N.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Mr. Schneider, will anyone else be giving evidence for Vulcan County? MR. SCHNEIDER: No. We do -- we do have two members of our planning commission joining us as observers.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, thank you.
Are there any other parties eligible to participate in the hearing?

A11 right then. Let's begin.
MR. SCHNEIDER: Madam Chair, sorry. I did neglect to mention one more on behalf of Vulcan County: Ryan Dyck with the Oldman River Regional Services Commission. I'11 let him introduce and spell his name for the record.

MR. DYCK:
Thank you, Madam Chair. Ryan Dyck, acting as planning advisors for Vulcan County. I'm not looking to give a submission, but if the need arises for questions and the like, it's R-Y-A-N D-Y-C-K.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Dyck.
Okay. So are there any preliminary matters to address, procedural, legal, or others?

Little Bow Colony, is there anything that you have for procedural matters?

MR. HARRISON: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just have one quick question for the Panel. Is it -- I have two questions: First, while testimony is being given, is it okay to have the witnesses observing that testimony? And, second, whether the witnesses are able to have their notes available to them while presenting?

1 THE CHAIR:
that, please?
MR. KENNEDY:
both -- yes to both. If there is a situation, Mr. Harrison, where you or another party thinks that -procedurally there's a need to exclude a witness from the proceedings -- or a future witness from the proceedings during a particular part, then we could entertain that. It's unusual. I'm trying to think of an NRCB hearing where I've seen that happen. I don't know that $I$ have.

And as for notes, yes, if it's helpful, by all means please do refer to notes.

We do ask that counsel, if they're -- if we take a break during a time when their witnesses are still impanelled, we do ask that counsel not have discussions with those witnesses during the break about the evidence and responses they're providing.

Hopefully that answers your question, Mr. Harrison.

MR. HARRISON:
It does. Thank you. And I'11 just say since the video has been turned off, the stream has been much better on our end. So thank you very much, everyone, for doing that.

THE CHAIR:
Great. Thank you. That's great
to hear.
Vulcan County, do you have any preliminary matters?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Vulcan County has nothing at this time.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you.
Mr. Kennedy?
MR. KENNEDY: I have nothing.
THE CHAIR:
Ms. Vance?
MS. VANCE:
Yeah, Field Services, we have nothing at this time. Thank you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, thank you. So the hearing exhibit list was prepared and posted on the NRCB website for all parties to reference, and I propose that we adopt the hearing exhibit list, which includes the relevant documents before the Panel.

Are there any objections to adopting the exhibit 1ist?

Okay, I'm hearing... Hearing none, we will consider them adopted.

All right. We are now ready to hear direct evidence from Little Bow Colony. So I will leave it in Ms. Gerbrandt's hands to swear or affirm Little Bow's witnesses.

MR. HARRISON:
Thank you, Madam Chair, and Panel

6 SAM HOFER (For Little Bow Colony), affirmed
7 MR. HARRISON EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
8 THE CHAIR:
members again.
As I noted, our first witness will be Mr. Sam Hofer, who is the CFO on behalf of Little Bow, and he's prepared to be affirmed this morning. proceed.
Q. MR. HARRISON: Good morning, Mr. Hofer. What is your role at Little Bow Hutterite Colony?
A. I partake in the day-to-day operations, CFO operations at the colony. But in respects to the application, I was tasked with some of the technical details, such as the mapping, scaling of the project, which I then forwarded to our financial manager, Darius Hofer, and he submitted it to the NRCB.
Q. So would it be fair to say, for example, that you prepared the application for the expanded CFO that we're -- before the Panel here today?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, how long have you held that position with Little Bow Colony?
A. I've been involved with operations ever since $I$ was a child, but more so over the last five years.
Q. Now, please tell the Panel why Little Bow Colony wants to expand its livestock operations?
A. To come into compliance with some of the changing rules and regulations that are put forth by the industry. Some of these being animal welfare, biosecurity, as well as food handling. That would be one.

I could also say that the economic value that it adds to our operation in that there's some incentive for producers to step up and meet some of the demand in the food supply. And also the -- and this helps to keep costs to producers stable and keeps produce affordable.

Along with that, $I$ think $I$ could add the added economic value it brings to our operation in its entirety, and the fact that we have 90 members within our community that we have to support, and this CFO operation is one of the ways in which we make that happen and keep our head above water.
Q. Now, you mentioned that there are incoming rules and regulations with respect to this CFO operation. Are
A. Yes, there's substantial costs involved. Automated control systems are expensive. Caging requirements that are mandatory. They're not - they're not applied
as in do it if you want. They are mandatory, so there are some costs involved there.
Q. Now, would it be fair to say, for example, that the expansion will help to pay for those costs?
A. Absolutely, yeah.
Q. And is that one of the drivers for -- for seeking that expansion?
A. Yes. I would agree.
Q. Now, why don't you walk the Board through the current poultry CFO at Little Bow Colony?
A. The current CFO operation consists of 2500 units of quota that we own. In addition to that, we also have approximately 1100 units that are overbase quota. We are currently leasing out the overbased quota due to the size of our facility and not being able to facilitate that extra quota.

So there are some rules in regards to overbased quota that the Board allows producers to lease out that quota for ten years maximum, and at that point it is required for them to place the quota within their own facility. And that period of time came to fruition for us and our operation in 2019. We had other obligations at the time, so couldn't commit to placing that quota, so we approached the Board and requested for a three-year extension. They granted that extension.

And as far as the facility, it's 20 years old and showing aged infrastructure. It relies heavily on manual controlling the environment within the barn that should be upgraded and needs to be upgraded to a more continuously monitored and automatic control of that environment. This would improve animal welfare indefinitely.

Along with that, $I$ would say that the facility has an onsite grading station which allows us to market our eggs locally to restaurants, grocers on a daily basis.

Is that enough to...
Q. Thank you very much. How long has the Little Bow Colony had the CFO poultry operation?
A. We've had the CFO poultry operation since 1983, and that was at the what we'll call the old place, which is beneath the Twin Valley Dam currently, but it's been there since 1983, when Little Bow was founded and established the colony there.
Q. Now, why don't you tell the Pane1, or walk the Panel through how Little Bow Colony came to be in its current
A. As I just mentioned, we were founded in 1983 and we established our operations at again what we'11 call the old colony beneath the Twin Valley Dam.

In the mid 1980s the provincial government put a
halt to our operations. And the reason to this is the proposed project, which is now the Twin Valley Dam. The colony continued at that time during those restrictions, and we basically made do with what we had at that time, until the mid 1980s, when the provincial government obliged the colony to relocate to make way for that project.

We did that without much -- we did that without much resistance because we understood the significance of that project and what it brought to the region, and especially the farming community, and as far as irrigation is concerned.

The government and local planning development officials selected a parcel of land to relocate the colony to and basically grandfathered all of our existing CFOs from the old colony to this new location, and we took possession of the colony in 2002.
Q. Now, why was the current location selected for Little Bow Colony?
A. It's under -- it's under my understanding that it was
place.
Q. So prior to its current location, would it be fair to say that Little Bow Colony was actually located in the Municipal District of Willow Creek?
A. Most of our CFOs were located in Willow Creek, except for the dairy operation and our main shop.

MR. HARRISON: Madam Chair, I wonder if we could now pull up Exhibit 10, if they are numbered sequentially, or the last document in the exhibit book1et.

I'm hoping that we can go to Map 12, which is seven pages from the last page. Oh, there we go. Scroll down. There's Map 12. No. If we could just go up a little bit more. No, that's good. Thank you. I appreciate that.
Q. Now, Mr. Hofer, do you see where Highway 529 is identified on this map?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. It should be in the middle approximately proportion on this map?
A. Yeah.
Q. And do you see just southeast of the number 529 there is a picture of a calf?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. Are you able to confirm that that is the location of

SAM HOFER
Examined by Mr. Harrison

Little Bow Colony?
A. That is the location, yes.
Q. And that's the location of the confined feeding operation that we're here to discuss today?
A. That's correct.
Q. So it's fair to say that the confined feeding operation is in the CFO exclusion zone on the IDP?
A. That's right.
Q. Mr. Hofer, who is Doug Bourque?
A. Mr. Bourque was the government official appointed by Alberta Infrastructure to manage the Twin Valley Dam project, and his role -- one of his roles was to facilitate the relocation of the Hutterite colony.
Q. And did you ask Mr. Bourque to provide a letter outlining his understanding and recollection of Little Bow Colony's transition?
A. We did. On behalf of the colony we did ask him to provide a letter.
Q. I wonder if we could now turn to page 4 of Exhibit 9. I'11 be looking specifically at the third last paragraph of page 4. It starts with "Despite the Colony's hardships..." There we go.

So Mr. Bourque writes: (as read)
"Despite the Colony's hardships (identified below) during the relocation
transition, they have fully cooperated and acted in good faith to assist in the successful completion of all phases of work, so that the Dam and reservoir plan is completed within the time frame allotted and functioning as designed for comprehensive water resources management for Southern Alberta."

Do you see that, Mr. Hofer?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. Now, what hardships did Little Bow face?
A. I think Little Bow faced two significant hardships, and the first being that the government curtailed our operations back in the mid 1980s. Right after we established the colony, which was probably one of the most important times for people to -- for colonies to establish their operations, I specifically remember we weren't allowed to develop any permanent structures. However, they did allow temporary housing to be put in place there, and we had approximately nine to ten mobile trailers. But essentially all other permanent construction was halted.
Q. You mentioned two hardships. What was the other hardship?
A. Oh, sorry. The other hardship would be the uprooting
of the entire colony, in that case around 100 members, and placing them into a colony that they had very little input in designing or constructing. And the adjustments -- both the social adjustments required, as well as getting the operations back to full production.
Q. Now, you mentioned that when you transitioned to the new colony, you had little input into that new colony's design. Can you describe who did have input at that point in time?
A. I think predominantly it would have been the provincial government. They basically, from our understanding, replaced what we had existing. We did see some improvements, but essentially it was just a replacement.
Q. How about the historical value of the former location? What can you tell me about that?
A. The historical value, as in growing up there, our childhood -- my childhood anyway, I was 14 when we moved, it's tied to that location. Childhood memories of being kids growing up there, definitely that's something that we lost in the transition.
Q. Did you have a -- or did Little Bow Colony have a confined feeding operation, a poultry CFO at the old location?
A. Yes. And I think it was established also in and around

1983 when we first moved there.
Q. Now, please walk the Board through the reasons you feel it should approve Little Bow's application for an expanded CFO?
A. I would like to start with saying that we reviewed the approval officer's decision and understand how he came to that conclusion. However, given our location, and being that we're 15 kilometres from any significant populations -- and, in our case, it would be the Village of Champion -- the factors of a nuisance are minimal and we have very few neighbours and acreages in the area.

Some of the other reasons we think that they should be approved is our proximity to the waterways and the fact that we meet and exceed AOPA legislation and any requirements that the NRCB regulates; as well, the improvements that we're making, the improvements that are proposed in this -- in this development or this expansion project, as far as animal welfare, biosecurity and proximity to other CFOs on that parcel of 1 and, as well as the economic aspect that it brings for our operation and as well as the regional and Vulcan County and beyond.
Q. When was the last time that your poultry -- or Little Bow Colony's poultry CFO expanded?

SAM HOFER
Examined by Mr. Harrison
A. Actually, this is the -- this is the first application with the NRCB since 2000, 2002.
Q. When the operation was established in the new colony?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And how, with respect to water licensing, does

Little Bow Colony have a water licence?
A. Yes. We fall within our licensing in the fact that we are under the Water Act.
Q. And when you expand the CFO, would that still be within the water licence?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, how far is Little Bow Colony from any boundaries?
A. We're approximately 1600 metres from the boundary with the MD of Willow Creek.
Q. So you're over a kilometre and a half away from the MD of Willow Creek?
A. That's correct.
Q. And is that the location of where the expanded CFO would be, or is that the location of the colony?
A. That's the location of where the proposed CFO would be.
Q. So the proposed CFO would be approximately just over a kilometre and a half from the MD of Willow Creek?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Now, how would this expanded CFO improve the environmental impacts of the current CFO operation?
A. It would increase the environmental -- or improve the environmental impact in the fact that we're actually proposing a 400-metre further separation from the nearest waterway and being that the Little Bow River, in comparison to the current CFO.
Q. So you would actually be moving your operation further away?
A. Yeah. By approximately 400 metres.
Q. Would you be developing any new 1 and for the current CFO operation?
A. No. It would be on developed land.
Q. And you understood I meant the new CFO?
A. Yes.
Q. How about animal welfare? What can you tell me about that in terms of improvements there?
A. With the new caging requirements that are put forth by the Egg Farmers of Canada, they're transitioning producers out of conventional caging, which we currently have in our barn, and into a more enhanced or free range caging system. And I think we can all appreciate the recent -- in the recent years the pressure that has been put on producers to take into further consideration animal welfare. So there is a significant improvement.

Along with, as I mentioned earlier, the
environment that the birds are in with updating the systems to a more automated continuous monitoring and continuous adjustment.
Q. Why don't you -- today is obviously a good example, we're in a heat wave. Why don't you tell me a little bit about what the new system would be versus the old system would be like given today's temperature?
A. Well, the new system, as I said, continuously monitors outside temperatures and adjusts the internal
temperature in the barn accordingly, whereas our old barn is more manually controlled. So it's up to the discretion of the operator to make those changes.

So the birds experience less extreme temperature differences, which is an added comfort level to the animals, of course.
Q. And you mentioned the environmental positive. For example, greenhouse gas emissions?
A. Absolutely. The proposed construction -- or the proposed plan of the CFO would significantly improve the efficiency of the barn.

09:44
those environmental improvements?
A. That's right, yeah.
Q. Now, why wouldn't you move the CFO outside the CFO exclusion zone?
A. Any parcels of land that we own that we would consider suitable for this type of development is -- for example, across the road, those two quarters across the road and to the north are irrigated acres, and so would either require taking that land out of production or moving the water rights to a different parcel of land.

We're very familiar with the process of transferring water rights and that we would lose 10 percent of the water rights allotted in the transfer of the water rights to different parts of the land.

But also the cost to the infrastructure and the pipings -- the pipeline and the pumping -- and pumping capacities. There are revisions on that end that the costs would be substantial. And in taking that, the second option and taking that crop out of -- or that parcel of land out of production, it doesn't make much sense for us to move a CFO 200 metres across the road onto undeveloped 1 and. And there's no incentive -there's no -- there's no incentive for us to do that. It actually devalues that parcel of land.

So, therefore, I think we can -- we can conclude
that it's not a piece of land that's suited for that type of development.
Q. Right. So just to summarize your evidence on this point, to move the current CFO and the expanded CFO operation outside of the CFO exclusion zone would be a 200-metre move?
A. Approximately when you take in setbacks from the road, yes.
Q. And that 200 -metre move would involve taking farmland and cropland out of production?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And it would involve new infrastructure to support that -- the new CFO location?
A. Yes, being that it's undeveloped land.
Q. And you would lose 10 percent of your water rights?
A. That's right. 10 percent that we -- that we don't have the opportunity to recoup.
Q. Now, are you familiar with the Vulcan County municipal plan?
A. Yes.
Q. Development plan?
A. Yes. I've become familiar with it throughout this process.
Q. Did Little Bow Colony participate in the public hearing for the MDP?
A. It's my understanding that we didn't, no.
Q. Why not?
A. I don't think that we were notified that there was an MDP or notified that there was a public hearing or any notice of that type.
Q. You didn't know about it?
A. No.
Q. Now, how does Little Bow Colony receive notifications from Vulcan County?
A. Typically it would be registered mail, being that we're isolated.
Q. You mentioned you're isolated. What do you mean by that?
A. We're 15, 20 kilometres from the Village of Champion or the Town of Vulcan. So we're self-sustaining and community orientated. There's no reason for us to commute into town every day. In that sense I would say that we're fairly isolated.
Q. Is it fair to say that Little Bow Colony is isolated from a community standpoint because it's self-sufficient, and it's isolated geographically because it's far from any other centres?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. So you, for example, don't have someone going down to the municipal office on a weekly basis to see what
public hearings are taking place?
A. No. No, we wouldn't have.
Q. Does Little Bow Colony receive notification from Vulcan County in any other capacity other than registered mail?
A. Not that I'm aware of at this time, no.

MR. HARRISON: Those are my questions for this witness.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Harrison.
Thank you, Mr. Hofer.
Mr. Harrison, you can please proceed with your next witness, if you care to.

MR. HARRISON:
Thank you. Our next witness will be Ms. Ashley Kozak. And perhaps before we go any further, we'11 just get you to switch seats so that Ashley will be a little bit closer.

ASHLEY KOZAK (For Little Bow Colony), sworn
MR. HARRISON EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
Q. Ms. Kozak, what is your relationship with and to Little Bow Colony?
A. My relationship with Little Bow Colony is I'm a CA and a partner at MNP. I have been an advisor to agriculture clients over the last ten years and a direct advisor to Little Bow Colony for the past six.

MNP has been an advisor, a business advisor, to the Little Bow Colony for the last 15 years, 10 to 15 years.
Q. So it's fair to say that you have a good understanding of Little Bow Colony's business economically?
A. Absolutely, yeah.
Q. Why don't you tell us about Little Bow's economics with respect to its poultry CFO?
A. Yeah. So as you heard Sam say, the poultry operation at its current location has been there for about 20 years. They do own 25 units -- 2500 units of quota holdings and 1100 units of overbase that they do currently lease out.

I guess it would be more economical to use this quota for themselves, but due to the capacity constraints, they do lease it out right now.

Their barn is, again, 20 years old, so there is -repairs and maintenance are starting to creep up. And the changes in the operational systems that are required to keep up with the supply and the demand need to happen sooner than later.

As barns -- infrastructure and their internal systems age, it does put a strain on the birds, and eventually it does affect their top line revenues and their net profits.
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Q. You mentioned that Little Bow Colony has a quota of a certain number of birds, but it only has approximately currently 2500 poultry units. Why can't it make use of its entire quota?
A. Yeah. So the entire quota with the overbase, they can't make use of it right now because their barn is not big enough at this time. They can only place the 2500 birds. So that's why they have to lease out their 1100.
Q. Can you please describe the capital costs that a poultry CFO is generally subject to?
A. So there's three major capital costs that a poultry CFO is subject to. Those would be the quota, the price per bird. Infrastructure would be the next one, and inflationary costs involved.

So quota would be -- we all know their operation is supply managed and producers are required to have quota in place in their barns. The average producer in Alberta has 10,000 to 15,000 penned, so units. The larger barns could be 30 to 40,000 units. And Little Bow has 2500.

The price as of January 1st, 2021, for quota was 520. The only way that you can get quota is either you purchase it per hen or there is natural progression, natural -- you can obtain it naturally. So as demand
increases, as we said with the overbase, the supply-managed industry will give you some extra quota. So that 1100 extra units of quota that they have, in the future, as demand goes up, they could increase that, along with every other competitor in the industry.
Q. You mentioned that there were three capital costs that a CFO is subject to.
A. Right. Right. So, yeah.
Q. What's the other?
A. So it would infrastructure cost. Essentially those are you're either going to retrofit your barn or you're going to build a bigger barn.

So I guess with barns and infrastructure, as they age, they become more obsolete. In our industry we've noticed that the average lifespan of a barn would be 20 to 30 years and/or you're building a new barn because there's -- there's what we would call the regulatory environmental changes that Sam had spoke about before.

When you're building a new barn, you would be always thinking to build for the future. So you're building bigger to capture the idea of getting more quota through natural abilities or through purchase. And, also, you're thinking about the possibility of other regulatory standards, environmental standards,
coming in so that you're ready for those -- when those come down the line.

The last would be for costs, the CFO would probably be inflationary costs.

Producers need to grow their top line because, as we all know in the current environment, costs are rising. So in order to stay viable, sustainable, producers really need to ensure that their top line revenue, and in supply manage the top line revenue needs more birds possibly. So to cover those inflationary costs, producers need to have more quota involved and bigger barns.

Over the last ten years, farm costs have increased 30 to 40 percent. So that's about 3 or 4 percent per year. And so that hasn't gone in conjunction with the revenues. So margins are slimming at this point.
Q. Costs are arising due to inflation, but you mentioned, for example, revenue is not rising?
A. Yeah. I guess in the layer operation, revenues have only really risen 10 to 15 percent.
Q. So a poultry CFO is generally subject then to three types of capital costs: The price per bird, infrastructure, and inflation. Fair to say?
A. Fair to say, yeah.
Q. Now, how do these factors apply to Little Bow Colony,
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in particular?
A. So as we've mentioned earlier, Little Bow does have 2500 birds. So if they were just to retrofit their barn at this point, with the new caging system, they would only be able to place about 1500 birds. So they would be losing out on a thousand birds there, plus their 1100 birds that they have as overbase, they wouldn't be able to place those as well. So that's 2600 birds automatically that they would be losing out on their -- on their farm for revenues.

Also, when we -- when I said that barns are usually 10 to 15,000 units, right now in the barn that they have, it's only -- they only have 2500 , which is on the lower end, I guess, of their competition. So to keep them viable, it would be better to have an increased barn.

We would also say that, going forward, Little Bow, with their aging infrastructure, we're not going to build a barn that's exactly the same as the old barn. Just like anything, things go obsolete. So we want to competition and, obviously, build a barn that's relevant to today and not relevant to 20 years ago.

And it would be a barn that they would want to consider the fact of future changes and future
abilities to get more quota because the demand is up there. So they want to keep viable and keep competitive in their market.
Q. Right. Now, you talked a little bit about the infrastructure costs with respect to the new CFO and the new regulations coming in.

With respect to the incoming regulations, if their -- if Little Bow Colony is forced to keep its current operations, will it be able to afford the improvements that are required by the new regulatory environment?
A. No. As I said earlier, with rising costs and, I guess, the diminished per hen housed to 1500 , that won't be sustainable in the future. The viability of the operation will shrink and the margins will grow smaller and smaller and thinner, and they won't be able to continue the operation eventually.

Overhead costs will stay -- will rise over time, so we can only imagine how that would work out for them.
Q. So to summarize, then, without the ability to expand their current CFO, Little Bow Colony will not be able to justify keeping the current operations?
A. Absolutely, yes.
Q. And that's because of not only added costs with the new
regulatory regime, but also because of the decrease in quota because of the size of the cage pens?
A. Yes.
Q. So with respect to the size of the cage pens, their current barn that they currently have, as those cages grow bigger, they have less ability -- or they have the ability to have less hens in that barn. Is that fair?
A. Yeah, yeah. You only have so many square feet to use. And, yes, as cages get bigger, then less ability for hens to be housed.
Q. You understand that that is part of the new regulatory requirements that are coming in?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, what can you tell me about the current market for poultry products?
A. The market -- the demand is strong right now in that environment. And so in the future, more quota will be available. And I'm thinking that expansion is required to stay competitive in this market, in this marketplace for sure.

MR. HARRISON:
Those are my questions for this witness, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, great. Thank you,
Ms. Kozak.
And, Mr. Harrison, you have Mr. Tschetter as well
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as a witness. Please proceed.
MR. HARRISON:
So, obviously, Mr. Tschetter is not in our boardroom here. He'11 be joining in a moment.

THE CHAIR:
Yes. Ms. Gerbrandt will have to swear or affirm him as well.

DAVID TSCHETTER (For Little Bow Colony), affirmed MR. HARRISON EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Tschetter. What is your role with the Little Bow Colony?
A. I'm the Vice-Chair of the Hutterian Advocacy Counci1, and we are currently supporting members of the Little Bow Colony.
Q. How long have you had that role for?
A. Eight months.
Q. And what is the Hutterian Advocacy Council?
A. The Hutterian Advocacy Council is an organization that's compromised of Hutterite members across the province. Our mandate is to provide supporting role for Hutterite colony leaderships in many areas.

So, for example, we may be required to facilitate discussions with non-governmental organizations and government in general on issues that pertain to us.

We feel that it's important to foster positive
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relationships within local and region communities, municipality and other agricultural organizations.

We support farmers and ranchers like Little Bow Colony in their efforts to rise up to and exceed the agricultural and society standards of farmers and ranchers who exce1 in these areas. We are an asset to municipalities because they're role models of the agricultural landscape, and we support and advocate for this type of collaboration.
Q. When you mention standards and the Hutterian Advocacy Council's role when assisting colonies and meeting and exceeding standards, you're referring to, in this case, farming standards?
A. That's correct. Farming standards, also environmental standards, consumer demand on food safety, food security, and also transparency as well. So it's right across the board.
Q. Are you a member of the Little Bow Colony?
A. No. I'm a member of Shady Lane Colony in the Peace River regions. Right between Grande Prairie and Peace River.
Q. Now, in your role as Vice-Chair, why is Little Bow's application for an expanded CFO one that you have involved yourself with?
A. It's complex, but $I$ would like to answer it by making a
few points for starters. This is a good example of farmers and ranchers like Little Bow Colony. In their efforts to rise up and exceed the agricultural and society standards, they require support from a broader perspective.

Given that Little Bow Colony, it was unaware of the CFO exclusion zone until the recent application, this application, we recognize that given the timeline of the ongoing Vulcan County IDP process, the relocation of the colony to its current location at the behest of the Alberta government, it's apparent that the Hutterian Advocacy Council provide a broader support to Little Bow Colony.

It's reasonable to conclude that the Alberta government may not have foreseen this quarter of 1 and that Little Bow Colony was geographically translated to would have a confined feeding operation exclusion zone superimposed onto it. Regardless, Little Bow Colony now finds itself restricted from what would otherwise be a reasonable agricultural land use of their home quarter section. So this is a concern for us. Another point $I$ would like to make is that Little Bow Colony has met and exceeded the rigorous confined feeding operation application process and every regulatory requirement.
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Given that this application is well within the Agricultural Operation Practices Act and other regulatory requirements, we would like to point out that, as a result, that the exclusion zone for the home quarter of Little Bow Colony is onerous and unreasonable.

The new CFO improves the economic output, as just stated by the previous witness, by assisting the colony to increase its profit margin. And it's been -- and the lengthy economic growth restrictions at the previous location, which happens to be beneath the Twin Valley Reservoir, can now be offset at the current location through this new CFO.

We've looked at it and there are no deterrents to expanding the new CFO that we can identify; there are only benefits. For example, some of the benefits are securing the local and regional food supply, and it improves the environmental standards for the current operation.

And above all this, farmers and ranchers like Little Bow Colony are committed to meeting and exceeding the consumer demand for food safety and traceability. The consumer is playing an active role in driving that.

Another point that I want to make is that I'm
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pretty certain that the current temperature, outside temperature, in all of your locations is just as balmy as where $I$ am, and so these record-setting heat waves are a risk to livestock. And during heat waves, we humans, we can enhance our environments, like ensuring the air conditioning is working, but our livestock depend on us to mitigate it for them.

And, as pointed out by Sam Hofer, the new infrastructure would improve the automation environmental control systems, so -- but it's important to note that not on1y do heat waves create stress for animals, but widely fluctuating temperatures within the CFO facility during heat waves only amplifies the stress level on the animal.

So Little Bow Colony modernizing their CFO environmental control system within their facility through this application can only be a good thing.

The new confined feeding operation improves the wellbeing of Little Bow Colony. It's rare to find a multifamily farming operation without some type of CFO. And, similarly, it's rare to find a CFO without some type of multifamily culture and social structure that encapsulates it. For most farms and ranchers in Alberta, these go hand in hand.

And, given that this CFO application is the first
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in approximately 20 years, it will certainly strengthen the social fabric of Little Bow Colony.

And then the final point that $I$ want to make is the impacts of a denial of this permit. Such a concerning note for other -- for existing confined feeding operations and agriculture in general across Alberta when and where discrepancies exist between the AOPA, the MDPs and the IDPs. So we request that the NRCB Board exercises its discretion and to grant this application to Little Bow Colony.

We understand that each confined feeding operation application is unique. We also request that the NRCB considers this application as a precedence in future confined feeding operation applications that meet and exceed AOPA, but are unreasonably stifled (phonetic) by municipal development plans and/or intermunicipal development plans.

Thank you.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Tschetter.

MR. HARRISON: Those are my questions for this
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MR. SCHNEIDER: Great. Thank you. I have a couple of questions to direct to the applicant there.

MR. SCHNEIDER CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. First off is what is the proposed plans for the barn that is currently in operation if a new facility were to be constructed?
A. MR. S. HOFER: The proposed plan is to take the -- take the current facility out of operation and use it -- just repurpose for other farm use.

What we plan on doing is our turkeys and ducks are raised predominantly outside, and we would like for the initial, when they're young birds, to put them in that facility and house them so they have protection.
Q. Thank you. Next question is, what technical documents have been supplied to show the site suitability for this proposed barn?

MR. HARRISON: I can provide the exhibits to the witness. Is that okay, Madam Chair?

THE CHAIR: Yes. Please do so, Mr. Harrison.
MR. HARRISON: I'm providing Document 3 to the witness from the exhibit list.
A. MR. S. HOFER: So could you just explain your question a little bit, please?
Q. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. We're just asking for some further information on what -- what has been done to
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determine that this site is suitable for the barn that you are proposing.
A. MR. S. HOFER: We're proposing the facility on already developed land, being that it's within the quarter. So our -- getting the infrastructure, such as gas, water, and all of that in place is readily available to us and easily accessible.
Q. Has there been any third-party review done of your plans to determine site suitability?

MR. HARRISON:
I would like to object to the question, Madam Chair, and just ask that the question be specified as to what type of third-party review is being requested in the question.

MR. SCHNEIDER: My apologies. I will rephrase that to has a third-party environmental assessment been done to determine site suitability for this proposed barn.

MR. HARRISON:
Again, I just query as to whether it's a biodiversity environmental review, water, wetland environmental review. Just a few different environmental reviews.

MR. SCHNEIDER: I'11 leave it genera1.
Q. Has any type of environmental review been done to determine site suitably by a third party?
A. MR. S. HOFER: No.
S. HOFER, A. KOZAK, D. TSCHETTER

Questioned by Mr. Kennedy

MR. SCHNEIDER: Okay, thank you. We have no further questions at this time.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Schneider.

Field Services. Ms. Vance, do you have any questions for Little Bow Colony?

MS. VANCE: Thank you, Madam Chair. Field Services does not have any questions for Little Bow Colony.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Vance.
Mr. Kennedy, do you have any questions for Little Bow Colony?

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I do have one or two questions.

MR. KENNEDY QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. And the first one may have already been answered, but, Mr. Hofer, when did you become aware that your confined feeding operation was located in the county's confined feeding operation exclusion zone?
A. MR. S. HOFER: When the approval officer submitted his decision, that's when we become aware.
Q. And what is your understanding of the purpose for the county establishing that exclusion zone?
A. MR. S. HOFER: My understanding is that it's with the border of Willow Creek and possibly protection of waterways.
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Q. So purely environmental reasons? Is that -- is that your understanding?
A. MR. S. HOFER: Yes, that is my understanding.
Q. And in terms of managing your CFO facilities in proximity to the Little Bow River, can you give us a quick summary of what you identify as the on-site risks from the confined feeding operation?
A. I would assess there is not very substantial risks and due to the fact that it's dry manure, it's storage, it's in the proposed -- sorry, the proposed manure facility meets AOPA's liner regulations. I'm not sure if that answers your question.
Q. Yeah. Well, perhaps more broadly, one of the points that you made, I believe, in answering a question from Mr. Harrison was there was an environmental benefit from moving this facility further away from the Little Bow River. And implicit in that answer is there might be an inherent risk from the current facilities. And I'm trying to get an understanding of what that risk might be.
A. MR. S. HOFER: It's basically just based off of the proximity to that waterway and the facility.
Q. And from your CFO facilities, and from all of your CFO facilities on the site, is manure -- does it move from that facility toward the Little Bow River naturally?
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MR. HARRISON:
Sorry, I just want to make sure we got the question just because there was a lot of freezing there.

The question was: From the CFO facility, does manure move from that CFO facility?

MR. KENNEDY: Yeah. And, Mr. Harrison, the question related to all of the facilities and how -generally how manure is managed and what risk those facilities pose to the Little Bow River Reservoir.
A. MR. S. HOFER: I would say that it's minimal due to the fact that we have manure -- liquid manure storage and basins -- catch basins in place.
Q. And, Mr. Hofer, the current municipal development plan is -- I think it is dated 2012, and these things are updated every ten years or so. Does the colony anticipate, as the county updates its municipal development pl an, $i t$ would actively participate in the -- in whatever revisions might arise?
A. MR. S. HOFER: I would assume so, yes. If it affects our operations and our future of our operations, absolutely.
Q. And, Mr. Tschetter, I think this question is for you. Is this -- in terms of municipal development plans and county's adoption and revision to plans, is this something that your group would be engaged with on
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behalf of your constituents?
A. MR. TSCHETTER: Yes. I believe we'd be very interested in participating in that process.
Q. Thank you. And, Mr. Hofer, how do you anticipate that the county -- becoming aware when the county initiates its next revisions to its municipal development plan? Do you believe they'11 reach out to you, or do you think you're going to have to actively watch and be aware when they initiate that process?
A. MR. S. HOFER: Based off of the past, I think we would have to stay current with what's happening within the county and keep ourselves updated to engage in those kinds of events.
Q. And, Mr. Hofer, do you have a precise distance between the new -- or proposed facility and the Little Bow River Reservoir?
A. MR. S. HOFER: Negative. We do not have a precise location, but we can tell you off of satellite mapping, that's within 1600 metres.
Q. Within 1600 metres. How much within? Do you have an idea of that?
A. MR. S. HOFER: No, I don't.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you, witnesses. Those are my questions.
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Thank you, Madam Chair.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Kennedy.
Ms. Stuart, do you have any questions for Little Bow Colony?

MS. STUART:
I do. Thank you, Madam Chair.
MS. STUART QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
MS. STUART: Can I ask the Document Manager to pul1 up Exhibit 8, Vulcan County's hearing submission. And my question will be to Little Bow, perhaps Mr. Hofer, but whoever can appropriately answer the question as $I$ have stated it.

So if you go to page 2 and point Number 4, which refers to municipal setbacks.

And I apologize if this was somewhere in the material that $I$ didn't see, but $I$ note that the county said that the stated number for the application did not include setback distances and, therefore, Vulcan County cannot confirm if the project is in compliance with setback requirements, and they state 38.1 metres from the centreline of the road and 7.6 metres from the property 1 ine.

Mr. Hofer, or perhaps anyone else with Little Bow, can you confirm if the proposed site is in compliance with those county setback requirements?
A. MR. S. HOFER: Yes, we are.
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Q. Okay, thank you.

MS. STUART:
And, Document Manager, can I ask you to pull up Exhibit 3, which is the technical document, Part 2.

And, man, that's fast. The Document Managers do a great job.

Can I ask you to go to pdf page 23 of 29.
Q. Can you confirm that that is the proposed building site for the poultry expansion?
A. MR. S. HOFER: I can, yes.

MS. STUART:
And if we just scroll up,
Document Manager, so we can see the writing at the top.
Q. There's a note. It says AO Note, approval officer note, that the topography is flat.

Can you tell me what your observations are about the topography on that area and whether you agree with that statement?
A. MR. S. HOFER: I would agree with that statement. It is predominantly flat.
Q. And when you say "predominantly flat," do you have any
A. MR. S. HOFER: There's no visible indentation in the topography, so $I$ would conclude that it is flat.
Q. Okay, thank you.

MS. STUART:
Now, to scroll back, Document
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Manager, to more of the actual land in the photo. Just scroll. That's perfect. Thank you.
Q. It appears to me that manure has been spread on that -on that quarter. Can you tell me, is that correct?
A. MR. S. HOFER: I can't say for certain, but it could be possible.
Q. Do you spread manure on this quarter?
A. MR. S. HOFER: It used to be our garden actually, so we haven't in the past, but it could be possible that it was -- there was some manure this spring spread on that parce1.
Q. Thank you. And are you aware, do you have any restrictions from spreading manure on that site?
A. MR. S. HOFER: Not that I'm aware of, no.
Q. Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. STUART: In the same Exhibit Number 3, pdf page 12 of 29 , I believe. Okay, so, again, that's faster than I can actually look at my question.
Q. In the first paragraph, it talks about -- it refers to an unnamed tributary that originates in the southwest corner of the CFO and defines it as ephemeral with a poorly designed channel.

Can you describe the characters of water movement from -- well, first of all, do you agree that there is an ephemeral unnamed tributary on the southwest corner
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of the site?
A. MR. S. HOFER: That is possible, yes.
Q. Can you describe what the character of that water movement would be in that area?
A. MR. S. HOFER: It predominantly moves to the southwest.

You're referring to the slope of the topography?
Q. I'm referring to what this -- what is referred to in this technical document when the approval officer says that there is an unnamed tributary that originates at the southwest corner and has a poorly designed channel that kind of moves southwest of that proposed site.

And I guess my question is, to be more clear, would you agree with the statement or disagree that that is ephemeral in nature and, you know, basically is it just a transitory -- a transitory movement of water that occurs briefly or has it a greater degree of permanence than that?
A. MR. S. HOFER: We don't see -- I could say that we don't see water flowing continuously, no. I'm not sure as to what the approval officer is referring to there. But based on your question, no, there is not -there is no water flowing continuously.
Q. Do you ever see water flowing from there?
A. MR. S. HOFER: I haven't, no.
S. HOFER, A. KOZAK, D. TSCHETTER

Questioned by Ms. Stuart
Q. Okay. Okay. No, thank you. Thank you very much. It was stated earlier, and Mr. Kennedy referred to this as well, that the expansion of the poultry barn, that that approval would result in an increased separation of 400 metres because of the location of the existing poultry barn.

Ms. Kozak spoke to the lack of economic inability of the unexpanded poultry facility, and you described that if the expansion application is approved, the current facility would move, you know, turkeys or young ducks, if I've got that right, to the facility. Did I get that right?
A. MR. S. HOFER: Yes.
Q. Okay, thank you. So I'm just wondering, if your application to expand the operation were to be denied, would you maintain the -- recognizing you, as you stated, couldn't maintain the 2500 bird level at the existing location, would you maintain it at the 1500 bird level required to meet the upgraded animal wellbeing requirements? Or if it were to be denied, what would you do with that existing facility? Would you continue to operate it?
A. MR. S. HOFER: We11, as Ms. Kozak alluded to, the feasibility just on the financial perspective is probably not feasible.
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Q. Okay.
A. MR. S. HOFER: To the upgrades necessary and the overhead costs.
Q. Okay.

MS. STUART: And with that, those are my questions, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Stuart.
Mr. Graham, do you have any questions for Little Bow Colony?

MR. GRAHAM :
Not at this time. Thank you.
THE CHAIR: Great.

THE CHAIR QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. I guess this is kind of a broad question that $I$ have for the colony.

If this was approved and the buildings would move 400 metres away, do you -- what would you believe to be any difference in environmental protection or lack of protection? Like you would be increasing the amount of manure on site, you would be increasing the amount of birds. How would you deal with any I'11 just say environmental differences from what you have now to what you're proposing?
A. MR. S. HOFER: Due to the proximity to the waterway, with it being further away, it's possible that there would be less risk in the runoff and the
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manure and what have you affecting the environment and the waterway.
Q. Al1 right. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
And that's the only question that I had.

Is there any redirect evidence from Little Bow Colony?
MR. HARRISON: Just a brief redirect, Madam Chair.

MR. HARRISON RE-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
MR. HARRISON:
I would ask that we go to page 23 of Exhibit 3. And this is for Mr. Hofer.
Q. Mr. Hofer, you recall answering questions from Vulcan County with respect to whether any third-party environmental reviews had taken place with respect to the expanded CFO?
A. MR. S. HOFER: Yes.
Q. Now, is the site of the -- is the proposed site of the new expanded CFO near any wetland?
A. MR. S. HOFER: No.
Q. Do you recal1 answering questions from Board counsel, Mr. Kennedy, as well as the Board Chair, with respect to the location of the CFO to the Little Bow River?
A. MR. S. HOFER: Yes.
Q. Now, what type of safeguards does Little Bow Colony
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have with respect to its current CFO operations and the impact of manure (indiscernible) --
A. MR. S. HOFER: In turn?
Q. Yes.
A. MR. S. HOFER: I'm assuming you're talking about our manure storage?
Q. Yes.
A. MR. S. HOFER: So the current manure storage facility is basically an open -- an open shelter. It's open to air shelter, concrete lined, whereas the proposed facility would be an enclosed environmentally controlled storage.
Q. And how close to the stable operation would the new manure storage facility be?
A. MR. S. HOFER: It would be attached.
Q. Okay.

MR. HARRISON: Those are my questions on redirect.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Harrison.
Because we did have redirect evidence, we will give parties an opportunity to question on the redirect.

Vulcan County, Mr. Schneider, do you have any questions on the redirect?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Vulcan County has no questions.

Thank you.
THE CHAIR: Thank you, sir.
Ms. Vance?
4 MS. VANCE:
Field Services has no questions on
redirect. Thank you.
6 THE CHAIR:
Thank you.
Mr. Kennedy?
MR. KENNEDY: Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Stuart?
MS. STUART: Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Graham?
MR. GRAHAM :
Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. And I have no questions as we11.

So thank you, Little Bow Colony, for your direct evidence.
(PANEL STANDS DOWN)
No questions at this time.
I have no questions. Thank you,

THE CHAIR:
We're through this portion of the proceedings, so I think it's probably a good time for us to take a break for everybody to maybe grab some ice water in this lovely weather that we've all been talking about.

My clock says that it is 10:38. How about we get back together again at 10:50, and we will begin with direct evidence from Vulcan County.

MR. HARRISON: Thank you, Madam Chair.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you.
(ADJOURNMENT)
THE CHAIR: I believe everyone is here, then, because I see all of our Panel, I know the colony has turned off their camera so that they will have better -- I'11 cal1 it "reception," but they are here.

So we will resume and we will start with direct evidence from Vulcan County.

Mr. Schneider, will you please 1 ead us?
MR. KENNEDY: Madam Chair - -
MR. SCHNEIDER: So there we go. Sorry, I hit the mute button there.

Okay. As far as Vulcan County's presentation goes, I'11 refer to the Apri1 8th letter from Vulcan County --

THE CHAIR:
Excuse me. Sorry, Mr. Schneider. Before anyone provides evidence, we do need to have them sworn in or affirmed.

MR. SCHNEIDER:
THE CHAIR:
Yeah. Sworn in is fine.
Okay. Ms. Gerbrandt, would you please help.
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J. SCHNEIDER, A. ERICKSON, R. DYCK (For Vulcan County), sworn/affirmed

THE CHAIR: Mr. Schneider, please proceed.
EVIDENCE IN CHIEF FOR VULCAN COUNTY:
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you. Those were just the response to the questions that were asked by the NRCB during the application process, I don't have anything else to add on that. It was just our response to the questions that were asked of us. That included if this application was in a CFO exclusion zone, which this application did fall within our exclusion zone.

A few points that $I$ would just like to add on that.

The exclusion zone was established with the ratification of the municipal development plan in 2012. This area was included in the development plan. It was once again noted in the intermunicipal development plan that was completed in conjunction with Willow Creek in 2015. I will just note that the boundaries of that exclusion zone did not change in 2015. They were simply just noted. It was not expanded or changed in any way from the MDP of 2012.

I will just make a note in regards to notification. Vulcan County's notification process on
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any development plan, whether it's an intermunicipal development plan or a municipal development plan, is that all affected landowners that would be included in the plan area do receive a direct mailout. So, in 2012, the applicant would have received a direct mailing.

In addition to that, our policy in 2012 was we also sent a copy of the Vulcan Advocate to every ratepayer in Vulcan County, and as per our -- I guess under the MGA notification requirements, we did run notification of the municipal development plan in the newspaper in two consecutive weeks. So the applicant would also have received the Vulcan Advocate with that notification.

The applicant also would have received the notification on the Willow Creek 2015 IDP as they were also in that notification area. It would be sent to the registered landowner on title. So it would have -whoever is registered with Land Titles would have been the one to receive that letter. That's Vulcan County's policy, as well as, that also puts us into alignment with the MGA for notification requirements.

Speaking to the CFO exclusion zone, I will just refer to Section 20 of AOPA, which does refer that municipalities are able to set CFO exclusion zones.
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That is also confirmed with Section 632 and 633 of the Municipal Government Act. So putting in these exclusion zones is -- is an option for municipalities to do.

Back in 2012, the reasoning for putting these exclusion zones in was the protection of the waterbodies within Vulcan County. Those -- those exclusion zones were applied to all waterbodies within Vulcan County. This was not -- this area was not treated any differently than every other waterbody within Vulcan County, and that's -- therefore, it was made to protect waterbodies from things like seasonal runoff and it was applied evenly across -- across the county there.

As far as -- I think that kind of covers why these exclusion zones have been put in place. Like I had mentioned, they've been in place since 2012.

It had been mentioned earlier, as far as looking at revising them, they do get typically revised on a 10- to 15-year pattern. So that just depends on, you know, factors within the municipality, but this one has not been modified since 2012.

I think that basically covers it.
We were sent the referral letter. We saw the application like the general public and like everybody
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else and we have provided our response to the four questions, and I don't think we have anything to -further to add on those four questions.

I will just ask if our manager of development or our planning advisor have any other -- anything else they would like to add at this time, and then we'll be ready for questions.
A. MS. ERICKSON: Thank you. I would just like to briefly speak on the municipal development plan, and I would suggest that we are now just completing our intermunicipal development plans and recognize that our MDP will require an update. And so $I$ would hope that that starts and commences in 2022, and that, at that time, we would engage in some meaningful conversation with stakeholders within the county. Obviously, that would include operators of confined feeding operations.

I am unsure of Little Bow's timeline and if it would be -- if there would be opportunity to engage in that conversation and update the MDP in order to come together for this project.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you. Thank you,
Ms. Erickson.
Wil1 Ryan Dyck be providing any evidence for Vulcan County?
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So, Mr. Schneider, is that all for direct evidence from the county?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes, it is.
Okay. Thank you, sir.
Okay. Now, we have an opportunity to question Vulcan County, and first up is Little Bow Colony.

Mr. Harrison, do you have any questions for the county?

MR. HARRISON: I do. I'11 be asking Mr. Schneider questions.

MR. HARRISON CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
MR. HARRISON: Mr. Schneider -- I can jump into it, Madam Chair?

THE CHAIR:
Yes. Please do.
Q. MR. HARRISON:

Mr. Schneider, you recall providing evidence that you -- that Vulcan County had provided notice of the municipal development plan and
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correspondence to Little Bow Colony, did you?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I was not on council at the time of 2012.
Q. You weren't even on council at the time?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: No. That is why I highlighted our notification process that Vulcan County used at the time and currently still uses.
Q. And who was it who the county placed the responsibility on to of sending notice?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: That would fall to the chief administrative officer would be the one that would be ultimately responsible to make sure that the correspondence was sent out.

COURT REPORTER: Sorry, Mr. Harrison, sometimes you're hard to hear or understand.

MR. HARRISON:
I'm sorry. I will try...
THE COURT REPORTER: Okay. Sorry?
MR. HARRISON: I'm just looking at my audio settings.
Q. To the best of your information and knowledge, Mr. Schneider, the Little Bow Colony is within the CFO exclusion zone in the municipal development plan; correct?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: That is correct.
Q. And it's in the CFO exclusion zone for the Willow Creek
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IDP?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: It is. It is highlighted in the Willow Creek IDP to show that there is a CFO exclusion zone in that area, yes.
Q. I just want to confirm that Little Bow Colony is in both exclusion zones.
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: Could you please restate your question? Or repeat your question, sorry.
Q. Yeah. Sorry. I just wanted to confirm that Little Bow Colony is in both the MDP exclusion zone and the IDP exclusion zone?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: It is in the MDP exclusion zone, and that exclusion zone is mentioned in the IDP. But it is -- yeah, it is mentioned in both documents, yes.
Q. Okay, thank you.

MR. HARRISON:
Madam Chair, I would like to put two documents side by side to the witness. I think the best way for me to do that is to share my screen, and I just canvass whether that would be acceptable to the Board.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Kennedy, are there any issues with that?

MR. KENNEDY:
If we could just clarify. Mr. Harrison, are we using existing exhibits that you're bringing up and just putting them side by side?
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MR. HARRISON:
MR. KENNEDY: I'm just not sure whether technically -- we haven't done that before in a hearing, so perhaps we could rely on . . .

MR. HARRISON:
What I have -- let me try this.
They've asked me whether I want to start my...

MR. HARRISON: are seeing?

MR. KENNEDY:
MR. HARRISON: That is at Exhibit 10, and on the left is the municipal development plan.

Now, the MDP was not exhibited, but I only plan on using language from the MDP that is contained at page 7 of Exhibit 2, and so that language is with respect to the CFO, which is located on page 21 of the IDP. You should see it there on your screen.

So you have Policy 4.1 here, which is stated on, like $I$ said, on page 7 of Exhibit 2.

And then on the IDP, I am turning to Policy 4.3.4.
Is everyone able to see that?
Q. Can you see that, Mr. Schneider?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yeah. It's quite sma11, but
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I'm -- I got the page numbers from you.
Q. Okay, great. So Policy 4.1 of the MDP reads:
"New confined feeding operations (CFOs)
are not permitted to be established and existing confined feeding operations are not permitted to expand within the exclusion areas as shown on the map in Appendix B."

And I'll repeat my question earlier. You would agree that Little Bow Colony does appear in the CFO exclusion zone on the map in Appendix B; correct?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: Which map are you referring to?
Q. This will be the map at Appendix B, and you'll see that our clients' little slice of heaven is right over here. Right here. Can you see my cursor there?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: You are highlighting over both highlighted and non-highlighted areas. It's quite small on your screen there.
Q. Fair enough, yes. But you did answer the question earlier that the CFO exclusion zone and Little Bow Colony was in both CFO exclusion zones. So I just wanted to show you there that it is in both areas.

So just to repeat, Clause 4.1 of the MDP:

## (as read)

"New confined feeding operations are not
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permitted to be established and existing confined feeding operations are not permitted to expand within the exclusion areas as shown on the map in Appendix B."

And then on the IDP is Clause 4.3.4. And it reads: (as read)
"Any existing CFO permit holders may be allowed to expand operations within CFO Exclusion Areas if it is to upgrade and modernize (within the requirements of AOPA and Regulations), demonstrating changes will reduce negative impacts...to the residents of the area, additional environmental protection will be considered, and comments from both the municipalities are received and considered by the NRCB."

Do you see that?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm just trying to get to it.

J. SCHNEIDER, A. ERICKSON, R. DYCK Cross-examined by Mr. Harrison

just to repeat, is?
Q. I haven't provided you my question yet. My question is, you would agree with me that there is a conflict between the IDP and the MDP, would you not?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would say that they are not the same -- they are not word for word the same, no.
Q. Right. But one permits and extends to existing CFOs and the other does not; correct?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: One said "does not" and one says "may."
Q. Okay. Has Vulcan County given any consideration to how conflicts between municipal development plans and intermunicipal development plans...

THE COURT REPORTER: Sorry, Mr. Harrison, I missed the end of your question.

MR. HARRISON:
Sorry. I'11 repeat it.
Q. Has Vulcan County given any consideration to how a conflict between a municipal development plan and an intermunicipal development plan gets resolved?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm not sure -- I'm not sure how
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So at this point I would say the answer would be we are looking at updating the MDP in the future once our IDP process has been completed with all of the urban and rural municipalities that we border.
Q. Okay. Is Vulcan County aware of Section 638(3) of the Municipal Government Act, that mandates that any conflict between a municipal development plan and an intermunicipal development plan is resolved in favour of the intermunicipal development plan?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes. That's what the MGA says.
Q. Yes. So you're aware of that?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes.
Q. Okay.

MR. HARRISON: Those are my questions for
Vulcan County witnesses.
THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Harrison.
Field Services. Ms. Vance?
MS. VANCE:
Field Services does not have any questions for these witnesses. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thanks, Ms. Vance.
Okay. NRCB staff and Panel. We'11 start with Mr. Kennedy, please.

MR. KENNEDY:
Thank you, Madam Chair.
MR. KENNEDY QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. Mr. Schneider, the Board, in setting this matter down
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for hearing, asked four questions -- or set four questions down. And the first question is identify the municipal authority's rationale for establishing the relevant provisions in the MDP. And, of course, can you direct us to the part of the MDP that says these exclusion zones are established for these reasons, and so we can identify those reasons?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yeah. If you want to give us a minute here, we can -- we can get you the page number out of the MDP that might reference that.
Q. Take your time.
A. MR. DYCK: Madam Chair?

THE CHAIR:
Yes, sir.
A. MR. DYCK: This is Ryan Dyck. I wonder if I may be able to step in and provide a little of the context that $I$ think that the Board may be seeking and perhaps to supplement some of the responses to the questions, if that's okay.

THE CHAIR:
Certainly. Anything that you can do to help answer the question would be much appreciated, Mr. Dyck.
A. MR. DYCK: Okay. Firstly, I guess in terms of context and, as was stated, the MDP came into place prior to the IDP with Willow Creek.

The county is very much aware of the consistency
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of plans, requirements in the Municipal Government Act, Section 638, that counsel for Little Bow Colony referenced. And I think it brings about something we've been grappling with and talking about with the county, the need for consistency.

And, of course, it's our feeling that the law should be applied fairly and consistently. That sometimes is challenging to do because we are looking to establish municipal land use provisions within the relatively narrow scope provided for municipalities in Section 20 , or whatever the relevant section of the AOPA is, and dealing with this multi-jurisdictional approval regime. The same sort of regime municipalities have to deal with for any types of entities where there's provincial interest, whether it's with the AUC, the AER, the NRCB, and sometimes that's quite challenging to do. We're left at the bottom of the ladder, but we want to be involved in the process, of course, and want to be involved in planning. Maybe that's a little context, stuff the Board might already know.

Anyways, I say that and go on to say that in a case like this where $I$ do recognize the discrepancy that Mr . Harrison pointed out, and this may be an occasion where the Board chooses to read down the
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full-on exclusion, I guess you could say, in policy Section 4.1 of the MDP in favour of the more lenient policy in 4.3.4 of the IDP. That may be the outcome of this. I'm not sure.

But I think what Reeve Schneider was trying to refer to was that in the IDP we were just looking to reference the existing CFO exclusion area out of the 2012 MDP. The IDP did not establish new CFO exclusion area. And the reason we wanted to do that was to make sure that these things were consistent.

Now, it looks like we may have erred and that these policies aren't identical, but that may have been somewhat intentiona1. I can't exactly recall or know for sure.

I was involved in a limited capacity in the 2015 plan, but $I$ don't think any of the parties with the county today were involved in the 2012 MDP.

That's al1 I would say for now.
Q. MR. KENNEDY: Mr. Schneider and Ms. Erickson, have you found what you were looking for?

J. SCHNEIDER, A. ERICKSON, R. DYCK

Now, I would -- I'm happy to have these sent in because they do address the rationale and because these questions were asked during the open house process and council did at the time did provide a response as to how they were -- how they were going to justify the exclusion zones -- or, sorry, what the reasoning is -was to justify the exclusion zones. We would be happy to send those in.

I can read the answer here and send in the documents, whatever you would prefer.
Q. Mr. Schneider, what I'm looking for, and my question was, is where do we find the explanation and the rationale within the municipal development plan?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: Pages 14 and 15 refer to the confined feeding operations. I believe that's -- I guess that would be probably what you'd be referring to?
Q. No. Well, perhaps. What I am looking for is the rationale within the municipal development plan for the establishment of the exclusion zone. So the CFO exclusion zone, which is set out on the map, and looking for the rationale.

So going back to the question that the Board posed in its decision which we've set down this hearing, is identify the municipal authority's rationale for
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establishing the relevant provisions in the MDP. And normally you would look in the MDP for those relevant provisions and the justification. And that's what I'm asking for you, is to point out in the MDP the rationale for those exclusion zones?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't believe the council at the time put them into the MDP. Like I said, they were included in the public hearing minutes there. I would say the only rationale is that, under the MGA, they established CFO exclusion zones. That's all that I would have to refer to in the MDP.
Q. So in terms of what you would suggest this panel do, because, of course, it's trying to understand the planning purposes for those exclusion zones and determining whether or not the Little Bow Colony's application should get an exemption from those exclusion zones, how do they understand what the purpose of that exclusion zone is from a planning perspective for Vulcan County?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would say I would refer to the minutes of the public hearing that was conducted when the MDP -- or the MDP was being developed, and those answers were in that document, and I would be happy to provide you a copy.

But as far as reference specifically in the MDP,
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they weren't, other than just being able to establish them under the MGA and then the rationale that was given during the public hearings in February of 2012.
Q. And that exclusion zone is established at, more or less, at 1600 metres, and it looks like it follows quarter section boundaries as it's drawn out on the map. So is it a minimum of 1600 metres?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe that was the intention, and then they went by quarter lines because the river obviously is not -- not straight or uniform.
Q. And can you help us understand why 1600 metres? Why was that distance chosen?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: As I stated before, I wasn't part of the MDP development, so I don't have anything to add on that one.
Q. Perhaps I should ask this question first. Does the county object to the exemption requested by Little Bow Colony?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: The county has just responded to the questions asked by the NRCB and the one asked if it was in an exemption zone, and it is. To my knowledge, we've never been asked for a waiver. That's within the NRCB's jurisdiction and not Vulcan County's. We were simply answering the questions that were asked of us, and it does fall within the exemption zone -- or the
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CFO exemption zone.
Q. Well, let's ask that question now. Does the county take exception with the request?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I cannot answer that. I would have to ask council. I am simply representing our -the letter that we sent. So I can't speak for the rest of council, I guess is what I'm trying to say.
Q. You understand, Mr. Schneider, that, you know, these four questions have been in front of the county for some time and, frankly, your answers aren't particularly helpful in understanding the county's position. So whatever you can do to kind of expand on these answers so that the Board has an understanding of where Vulcan County might stand with respect to its exemption -- exemption zone, it would be more than helpful.
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I understand, but as -- your question is asking do we oppose the exemption zone. That was not a question that was asked of Vulcan County. If we had been asked that question, we would have been able to have given you a response on behalf of council.

You're asking me as one individual of a council to answer on behalf of seven.

So I apologize if that's not the answer you're
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looking for, but if you would like that answer specifically, we can get that, but it will require the majority of council, you know, convening.
Q. Fair. One of the questions the Board asked and said it would be examining is: Is the relevant provision reasonable and reflective of good planning? Can you provide a response from Vulcan County as to, you know, how reasonable is the exemption -- or the exclusion zone, and how does that reflect good planning?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I think it reflects good planning because we have uniformly -- sorry, these zones are uniform across -- in -- sorry. These CFO exclusion zones are uniform on all of the waterbodies within Vulcan County.

Based on the notes from the public hearing and the responses that council of the day provided, it does -it is my opinion that the rationale was to protect the waterbodies and to prevent further development around those waterbodies. That's well within our mandate as a council and through the MGA to promote safe and viable communities. And I believe protecting our water sources is well within that mandate, and we are given that power to put CFO exclusion zones in areas through the MGA in Sections 632 and 633.

So I believe, through the uniformity as well as
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our responsibility to create safe and viable communities, protection of our waterbodies is well within our mandate.
Q. And to come back to the 1600 metres. Is there anything to support why 1600 metres was chosen as opposed to 100 metres or 3,000 metres?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I can't speak to that. At the date that was the distance it was chosen, it was felt to be reasonable and applied across the entire County of Vulcan.
Q. And does the county of Vulcan have anything that it can put forward that would suggest that 1600 metres is necessary as an exclusion zone to protect the waterbody?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe, according to the minutes, that was the number that they came up in consultation with the ratepayers and the council of the day. 1600 metres was felt to be a reasonable amount.
Q. And I see that the same exclusion zone seems to apply around hamlets and villages. That's, I presume, for
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: That is correct. In the minutes, they also reference to preserve existing and future quality of life and reducing the potential for future land use conflicts for residents within those areas.
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Those areas have all been reexamined during the provincially mandated IDP process.

In some areas those exclusion zones have been expanded. Just as time goes on, operations getting larger and larger, the urbans have requested further setbacks from urban areas, but those -- those were all looked at on a case-by-case basis with each of the five villages and the one town within Vulcan County's border.

So all six of those exclusion zones have been recently reviewed during the IDP, but that was just in regards to proximity to urban areas.
Q. And is there -- is there any portion of the exclusion zone that applies to the Little Bow Colony that the county of Vulcan would identify as creating a land-use conflict?

So is the exclusion zone where the Little Bow Colony is, is it there for land-use conflict purposes?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I can't speak directly to that because I wasn't part of those discussions, but I would say due to the uniform application of the -- of the zone -- the CFO exclusion zone to all waterbodies, I would say -- I would say that -- I guess we could speculate, but $I$ would say it was -- I would venture a guess that, and according to the notes, that it was
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more in regards to proximity to waterbodies, is what they were -- they were concerned about at the time of February 2012.
Q. And, Mr. Schneider, you would -- and I think this question is for you. You would accept that the purpose of the Agricultural Operation Practices Act, or one of the purposes, is to protect surface waterbodies?
A. I would say.
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would say it's one of the bodies that takes that into consideration, yes.
Q. And that it establishes standards and setbacks from surface waterbodies?
A. I believe it does, yes.
Q. And in establishing the 1600 metres in the MDP, did the County of Vulcan have regard for the fact that $A O P A$ is there to address that very issue?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: During the public -- the public hearings, open houses, and the consultation, they would have been -- they would have been referred. So I would say that they would have looked at all of the provincial standards from various bodies and then made a decision accordingly.

I realize that all those numbers might not match identically, but I believe, under the MGA, they would have been able to make a decision that works for their
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area as opposed to just a general legislation. But, once again, this was February of 2012, before my time on council.
Q. Thank you. And the colony, in its submission to the Board, suggested that there is not a similar exclusion zone setback on the Willow Creek side. Do you have any understanding as to whether that is true or not?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: That would be a question that would need to be referred to Willow Creek. I could not speak to that.
Q. And is that the kind -- if the County of Vulcan is interested in protecting a surface waterbody, is that the kind of thing that might come up in discussions when an intermunicipal development plan is on the table?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: It definitely would be a topic of conversation, but ultimately every municipality has to make decisions that they feel is in the best interests of their residences.

In this particular IDP, if this was what we identified, that there was no request for either side to change any of their exclusion zones, we primarily just highlighted it in the document because these are areas within the IDP -- sorry, these lands fall within the IDP area between Willow Creek and Vulcan County.
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So they were highlighted, but as far as any changes or requests for changes from either side, there were none.
Q. And, Mr. Schneider, I just want to circle back to the very first question that I asked, and the Board -- the Board, in its decisions, wants to be respectful of municipalities' purposes for establishing its planning objectives and setting those out in its municipal development plan.

And when I asked that first question, it was really because I think the Board is going to struggle at the end of the day understanding why the exclusion zone was established in this instance and what planning purposes and objectives are there, because -- I asked you because I could not find them in the municipal development plan.

Would you agree with me that it's not particularly helpful if it's not in a municipal development plan?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would agree that that is something that would need to be updated because, as I referenced before, referring to all of the rationale and the reasoning that was put into the public hearing notes, there was quite a -- there is quite a bit of reasoning put in there, but $I$ cannot speak to why it was not included into the MDP as well, as I was not on council at that time.
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Q. Thank you.

MR. KENNEDY: Thank you, county. Thank you, Mr. Schneider.

Thank you, Madam Chair. Those are my questions.
THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Graham, we'11 go to you next. Do you have any questions for Vulcan County?

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.
MR. GRAHAM QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. Reeve Schneider, can you tell me how in 2012 your MDP was developed, how you -- I think you've touched on it a couple of times, like, meetings held. How was the input from the public garnered? Or was this a council? Or was this more just a council document, not input from the public?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: Sorry, you were cutting out, but I think I got the gist of your question here, and that was just how the MDP was developed and what process was followed.

So there were -- public input was sought and open houses, there was input that was garnered from -- for example, surrounding villages. There was letters from the Village of Milo, the Village of Arrowwood. Actually even Mr. Cumming from the NRCB is also
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referenced in here. The NRCB was consulted. Alberta Health Services was consulted. The county of Newell was consulted. There's also individual letters from landowners in the area that were also sent in, and council provided responses to those in those minutes. So it was a public process, and then the -- I guess the input that was gathered at that point was then incorporated into the MDP at the time, and that's how that document was created.
Q. Okay. Thank you. One other question. Does this fall within an ESA, this land of the colony's?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: Sorry, we would have to refer -there was an ESA study done there, but I would have to look further into that to get you the proper answer to your question.
Q. Okay, thank you. It was mentioned before about an ephemeral waterbody. Is that part of the -- of what may be an ESA?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would have to refer to that document. We -- we received the same information. That was -- that was an assessment done by the NRCB officer --
Q. Yes.
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: -- during the application there. But I have no -- I have no documentation to prove one
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way or the other. I have not seen any technical study done on this land to either confirm or deny that.
Q. Okay, thank you.

MR. GRAHAM :
That's all, Madam Chair.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Graham.
Ms. Stuart, do you have any questions for the county?

MS. STUART: I do, Madam Chair. Thank you, although a number of them have been covered, so if you'll bear with me while I scan through my notes. I'm assuming that these will be for Mr. Schneider or Ms. Erickson, whoever is appropriate to address each question.

## MS. STUART QUESTIONS THE PANEL:

Q. I am certainly recognizing the challenge when we're talking about an MDP that was developed before your time, and perhaps this is Mr. Schneider.

Are you able to speak to what the previous zoning for the quarter under discussion, the potential development site under discussion, what the previous zoning was and why it would have been zoned that way, before the exclusion zone was applied?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I would assume, just based on its location, the majority of the land in Vulcan County is zoned rural genera1. A pretty broad category for
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agriculture-producing 1 ands.
Q. Okay. Thank you very much.

And, again, recognizing, you know, you weren't necessarily there, but do -- further to Mr. Kennedy's point that there's not much to go on in the MDP, but do you have a sense of what specific considerations, if any, were applied to that specific development area that's proposed, or if that area was simply part of the obvious 1600-metre approximate setback?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I have no evidence to suggest that this area was looked at outside of the general area.

Like I said, the exclusion area was applied the same to every waterbody going through Vulcan County. So there's no -- there's no evidence and there was no -- nothing in the public hearing notes to suggest that this area was treated any differently than any other area in proximity to waterbodies within Vulcan County.
Q. Okay. Thank you very much. And, further, I believe you stated that -- again, that rationale, as you've
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know you did mention that you believed in that area of the -- of the proposed CFO that it would be for waterbody protection.

But my question relates to the development side, and can you tell me, what -- what development, other than CFOs, is excluded from that 1600-metre margin that has them kind of uniformly placed across the county boundary?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: So we do have setbacks from waterbodies for other types of development, but in the MDP, this is specifically referenced as CFO exclusion zones just because that is independently handled in the MGA in 632 and 633.

So this was just in reference to CFO exclusion zones, but we do have other setbacks that would apply to -- if you were going to build a house near the water, that would fall within our land use bylaw. Those setbacks would be contained in that document.
Q. Okay, thank you.

MS. STUART:
Actually, Document Manager, can I
Q. So in this section entitled "Confined Feeding Operations," we see that paragraph right at the top above the photograph. And I believe it is the -- let's
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see, the second -- the sentence is: (as read)
"The preservation of agricultural
lifestyle is promoted and maintained
through the operations --"
So it's the next one that I'm thinking of: (as read)
"The potential issues caused by CFOs may
be mitigated through long-range planning
so these nearby settlements can still
enjoy the rural lifestyle of the
county."
Mr. Schneider, can you speak to what potential issues caused by a CFO that could be mitigated through long-term planning that you believe that statement may refer to?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe issues within the county's purview would be things like transportation. Also, of course, you know, proximity to res -- or, sorry, urban areas.

I think it's quite a general statement there just to try to mitigate any of these issues that might come up. But, obviously, the NRCB does handle most of the approvals, but local issues like setbacks, traffic, things of that nature, do come to a council and they work with the CFOs to try to mitigate, you know, impacts on the area and any neighbours.
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Q. Okay. Thank you for that.

So if you're thinking of some of those potential issues like transportation, for example, what are the differences that you see inherent in CFOs that would be different from, let's say, a more extensive agricultural operation?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I guess just to restate your question there, it's what's the differences between a smaller CFO and a larger CFO as far as impacts go? Is that where you're going?
Q. Yeah, I think so. I think when that statement in the MDP says "potential issues caused by CFOs can be mitigated," what would be the potential issues caused by CFOs that would require mitigation through long-range planning that would be different than say a non-CFO agricultural operation with respect to what the MDP is trying to get at here?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yeah. The statement says, you know, some of those issues may be mitigated.

One of the biggest ones is traffic. You know, our road systems in Vulcan County are older, so we typically do try to work with any operator or any new operator to make sure that our road system is able to handle it. We don't want to -- we don't want to ruin the infrastructure because that doesn't benefit county
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residents or the operators.
So, typically, our public works department is quite involved in these applications working with the -- working with the applicant to try to, you know, come up with the best routes to get their product in and out and -- you know, that's typically one of the biggest things.

As well as our development department, obviously, will work with them just to make sure that any other setbacks are met in -- that's usually in proximity to roads and quarter lines and things of that nature.

But those are typically the issues that we handle at a local level, and other things, you know, like odour and things like that are handled at NRCB level, and so not necessarily anything that the county can directly mitigate with the operator. It goes, of course, to a higher body.
Q. Okay, thank you. Thank you for that.

I'm not sure -- we can bring up the exhibit if you like, but you may recall from my questions earlier, when we looked at the technical document, we saw the photo of the site of the proposed development. Do you recall that?

And there it is because --
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: Yeah, there we go.
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Q. -- people can just read minds and find those things, so.

We've talked about the topography as described by the approval officer both in this document and by Little Bow, that they would characterize that topography as flat. Would you disagree or agree with that?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I have no firsthand knowledge of the site, and I have -- I have no documentation in my possession to prove one way or another.
Q. Okay. Fair enough. Thank you.

You referred to in -- I think in your -- some of your questions about whether a third-party environmental review had been undertaken for the site.

Can you tell me what your understanding of the requirements are with respect to an environmental review outside of the technical requirements driven by AOPA?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: It was a general question in regards to the NRCB officer's assessment that there were areas that were sloping towards the river there in the application. We were just asking if there was any further documentation that we could review showing -showing one way or another as -- you know, we're looking at pictures and are unable to tell the terrain,

J. SCHNEIDER, A. ERICKSON, R. DYCK

Questioned by The Chair
so as far as getting any -- we're just looking for some additional information on that, because $I$ do not have any firsthand knowledge -- or I have not been on the site here, so $I$ can't offer anything from my personal experience.
Q. Sure. I appreciate that. And, of course, as one -this is the last question -- Little Bow had, I believe, addressed the question that you have in Exhibit 8, page 2 of 3 , and $I$ know if $I$ speak slowly enough that exhibit is just going to pop up, as it does.

So, in Number 4, about the Setback Distances. Has that question now been answered for you?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: Question Number 3?
Q. Number 4. I apologize.
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe, yes.
Q. To your satisfaction?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: It's been answered, yes.

MS. STUART: Madam Chair, those are my questions. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Stuart.

> I have a couple of questions.

THE CHAIR QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. The first one flows, I guess, from one of Ms. Stuart's questions. She had asked, are there any other developments that have setbacks from waterbodies.
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And, Mr. Schneider, you had commented, well, houses is one, and I would expect that perhaps the reason for that is to keep them out of harm's way from flooding or possible erosion.

But, anyway, the question that $I$ have following up on Ms. Stuart is, are you aware if there are any other types of developments besides CFOs that have setbacks from waterbodies for environmental reasons?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I believe any development around a waterbody would have setbacks, and we would refer to Alberta Environment for their comment.

Development around lakes and rivers, it would be referred to them for the appropriate environmental setbacks, but each application is referred to the appropriate body if it is in proximity to water.

So I use houses as an example, but I would, I guess, further clarify that it would be any type of development around water would have a setback, and that would be laid out in our land use bylaw, but it would also -- it would also be referred to Alberta

Environment if there was any additional setbacks that they would be looking for because of environmental reasons or anything that they would put out.

And then the planning Commission would make a decision based on the information that they had
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received from Alberta Environment and in conjunction with the land use bylaw.
Q. Okay, thank you. And the other question that $I$ had has to do again with your notification method, and agreed that this would have gone back to 2012 and sooner -and earlier because of how you would have notified people in advance of the open houses and such for the MDP .

And you had explained to us that, at that point in time, mailouts were sent to ratepayers, as well as notification in the local paper for a couple of weeks, that sort of thing.

And I guess -- I'm sensing a bit of a disconnect here, and I don't know if you can answer this or if you would care to presume or make a comment on it, but I find it very curious, the impact that this CFO exclusion zone that ended up in the 2012 MDP certainly directly affected, and continues to affect, Little Bow Colony, and yet they didn't comment on that potential CFO exclusion zone for the 2012 MDP.

And my familiarity with Hutterite colonies is that they typically do expand their CFOs.

I guess, does the county have any comment or anything to kind of -- I guess I'11 just say, with regard to that, to help me perhaps understand the
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disconnect that I'm sensing here?
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: As far as who chose to comment, I can't speak to that. I would suggest that, based on the letters that were sent in through the open house process, that landowners did -- some did choose to comment.

I would say from experience of eight years on council, we've held many open houses over the years, and I would say that a vast majority of ratepayers typically do not comment on, you know, plans like this. They are -- that's just kind of the way it is. I guess unless you feel that it's, you know, really affecting you, you might -- you might not or you might not look into it. It is a large document.

So I would say that there was a lot of input put into it from different bodies and members of the public, and I can't speak why Little Bow or -- would have not commented on it, but it was open to public comment in, I guess that would have been -- it would have started -- this process would have started late 2011 and gone into -- I believe just the dates on these are, you know, beginning of 2012 is when a lot of the letters were sent in and the public hearing was held.
Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Schneider.
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: Sorry, I'11 just let our manager
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of development services supplement that question, if that's all right.
Q. Yes, please.
A. MS. ERICKSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to point to the MDP, it does have a section on public participation on page 2 of the municipal development plan document. It does provide a brief summary of just what was undertaken by the county and it discusses a direct notification by letter, newspaper advertisements, the holding of an open house, and the holding of a public hearing. Thank you.
Q. Okay. Thank you, Ms. Erickson.

THE CHAIR:
And that's it for questions from me.

So, Vulcan County, you now have an opportunity to submit redirect evidence if you would like.
A. MR. SCHNEIDER: I don't think we've really got a whole lot to add at this point.

I guess as far as referral letter, this referral was for a new barn and not an upgrade of an existing barn. I realize that it's going to be replacing a barn, but it was a new one, so I believe that's why the questions were sent on behalf of the NRCB.

We do receive expansion requests for additional capacity on existing facilities on a -- you know, on a
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somewhat regular basis.
I think that would be the only clarification $I$ would point out on this one, is that our comments were in reference to a brand new barn. This wasn't in reference to upgrading of an existing facility.

But other than that, I think we've covered our points here and I'11 just -- I'11 allow our manager of development and planning or our planning advisor, Mr. Dyck, if they have anything further they would like to add before we close.
A. MS. ERICKSON: Not from me. Thank you.
A. MR. DYCK: Madam Chair, I would say just one or two things quickly.

I think -- you know, it may be obvious, but the approach with the 2012 MDP, this represents the first time the county addressed CFOs. It's the first MDP the county had since AOPA came into place. So it's the first look at this.

And so I think it made sense that we attempted to approach things consistently, at least with respect to
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industrial developments within the rural industrial district to be set back 1 mile from environmentally significant areas, which generally correspond with river valleys.

There was another point I was going to make here. I'm just trying to recall.

I think the other thing I was going to say was -and the south -- the south office of the NRCB has communicated to us in the past that one of the best ways to go about establishing municipal land use provisions is through exclusionary zoning, exclusionary zoning because it's very clear, it's a hard yes or no, and that's typically been the approach in the region, not just in Vulcan County, as to how to go about establishing municipal land use provisions. There's no tests or conditions; it's a yes or no.

I think what we've identified with Vulcan County in the past year or two in doing all these new IDPs is that that may not be the best route moving forward for the county.
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or 35,000 head feedlot. So that approach in its nature is limiting and challenging.

So I think we may be looking to look at things a little differently in the future, but as it stands right now, I think the county's concerns is that we want the laws to be applied fairly and consistently as much as is possible and reasonable.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Dyck.
Mr. Schneider, does that complete the redirect evidence from Vulcan County?

MR. SCHNEIDER: Yes, it does. Thank you.
THE CHAIR: Okay. So we do give other parties an opportunity to ask any questions they may have on the redirect.

So I'11 start with Little Bow Colony. Do you have any questions for Vulcan County?

MR. HARRISON: We have no further questions. Thank you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.
Ms. Vance, Field Services?
MS. VANCE: Just one second. Yes, we do not have any questions. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, thanks.
Mr. Kennedy?
MR. KENNEDY:
I have no further questions.

Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Graham?
MR. GRAHAM
The mouse didn't work. No questions at this time. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you.
Ms. Stuart?
MS. STUART: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have no additional questions, and thank you so much for the responses previously.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. And I have no additional
(PANEL STANDS DOWN)
THE CHAIR:
So the next section that we have is rebuttal evidence from Little Bow Colony.

Mr. Harrison, do you expect that you will have some rebuttal evidence?

MR. HARRISON:
Little Bow has no further evidence.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. So we're at the point now where we're at closing arguments, and we're at the point now where it's also noon.

So I am going to suggest that perhaps we take a lunch break. It will give parties a chance to digest the information, prepare their closing oral arguments, and then when we resume, it will be closing arguments.

The other thing we could do is just continue on with closing arguments and adjourn the hearing.

So I am -- I guess I'11 just kind of canvass for what your wishes are.

And we'll start with Little Bow Colony. What would you prefer?

MR. HARRISON: I think we would like to go into closing arguments, but $I$ know everyone is probably getting hungry, so I'm a little sensitive to that.

THE CHAIR:
Vulcan County, what would you prefer?

MR. SCHNEIDER: We would ask to continue into closing arguments.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. It looks like that's what the preference is, and certainly our stomachs may be feeling a bit empty, but if that's what people would like to do and that's great. We will then proceed into closing arguments.

Little Bow Colony, you're up first.
MR. HARRISON: Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you again, Panel members. We certainly appreciate the opportunity to be able to make submissions in front of this Board today.

I want to really kind of start my submissions -- I don't think it's going to be much of a surprise -- but
really focused on the Board, the reviews decision, and how it wanted to proceed today. And that's by looking at what I'll term as the "sources of discretion" that this Board has to approve this review.

And in my submission those two sources of discretion really come from -- the first comes from the interpretation of the municipal development plan, in conjunction with the intermunicipal development plan.

And then the second source of discretion, as we noted in the Board's decision, was from Section 25.4(g) of $A O P A$.

And I'd like to take the Board through my submissions on those two sources, because I think that each provides an independent mechanism for this Board to approve of my client's application for an expanded CFO .

And I'11 start with the first source, which is the interpretation of the municipal development plan and the intermunicipal development plan.

And what I would like to do, again, with your permission, Madam Chair, is just pull up, if you would grant me that indulgence, the side by side of the MDP and the IDP.

THE CHAIR:
Sure. We've seen these already, so I'11 certain1y...

MR. HARRISON:
So we should have here the municipal development plan on the left-hand side, and I'11 show you... it is the municipal development plan, and on the right-hand side the IDP between Vulcan County and the MD of Willow Creek.

And as I noted in my cross-examination of Mr. Schneider, Reeve Schneider, there is a discrepancy between -- there is a discrepancy between the CFO exclusionaries, as they are stated in both the MDP and the IDP. And I would characterize it as being, the MDP is somewhat more restrictive, whereas the IDP has an allotment for operations that are looking to expand, and that are looking to expand with an eye to mitigation as well.

And if we look at first the MDP policy at Clause 4.1 there, the - although it does say that existing CFOs are not permitted to expand, it does at the same time one breath later, in the second sentence, note that: (as read)
"...although new CFOs and expansions to

And my submission on this point is that what this Board is going to first look to grapple with, in my estimation, is whether what my clients are looking to do is -- would meet the requirement of an improvement and thereby -- with respect to the maintenance and/or environmental protection of the existing CFO.

Now, I think that that's important to qualify because if this Board does find that my clients are improving their existing CFO and that the improvement wil1 meet certain environmental enhancement, environmental standards, and maintenance standards, then I would submit that they will fall within Policy 4.1 and the allotment in the MDP to be able to expand that CFO.

And when we're interpreting legislation such as municipal development plans, which is a legislative enactment, rights that are granted to parties, or provisions that remove rights to parties such as an exclusion zone, have to be read with an eye to minimize the rights that are being taken away. They have to be read with the idea that, when you are taking away rights that would otherwise be granted to citizens or individuals, then those read downs (phonetic) need to be read strictly, and that is what $I$ would submit ought to be read here.

There does appear in the MDP on the base of it a
distinction between, yes, we're not going to allow any expansion of CFOs, but if you are maintaining or improving your CFO or upgrading it, then you are allowed to -- then you are allowed. Then that is an allowable act.

And when we determine whether my client meets the condition that is established here as to whether they are maintaining and upgrading their facilities, the uncertainty that is, I would say, endemic to Clause 4.1 of the MDP ought to be read in my client's favour.

And that becomes more evident, I would submit, when you see the side by side with the IDP. And the IDP Section or Clause 4.3.4 is equivalent to Clause 4.1 in the MDP, and Clause 4.3 .4 reads that: (as read)
"Expansions are permitted insofar as
those expansions will assist in reducing the negative impacts."

And I would submit that from my client's evidence today, that is clearly what is happening, that the expansions are there to pay for upgrades to animal welfare, the expansions are there to pay for enhanced environmental features, the expansions are there in order to maintain this CFO, to maintain this CFO with respect to inflationary pressures, and to make this CFO a more efficient operation.

Now, as I noted in my cross-examination of Reeve Schneider, the MGA does speak to conflicts between MDPs and IDPs.

And with your permission, Madam Chair, I could pull up the section of the MGA so that we could review it, and it is Section 638(3) of the MGA.

THE CHAIR: Mr. Kennedy, can you advise on that?

MR. KENNEDY:
Yes. We11, by all means.
Statutory references, we can introduce. I'm hoping Mr. -- there, he has it, which is far quicker than I could find it. Thank you.

MR. HARRISON:
Thank you.
So when AOPA references municipal development plans in the legislation, what it does is it references it by source to the Municipal Government Act, and the Municipal Government Act does not define a municipal development plan.

What a Municipal Government Act does is it defines statutory plans generally. And you'll see hear that

And if you look at the consistency of plans clause, which is 638 and sub (3) of that clause, it reads: (as read)
"An intermunicipal development plan
prevails to the extent of any conflict or inconsistency between a municipal development plan, an area structure plan or an area redevelopment plan...in respect of the development of the land to which the conflicting or inconsistent plans apply."

So if we look back here at the IDP, it is clear that there is, at the very least, an inconsistency. And I would submit that that was, at least, acknowledged by Reeve Schneider during cross-examination, that there is an inconsistency between these two plans, if not an outright conflict. One appears to prohibit expansions, where the other permits expansions given certain qualifications.

I would submit that, given that the IDP is granted preference over the MDP with respect to conflicts, that the IDP is the plan that this Board ought to be applying as it pertains to my client. And there was no contradictory evidence before it by any party that what my client is doing here is upgrading and maintaining
this facility and this CFO operation for environmental stewardship for animal welfare and to pay for the costs relating to those upgrades.

I think that when we go through the MDP as well -and I see that this was a point that perhaps Mr. Kennedy was alluding to in some of his questions, we have objective sections within the MDP. And purpose sections within the statute are relative to the guiding light for the interpretation of a statutory object.

Of course, this is a legislative instrument, and so
I would submit that the same interpretation ought to be granted in this case. And when we look at the objective underlining the municipal development plan, what we have here is a real desire to uplift the community. Not to prevent, but to enable.

And if we look through it, for example: (as read)
"To protect good quality agricultural
land while allowing for subdivision
development to occur for a variety of
uses as specified in the land use

You heard my client's testimony today that the only other available site to this colony was agricultural 1 and.

And so for this Board to prevent the approval from
going forward and to develop that agricultural land in a way that removes that production, it's not going to be beneficial and it's not going to be, I would submit, in coherence with the clear objection -- or objective of the municipal development plan.

We keep going through the objectives here. To encourage development opportunities within Vulcan County, to expand the county's assessment base while limiting conflicts with existing land uses.

My client noted that there is no conflict with respect to this CFO. There is not a single party that has raised an objection to this CFO including, it would appear, Vulcan County itself.

And then the second last sentence of the objective is "to continue to promote intermunicipal cooperation." And if we continue through the objective of the MDP, or the guiding light of the MDP, we have another provision. It's page -- pdf page 28, page 22 of the MDP. It discusses the idea that intermunicipal cooperation between districts is a real essential point to this municipal development plan. And that provides further credence to my submission that the IDP ought to be applied over any conflict with the MDP.

When you have an MDP that is focused very heavily on intermunicipal cooperation, which is a laudable goal
for this County, then that ought to be elevated by this Board and not disregarded by ignoring the idea or the fact that the IDP, the Willow Creek IDP, does allow for expansions to an existing CFO.

And then the last provision, which is the provision of the IDP that I think there is some relevance, is page 29 of the pdf, which is page -- sorry, 19 of the IDP. And Clauses -- Clause 5.2.8 establishes what I would term as "an indication of preeminence of the IDP over the MDP." It reads: (as read)
"A newly proposed Vulcan County
statutory plan (excluding a Municipal
Development Plan) or amendment that will
have an impact on the Plan Area shall be referred to the M.D. of Willow Creek

No. 26 for comment prior to a public hearing."

When we look through planning with counties generally, and we include in intermunicipal cooperation clauses that require those planning documents to be referred
again. I submit that both permits for development of CFOs and the expanding of CFOS. I would acknowledge that the development under the IDP is more restrictive, but it still permits for that development, whereas in the IDP, the ability to expand an existing CFO is read directly into the legislative instrument itself.

In either case, this expansion is required so that the colony can have sufficient funds to be able to maintain these operations.

The question was posed in cross that how would the colony react to the situation where this application were to be denied. And the response by Mr. Hofer was unequivocal in that the operation would not be viable in the long run. And I don't think that that was the intent of either the MDP or the IDP. I think that when we were looking at elevating people, it is not to close down operations but to raise them up and improve them, not only for the betterment of the environment, but also the betterment of their own individual community.

Now, in that submission, as I noted, was the other aspect of this Board's discretionary power, and that's with respect to Section $25(4)(\mathrm{g})$ of $A O P A$.

I won't pull that up on the screen because -- I could pull it up on the screen, Madam Chair, if you would find it beneficial too.

1 THE CHAIR:
MR. HARRISON:
(as read) basis.

Sure. Please do.
So Section $25(4)(\mathrm{g})$ provides that:
"In conducting a review, the Board must have regard to, but is not bound by, the municipal development plan."

And there is some statutory interpretation -- or some jurisprudence on this provision, and that comes from the 2011 Alberta Court of Appeal decision in Grow North Inc. v. Alberta NRCB, and I can provide you with the citation of that. It's 2011 ABCA 236.

And in that leave to appeal decision, the Court held, and confirmed, the test under Section 25(4)(g), which was that: (as read)
"The issue that the Board has to grapple
with is whether there is a compelling
argument to override an existing
municipal development plan."
So I started off my submissions with outlining that by approving this expansion to the existing CFO, this Board is not going to override the municipal development plan. And I walked the Board through my submissions on that

But I would submit that, separate and apart from that argument, insofar as this Board finds that the
expansion to the existing CFO does override a municipal development plan , then I would submit that there is compelling reasons to override the MDP that we've just looked at.

Now, the arguments that I want to present are fourfold. First, that there's a conflict with the IDP such that that is a compelling reason unto itself to override an existing MDP.

Second, that lack of notice or participation by my client and in the municipal development process is another compelling reason.

Third, that my client has met and exceeded all other requirements, including setbacks, and that will go to also the environmental improvements that my client is going to be making with this expansion application.

And, finally, that expansion is necessary to pay for modernization of this facility and this confined feeding operation for environmental reasons, as well as welfare and comfort reasons for the animals. And that is a compeliing reason to permit the expansion to proceed.

But I would also -- after hearing Vulcan County in cross-examination, I would add a fifth ground, and that is that there is no opposition, not even alluded here from Vulcan County itself, to my client's CFO
application.
The question was posed to Vulcan County as to whether they are taking a position on it, and the answer that I heard was that they were not, but that they could not call old council to determine whether to waive any objection to my client's CFO.

And I go through those five reasons -- I'11 skip over the first because that involves the conflict with the IDP, which $I$ would submit is a compelling reason to override a municipal development plan. We've already looked at that in my initial submission.

The second, I would note that the lack of notice that my client received, and the participation of the MDP process, really harkens back to how my client came to be at its current location.

They left their colony in Willow Creek in good faith, and they did so for the betterment and improvement of 1 ives of many farmers and ranchers in southern Alberta who benefited from the project, the Twin Valley Dam project.

When they came to their current location, their CFOs were all grandfathered in. And obviously at that juncture there was no CFO in place because neither the MDP or the IDP had been approved by council.

I would submit that to impose an IDP and an MDP,
and given the history that my client has faced in moving to the new location, that the history that my client has faced and the challenges involved in moving to that new location, that care ought to be granted in determining whether this is a circumstance in which the MDP may be overridden.

You heard from my client repeatedly that every requirement is going to be met in this case, and the CFO that they are planning to expand is going to better and improve their operations.

And given that in their former location in Willow Creek, as was noted in cross-examination by Mr. Kennedy, there are no CFO exclusion zones. Given that that is the case, then care ought to be taken in determining whether their participation in the MDP process is a valid ground for determining whether the MDP may be overridden in this scenario, and I would submit that it is, if only given their history and their good faith in coming to the table.

Mr. Schneider provided no first-hand accounts that my clients, who are directly affected property owners, actually had any notice of either the public participation for the MDP, nor did they have any notice that the MDP was coming into place.

And when you have a colony of 100 people who are
moving across county 1 ines to improve, not only your county, but the county that they left behind, I would submit that you want to go above and beyond to ensure that they are provided with the fair chance to comment on issues and circumstances that are going to directly affect them.

As I noted, this is an application that has met and exceeded all other requirements, including setbacks. But I would also say significantly, as I have repeated here a few times already, this is going to make this confined feeding operation better.

If your concern is contamination of waterways, then this CFO is for you because it is going to be moving it half a kilometre from Little Bow River. If your concern is environmental stewardship, then this CFO is also for you because of the automated systems that are going to be employed here, the extended caging that is going to be granted to the hens, both of which are going to mitigate environmental circumstances that are subjecting -- or that are subject and consequences of the CFO operation.

But I would submit that the most compeling reason to grant this approval is because of the consequence of what's going to happen if you do not grant this approval.

As I noted, it was clearly not the intent of the MDP to close down existing CFOs, and my clients are subject to the market, just like everyone in our province is. They are subject to inflationary pressures and rising costs, just like everyone else is. And when those pressures mean that you need to expand your operation in order to pay for change in regulations and a change in regulatory environment, then the consequence of not granting that approval, being that the operation will be terminated, does not accord with either the intent or purpose of AOPA or the MDP and IDP for which this Board ought to be granting due consideration.

And then, in closing, I'1l just note that the lack of opposition to the CFO, even from neighbours who would be subject to it, is telling and ought to be granted due consideration by this Board as well.

And subject to any questions from you, Madam Chair, and Panel members, those are my submissions.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Harrison.
Vulcan County, Mr. Schneider, closing arguments that you may have?

MR. WIEBE: You are on mute.
MR. SCHNEIDER:
Sorry, my apologies. I had a great lead off here, and now I've got to start all over again, but that's technology for you; right?

So I'11 -- Madam Chair, members of the Pane1, I thank you for the opportunity to allow us to comment on this application and go through the process here.

I don't have -- I don't have a lot to add here. Just a couple of final points and thoughts that I will leave.

Mr. Harrison referenced once again council -- my response when I was asked about council's opinion about granting a waiver. I would just like to once again state that Vulcan County was not approached for a waiver. I cannot speak on behalf of council, I'm representing the council's letter and the discussion that council had in regards to this, but we were not asked for a waiver. I cannot speak on behalf of council. I just would like to make that very clear. I'm not -- if that is something that needs to be answered by the Pane1, that would have to go back to council. That's the way -- that's the way the Municipal Government Act and the municipal governance works. I would just like to make that point once again as it was referenced once again by Mr. Harrison in regards to me not answering on behalf of council if a waiver was -- would be favourable.

Also, in the original application there was an adjacent landowner that did submit comment in that.

That was in the first application there. It was from McDougal 1.

I believe as far as this goes, this document has been in place since 2012. Council did their due diligence, and from the public hearing minutes -the public minutes of that meeting, I was shown that consultation was done. I can't speak to why the applicant did not comment at this time, but we did follow our procedure as set out in the MGA for notification and holding our public hearings, so I do believe that the due diligence was done.

Nine years ago, we were all sitting in different chairs, so I can't speak to, you know, as -- I can't say that I personally delivered the letter to them, but our policy is to notify all adjacent neighbours, and I have no reason to believe that that would not have occurred at the time.

As far as exclusion zones, as a council, our mandate is to promote safe and viable communities, water protection is a huge issue, and I believe this council has been very consistent in our decisions to err on the side of caution when anything is around water. These exclusion zones are no different. They have been applied across the entire county consistently, and we have been provided no technical
documentation to suggest that this application would be any different than any others.

We're looking at it as a precedence. We have never been asked for a waiver or to be agreed to a waiver for any NRCB hearing. We simply answer the questions that were asked of us by the NRCB in the April 8th letter that Vulcan County submitted. Those are the answers. And at the time the question was, does it fall within a CFO exclusion zone, and our answer was, yes, it does. So I really don't have anything to add beyond that point.

We've answered -- we've answered the questions. I believe we've justified why we have these. Under the AOPA regulations, it states that counties are able to establish these zones. The MGA also establishes our authority to establish these zones. That is what council of 2012 did, and I will argue that it was done consistently across the entire county.

So I really don't have anything else to add to that. I just once again thank everyone for their time, and I guess if there was anything further, we're happy to answer -- answer any further questions. But thank you for your time.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Schneider.
Mr. Harrison, does Little Bow Colony have reply
argument?
MR. HARRISON:
I do not, Madam Chair. Thank you.
THE CHAIR: Thank you.

So I'll move into my closing remarks.
MS. VANCE:
Madam Chair, this is Fiona Vance with NRCB Field Services. I obviously do not have a final argument to make because we did not participate in the evidence portion.

I suppose I just had a comment on scope, and it addresses Mr. Harrison's first closing argument, which related to IDPs and MDPs, and I suppose that, if the Board were to contemplate making a finding in the context of this decision in relation to how Section 20 of AOPA and Section 638(3) of the MGA interact, as a matter of interpretation of Section 20 of AOPA, I suppose my comment is that, if the Board is contemplating making such an interpretation, I think Field Services would be grateful for an opportunity to participate in submissions on a purely interpretation point.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Vance.
MS. VANCE:
MR. KENNEDY:
Thank you.
Sorry, I don't mean to jump in and complicate things, and I have no idea where the Panel might go on this issue, but just to be clear,

Ms. Vance, would you expect that to be done with written submissions if the Panel were to call on them?

MS. VANCE: Yes, I think from the perspective of Field Services, I would have to seek some instructions from my client before I were to make submissions; and, of course, we would be happy to do them in whatever fashion that would assist the Panel.

MR. KENNEDY:
THE CHAIR:
With that, I will move into my closing remarks.
The Panel would like to thank everyone for their participation in this review process. No doubt the proceedings can be a little intimidating, particularly now that we're in the Zoom world.

To both Vulcan County and Little Bow Colony, I would like to thank both of you for a job well done.

Thank you as well to Field Services for your attendance.

Thanks to Ms. Kaminski and Ms. Taylor, our onscreen document administrators who seem to have things there even before we ask for them.

Mr. Wiebe, our Zoom host, thank you.
Ms. Gerbrandt, our court reporter, Ms. Friend, our manager of Board reviews, and Mr. Kennedy, the Board's general counsel, to all of you, your assistance has

PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED
been essential to the Board for this virtual hearing. We've received a lot of helpful information. The Panel will consider this information in reaching our decision, and we will provide our decision to all parties in the form of a written decision report, the Board's long-standing performance target for issuing its decision within 30 working days, or six weeks of the closing of the hearing, and I would expect that our decision will be completed within that time frame.

Thank you very much, everyone. The hearing is now
(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 12:39 P.M.)
$\qquad$

3 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing pages 41 to 128 are a complete and accurate transcript of the 5 proceedings taken down by myself in shorthand and 6 transcribed from my shorthand notes to the best of my skill 7 and ability.

8 Dated at the City of Calgary, Province of Alberta, on 9 June 29, 2021.

| "Donna Gerbrandt" |
| :--- |
| Donna Gerbrandt, $\operatorname{CSR}(\mathrm{A})$ |
| Official Court Reporter |16

67 ASHLEY KOZAK (For Little Bow Colony)32
89THE CHAIR QUESTIONS THE PANEL57
MR. HARRISON RE-EXAMINES THE PANEL ..... 58
J. SCHNEIDER, A. ERICKSON, R. DYCK (For Vulcan ..... 61
County)
EVIDENCE IN CHIEF FOR VULCAN COUNTY ..... 62
MR. HARRISON CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL ..... 66
MR. KENNEDY QUESTIONS THE PANEL ..... 73
MR. GRAHAM QUESTIONS THE PANEL ..... 87
MS. STUART QUESTIONS THE PANEL ..... 89
THE CHAIR QUESTIONS THE PANEL ..... 96

NRCB LA21011, Volume 1, J une 29, 2021

| 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 2019[1]-18: 22 \\ & 2021[11]-1: 21,2 \end{aligned}$ | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 64:2, 73:6, 75:1, 84:6, } \\ & \text { 110:16, 110:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { afford [2] - 28:25, } \\ 38: 9 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 6:20, 7:16, 7:17, 7:1 |  |  | dable [1] - |
|  | 8:1, 8:3, 8:6, 34:22, | 61 [1] - 129:17 | ct [2] - 11:22, 109:5 | :12 |
|  | 128:9 | $62[1]$ - 129:19 | cted [1]-23:2 | ge [2] - 33:23, 35 : |
|  | 2021-04 [1] - 7:19 | $632[3]-64: 1,81: 24$, | ng [1] - 13:11 |  |
|  | $2022[1]-65: 13$ | 91:13 | ctive [1] - 43:23 | ging [1] - 37:18 |
|  | 21 [1]-69:18 | $633[3]-64: 1,81: 24$, | actively [2] - 50:17 | go [2]-37:23, |
|  | $22[1]-113: 18$ |  |  | 23: |
|  | $23[2]-53: 7,58: 11$ | 638 | actual $_{[1]}-54: 1$ | ag |
|  | $236[1]-116: 11$ 24th |  |  |  |
|  | 24th [1]-8:6 |  |  | 55:14, 70:9, $72: 3$, |
|  | 25(1])(gi3]-115:22, |  | 10, 117:23 | 86:16, 86:18, agreed [2] - 9 |
|  | 116:2, 116:13 |  | 122.4 124:11 |  |
|  | 25,000 [1] - 7:13 |  | 17. | , 7 |
|  | 25.4(g [1] - 106:10 | 7 [2] - 69:16, 69:21 | 28:14, 38:25 | 3:17, 41:2, 41:5 |
|  | 2500 [8]-18:11, | 7.6 [1]-52:20 | addition [2] - 18:12 | 42:3, 42:20, 92 |
|  | 33:11, 34:3, 3 | 73 [1] - 129:21 |  | , 6 |
|  | 34:21, 37:3, | 780-720-2317 | additional [7]-9:18 | 113:1 |
|  |  |  |  | 退 |
|  | [1]-37:9 | 8 | , |  |
|  | $28{ }^{[1]}$ - 113:18 |  | 8:21, 9:17, 10:6, | 3:10, 32:24, 45:6, |
|  | $29[6]-1: 21,2: 5$ | 8[2] - 52:8, 96:8 | 13:17, 14:1, 72:24, |  |
|  | 53:7, 54:17, 114:7 |  | 77:2, 84:16, 89:12 | agricultu |
|  |  | 9:23 | dressed [2] - 96: | roducing [1] - |
|  | 29th ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ | 8th [2] - 61:18, |  | air [2]-44:6 |
|  |  | 9 |  | Alberta [18]-2:1, |
|  | 3 |  | dds [1] - 17:8 | 4:19, 42:11, 42: |
|  |  |  |  | 44:24, 45:7, 88:1, |
|  | 20 |  | 122:25, 123:15 | 97:11, 97:20, 98:1, |
|  | 53:3, 54:16 | $96[1]-129: 24$ | adjourn [1] - 105:2 | 116:9, 116:10, |
|  | 96:9, 96:13, 111:2 | 9:00 [1]-2:16 | ADJOURNED [1] - | 118:19, 128:8 |
|  | $3,000[1]-82: 6$ 30 | A |  | [1] |
|  | 36:14, 127:7 |  | -61:6 | 107:12, 108:1 |
|  | 32 [2]-129:7, 129:8 | a.m [1]-7:25 | adjustment [1] - 28 | allotted [2]-23:6, |
|  | 32-14-25 [1]-6:23 | A.M ${ }^{[1]}-2: 16$ | adjustments [2] | 29:13 |
|  | 35,000 [1] - 103:1 | AAMD\&C ${ }_{[1]}-3: 1$ | 24:4 | allow |
|  | $50[1]$ - 102:25 | ABCA [1] - 116:11 | adjusts [1] - 28 | 101:7, 1 |
|  | 38.1 [1]-52:19 | abilities [2]-35:23, | administrative [1] - | 122:2 |
|  | d [1] - 7:18 |  | 67:11 | allowable [1] - 109:4 |
|  | 4 |  | admi |  |
|  |  | 128:7 | [1]-15:1 |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 4[7]-11: 7,22: 19, \\ 22: 1,36: 14,52: 12, \\ 96: 11,96: 14 \\ 4.1[8]-69: 20,70: 2, \\ 70: 23,769,107: 16, \\ 108: 12,109: 9,109: 13 \end{gathered}$ | able $[21]-13: 24$, $18: 15,21: 25,28: 25$, <br> 37:5, 37:8, 38:9, <br> 38:16, 38.22 63.25 | adopting [1] - 15:17 <br> adoption [1]-50:24 | allowing [1] - 112:18 <br> allows [2] - 18:18, |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { allows [2] - 18:18, } \\ & \text { 19:9 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { alluded }[2]-56: 23, \\ & 117: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $69: 23,74: 15,79: 1,$ $80: 21,84: 25,89: 18,$ | 100:10 | alluding [1] - 112:6 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 70:22, 76:2, 107:16, } \\ & \text { 108:12, 109:9, 109:13 } \\ & \text { 4.3.4 }[5]-69: 22, \end{aligned}$ | 93:23, 105:22,108:13, 115:8, 124:14 | advise [1] - 110:7 | amendment [1] - |
|  | 71:6, 76:3, 109:13,109:14 |  |  | 114:13 |
|  |  | absolutely [7] - | 7:19, 7:24, 8:7 | Amicus [1] - 5:8 amount [3] - 57:18, |
|  | ${ }_{129: 10}^{40}$ - 36:14, 129:9, | 11:12, 18:5, 28:18, | advisor [6] - 32:23, |  |
|  |  | 30:11, 33:6, 38:24, | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 25,33: 1,65: 5, \\ & 101: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 19,82: 18 \\ & \text { amplifies }[1]-44: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $129: 10$40,000$400[1]-34: 20$40 | 50:21 |  |  |
|  |  | accept [1] - 84:5 | advisors [1] - 13:11 | Andy [2] - 4:16 |
|  | 57:16 | acceptable [1] - | Advocacy 5 -40:12, $40: 17,40: 18$, |  |
|  | 400-metre [1] - 27:3 | 68:19 |  |  |
|  | 403-620-8294 [2] - | accessible ${ }_{[1]}-47: 7$ accommodating [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:10, 42:12 } \\ & \text { advocate [1] - } 41: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 27:23, 44:14, 56:19, |
|  |  |  |  | 109:20, 112:2animals [3]-28:15, |
|  | 4:7, 4:8 44 [1] - 91:22 | $-2: 24$ | advocate [1]-41:8 <br> Advocate [2]-63:8, |  |
|  | $46[1]-129: 11$ | accord [1] - 121:10 |  | 44:12, 117:19 |
|  | 484:00[1] | according82:15, $83: 25-$ |  | Anne $[1]-12: 19$ANNE $[1]-12: 20$ |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AER }[1]-75: 16 \\ & \text { affect }[3]-33: 24 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:17 } \\ & \text { 4th }[2]-6: 20,6: 23 \end{aligned}$ | ```accordingly [2] - 28:10, 84:22 accounts [1] - 119:20 accurate [1] - 128:4 acknowledge [1] -``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 98:18, } 120: 6 \\ & \text { affected }[5]-7: 1, \end{aligned}$ | answer [21]-6:14, |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 8:2, 63:3, 98:1 | , |
|  | 5 |  | 119:21 | 73:1, 74:20, 77: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{5 . 2 . 8}[1]-114: 8 \\ & \mathbf{5 2}[1]-19: 13 \\ & \mathbf{5 2 0}[1]-34: 23 \\ & \mathbf{5 2 9}[2]-21: 16,21: 22 \\ & \mathbf{5 7} 7(1]-129: 14 \\ & 58[1]-129: 15 \end{aligned}$ |  | ```99:12 affects [1] - 50:20 affirm [2]-15:23, 40:6 affirmed [6] - 9:3, 9:4, 16:4, 16:6, 40:8, 61:22``` |  |
|  |  | ```115:2 acknowledged [1] - 111:14 acreages [1]-25:11 acres [1] - 29:8 Act[10] - 26:8, 43:2,``` |  | 118:3, 124:5, 124:10 |
|  |  |  |  | 124:22 |
|  |  |  |  | answer |
|  |  |  |  | 48:15, 96:12, 96:17, |
|  |  |  |  | 122:17, 124:12 |
|  |  |  |  | ering [5] |

NRCB LA21011, Volume 1, J une 29, 2021


NRCB LA21011, Volume 1, J une 29, 2021


NRCB LA21011, Volume 1, J une 29, 2021

| 116:4 confined [21]-6:22, 22:3, 22:6, 24:23, <br> 42:17, 42:24, 44:18, <br> 45:5, 45:11, 45:14, <br> 48:16, 48:17, 49:7, <br> 65:16, 70:3, 70:5, <br> 70:25, 71:2, 77:15, <br> 117:17, 120:11 <br> Confined [1] - 91:23 <br> confirm [7]-21:25, <br> 52:18, 52:23, 53:8, <br> 68:5, 68:9, 89:2 <br> confirmed [2]-64:1, <br> 116:13 <br> conflict [11] - 72:3, <br> 72:18, 73:7, 83:16, <br> 83:18, 111:5, 111:17, <br> 113:10, 113:23, <br> 117:6, 118:8 <br> conflicting [1] - <br> 111:10 <br> conflicts [5] - 72:12, <br> 82:25, 110:2, 111:21, <br> 113:9 <br> conjunction [4] - <br> 36:15, 62:19, 98:1, <br> 106:8 <br> connected [1] - 4:12 <br> consecutive [1] - <br> 63:12 <br> consequence [2] - <br> 120:23, 121:8 <br> consequences [1] - <br> 120:20 <br> CONSERVATION ${ }_{[1]}$ <br> - 1:1 <br> Conservation [2] - <br> 2:1, 2:19 <br> consider [5] - $9: 5$, <br> 15:20, 29:5, 37:25, <br> 127:3 <br> consideration [7] - <br> 27:23, 72:11, 72:17, <br> 84:10, 110:25, <br> 121:12, 121:16 <br> considerations [1] - <br> 90:6 <br> considered [2] - <br> 71:16, 71:18 <br> considers [1] - 45:13 <br> consistency [3] - <br> 74:25, 75:5, 111:1 <br> consistent [2] - <br> 76:10, 123:21 <br> consistently [5] - <br> 75:7, 101:20, 103:6, <br> 123:25, 124:18 <br> consists [1]-18:11 <br> constituents [1] - <br> 51:1 <br> constraints [1] - <br> 33:16 <br> construct [1] - 7:11 <br> constructed [1] - <br> 46:6 <br> constructing [1] 24:3 <br> construction [2] - <br> 23:22, 28:18 <br> consultation $[4]$ - <br> 82:17, 84:18, 90:22, <br> 123:7 <br> consulted [3]-88:1, <br> 88:2, 88:3 <br> consumer [3] - <br> 41:15, 43:22, 43:23 contact [1] - 5:22 contained [2] - <br> 69:16, 91:18 | contamination [1] 120:12 <br> contemplate [1] - <br> 125:12 <br> contemplating [1] - <br> 125:17 <br> context [4]-74:16, <br> 74:23, 75:20, 125:13 <br> continue [6] - 38:17, <br> 56:22, 105:1, 105:12, <br> 113:15, 113:16 <br> continued [1] - 20:3 <br> continues [1] - 98:18 <br> continuous [2] - <br> 28:2, 28:3 <br> continuously [4] - <br> 19:5, 28:8, 55:20, <br> 55:23 <br> contradictory [1] - <br> 111:24 <br> control [4]-17:24, <br> 19:5, 44:10, 44:16 <br> controlled [2] - <br> 28:11, 59:12 <br> controlling [1] - 19:3 <br> convening [1] - 81:3 <br> conventional [1] - <br> 27:18 <br> conversation [3] - <br> 65:14, 65:19, 85:17 <br> cooperated [1] - <br> 23:1 <br> cooperation [4] - <br> 113:15, 113:19, <br> 113:25, 114:19 <br> copy [2]-63:8, <br> 78:24 <br> corner [3] - 54:21, <br> 54:25, 55:11 <br> correct [15] - 16:21, <br> 22:5, 26:4, 26:17, <br> 26:23, 28:22, 28:23, <br> 31:23, 41:14, 54:4, <br> 67:23, 67:24, 70:11, <br> 72:8, 82:22 <br> correspond [1] - <br> 102:3 <br> correspondence [2] <br> - 67:1, 67:13 <br> cost [2] - 29:15, <br> 35:11 <br> costly [1] - 28:22 <br> costs [23]-17:11, <br> 17:21, 17:23, 18:2, <br> 18:4, 29:18, 34:10, <br> 34:12, 34:15, 35:7, <br> 36:3, 36:4, 36:6, <br> 36:11, 36:13, 36:22, <br> 38:5, $38: 12,38: 18$, <br> 38:25, 57:3, 112:2, <br> 121:5 <br> Costs [1] - 36:17 <br> Council [4]-40:12, <br> 40:17, 40:18, 42:12 <br> council [31] - 67:2, <br> 67:4, 77:4, 78:6, 80:5, <br> 80:7, 80:22, 80:23, <br> 81:3, 81:16, 81:20, <br> 82:17, 85:3, 86:25, <br> 87:13, 87:14, 88:5, <br> 92:23, 99:8, 118:5, <br> 118:24, 122:7, <br> 122:11, 122:13, <br> 122:15, 122:18, <br> 122:22, 123:4, <br> 123:18, 123:21, <br> 124:17 <br> Council's [1] - 41:11 <br> council's [2]-122:8, <br> 122:12 | ```Councillor [1] - 3:19 Counsel [1]-2:8 counsel [9]-4:1, 9:11, 9:25, 11:21, 14:14, 14:16, 58:21, 75:2, 126:25 counties [2]- 114:18, 124:14 county [39]-12:12, 48:22, 50:16, 51:5, 51:12, 52:15, 52:24, 64:14, 65:15, 66:5, 66:11, 67:8, 74:25, 75:5, 76:17, 79:17, 79:19, 80:2, 80:9, 82:11, 83:15, 87:2, 88:2, 89:7, 91:7, 92:10, 93:25, 94:15, 98:23, 100:8, 101:16, 101:17, 102:20, 120:1, 120:2, 123:24, 124:18 County [80] - 2:13, 3:13, 6:24, 8:4, 9:1, 9:22, 9:24, 10:4, 10:16, 12:10, 12:11, 12:14, 12:20, 12:22, 13:6, 13:12, 15:2, 15:4, 25:23, 30:18, 31:9, 32:4, 42:9, 45:25, 52:17, 58:14, 59:23, 59:25, 61:3, 61:12, 61:19, 62:2, 63:9, 64:7, 64:9, 64:11, 65:25, 66:9, 66:19, 66:24, 67:6, 72:11, 72:17, 73:5, \(73: 15,78: 19,80: 14\), 80:20, 81:7, 81:14, 82:10, 84:15, 85:11, 85:25, 87:7, 89:24, 90:13, 90:18, 93:21, 100:15, 102:14, 102:17, 103:10, 103:16, 105:10, 107:5, 113:8, 113:13, 114:1, 114:11, 114:22, 117:22, 117:25, 118:2, 121:20, 122:10, 124:7, 126:15, 129:18 COUNTY [2]-62:5, 129:19 county's [6] - 48:17, 50:24, 80:11, 92:16, 103:5, 113:8 County's [7] - 10:7, 52:8, 61:17, 62:25, 63:20, 79:23, 83:8 couple [5]-46:2, 87:12, 96:21, 98:11, 122:5 course [11]-28:15, 74:4, 75:6, 75:19, 78:13, 92:17, 94:17, 96:6, 101:22, 112:10, 126:6 court [5] - 5:8, 5:14, 9:3, 11:16, 126:23 COURT [4]-11:9, 67:14, 67:17, 72:14 Court [4]-2:14, 116:9, 116:12, 128:14 cover [1] - 36:10 covered [2]-89:9, 101:6 covers [2]-64:15, 64:23 create [2] - 44:11, 82:1``` |  | 116:12, 125:13, <br> 127:4, 127:5, 127:7, <br> 127:9 <br> Decision [2]-2:20, <br> 6:20 <br> decisions [3] - <br> 85:18, 86:5, 123:21 <br> decrease [1]-39:1 <br> define [1]-110:17 <br> defines [2]-54:21, <br> 110:19 <br> definitely [2]-24:20, <br> 85:16 <br> degree [1] - 55:17 <br> delivered [1] - <br> 123:14 <br> demand [8] - 17:9, <br> 33:20, 34:25, 35:4, <br> 38:1, 39:16, 41:15, <br> 43:22 <br> demonstrating [1] - <br> 71:12 <br> denial [1] - 45:4 <br> denied [4]-7:8, <br> 56:15, 56:20, 115:12 <br> deny [1] - 89:2 <br> department [3]- <br> 72:22, 94:2, 94:8 <br> deputy [1] - 3:13 <br> describe [4] - 24:8, <br> 34:10, 54:23, 55:3 <br> described [2] - 56:8, <br> 95:3 <br> description [1] - <br> 53:21 <br> design [1] - 24:8 <br> designed [3] - 23:6, <br> 54:22, 55:11 <br> designing [1] - 24:3 <br> desire [1]-112:14 <br> Despite [1] - 22:21 <br> despite [1] - 22:24 details [1] - 16:14 <br> determine [6]-47:1, <br> 47:9, 47:16, 47:24, <br> 109:6, 118:5 <br> determining $[4]$ - <br> 78:15, 119:4, 119:15, <br> 119:16 <br> deterrents [1] - <br> 43:14 <br> devalues [1] - 29:24 <br> develop [2]-23:18, <br> 113:1 <br> developed [6] - <br> 27:11, 47:4, 78:22, <br> 87:11, 87:18, 89:16 <br> developing [1] - 27:9 <br> development [85] - <br> 12:16, 12:19, 20:13, <br> 25:18, 29:6, 30:2, <br> 30:21, 45:16, 45:17, <br> 50:13, 50:17, 50:23, <br> 51:6, 62:16, 62:17, <br> 62:18, 63:1, 63:2, <br> 63:11, 65:4, 65:9, <br> 65:11, 66:20, 66:21, <br> 67:22, 69:14, 72:12, <br> 72:13, 72:18, 72:19, <br> 73:7, 73:8, 73:9, <br> 77:13, 77:19, 79:14, <br> 81:18, 85:14, 86:8, <br> 86:15, 86:17, 89:20, <br> 90:7, 90:23, 90:24, <br> 91:4, 91:5, 91:10, <br> 94:8, 94:22, 97:9, <br> 97:12, 97:18, 100:1, <br> 100:7, 101:8, 106:7, <br> 106:8, 106:18, <br> 106:19, 107:2, 107:3, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

NRCB LA21011, Volume 1, J une 29, 2021

| ```108:15, 110:14, 110:18, 110:21, 110:22, 111:4, 111:7, 111:9, 112:13, 112:19, 113:5, 113:7, 113:21, 115:1, 115:3, 115:4, 116:6, 116:18, 116:21, 117:2, 117:10, 118:10 Development [2] - 3:15, 114:13 developments [4] - 96:25, 97:7, 101:24, 102:1 difference [1] - 57:17 differences [4] - 28:14, 57:21, 93:4, 93:8 different [9]-29:10, 29:14, 47:20, 93:5, 93:15, 99:16, 123:12, 123:23, 124:2 differently [3] - 64:10, 90:16, 103:4 difficulties [1] - 4:3 digest [1] - 104:23 diligence [2] - 123:5, 123:11 diminished [1] - 38:13 direct [16] - 6:15, 8:22, 9:1, 9:20, 15:21, 32:25, 46:2, 60:18, 61:3, 61:11, 63:4, 63:5, 66:4, 69:1, 74:5, 100:9 directed [1] - 8:1 directly [8] - 6:25, 8:2, 83:19, 94:16, 98:18, 115:6, 119:21, 120:5 director [2] - 3:14, 4:16 disagree [2] - 55:14, 95:6 disconnect [2] - 98:13, 99:1 discrepancies [1] - 45:7 discrepancy [3] - 75:23, 107:7, 107:8 discretion [5] - 28:12, 45:9, 106:3, 106:6, 106:9 discretionary [1] - 115:21 discuss [1] - 22:4 discusses [2] - 100:9, 113:19 discussion [3] - 89:19, 89:20, 122:12 discussions [4] - 14:16, 40:23, 83:20, 85:13 disregarded [1] - 114:2 distance [3]-51:14, 79:12, 82:8 Distances [1] - 96:11 distances [1] - 52:17 distinction [1] - 109:1 District [2]-6:24, 21:4 district [1] - 102:2 districts [1] - 113:20 document [18] - 4:19, 4:23, 5:1, 21:9, 53:4, 55:9, 78:23, 85:23, 87:14, 88:9,``` | ```88:20, 91:18, 94:21, 95:4, 99:14, 100:7, 123:3, 126:20 Document [9]-4:20, 4:25, 46:20, 52:7, 53:2, 53:5, 53:12, 53:25, 91:20 documentation [4] - 88:25, 95:9, 95:23, 124:1 documents [8] - 8:10, 15:16, 46:14, 68:14, 68:17, 76:24, 77:10, 114:20 done [14]-10:13, 46:25, 47:8, 47:16, 47:23, 69:4, 88:13, 88:21, 89:2, 123:7, 123:11, 124:17, 126:1, 126:16 Donna [3]-2:14, 128:12, 128:13 doubt [1] - 126:12 Doug [1] - 22:9 DOWN [2] - 60:20, 104:12 down [11] - 4:6, 21:13, 31:24, 36:2, 73:25, 74:2, 75:25, 77:24, 115:17, 121:2, 128:5 downs [1] - 108:22 drawn [1] - 79:6 driven [1] - 95:17 drivers [1] - 18:6 driving [1] - 43:24 dry [1] - 49:9 ducks [2]-46:10, 56:11 due [11] - 18:14, 33:15, 36:17, 49:9, 50:10, 57:23, 83:21, 121:12, 121:15, 123:5, 123:11 during [18] - 4:3, 5:12, 10:10, 14:8, 14:15, 14:17, 20:3, 22:25, 44:4, 44:13, 62:8, 77:3, 79:3, 83:1, 83:11, 84:17, 88:24, 111:15 Dyck [8] - 13:7, 13:11, 13:15, 65:24, 74:14, 74:21, 101:9, 103:8 DYCK [8] - 13:10, 62:2, 66:1, 74:12, 74:14, 74:22, 101:12, 129:17 E-R-I-C-K-S-O-N [1] 12:20 Earl [2] - 2:7, 3:11 early [1] - 28:24 easily [1] - 47:7 east [1]-6:23 economic [6] - 17:7, 17:14, 25:21, 43:7, 43:10, 56:7 economical [1] - 33:14 economically [1] - 33:5 economics [1] - 33:7 efficiency [1] - 28:20 efficient [1] - 109:25 efforts [2]-41:4, 42:3``` | ```Egg [1] - 27:17 eggs [1] - 19:10 eight [2]-40:16, 99:7 either [13]-29:9, 34:23, 35:12, 85:21, 86:2, 89:2, 104:11, 114:24, 115:7, 115:15, 119:22, 121:10 elected [1] - 76:23 elevated [1] - 114:1 elevating [1] - 115:16 eligible [1] - 13:2 email [2]-5:23, 7:3 emissions [1] - 28:17 employed [1] - 120:17 empty [1] - 105:16 enable [1] - 112:15 enactment [1] - 108:16 encapsulates [1] - 44:23 enclosed [1] - 59:11 encourage [1] - 113:7 encourages [1] - 6:11 end \([7]\) - 10:25, 11:3, 14:23, 29:17, 37:14, 72:15, 86:11 ended [1] - 98:17 endemic [1] - 109:9 engage \([3]-51: 12\), 65:14, 65:18 engaged [1] - 50:25 engineer [1] - 3:18 enhance [1] - 44:5 enhanced [2] - 27:19, 109:21 enhancement [1] - 108:10 enjoy [1] - 92:9 ensure [3]-5:14, 36:8, 120:3 ensuring [1] - 44:5 entered [1] - 9:5 entertain [1] - 14:9 entire [7]-8:12, 24:1, 34:4, 34:5, 82:9, 123:24, 124:18 entirety [1] - 17:15 entities [1]-75:15 entitled [1] - 91:23 Environment [3]- 97:11, 97:21, 98:1 environment [9] - 19:3, 19:6, 28:1, 36:6, 38:11, 39:17, 58:1, 115:18, 121:8 environmental [39] - 3:9, 26:25, 27:1, 27:2, 28:16, 28:21, 29:1, 35:19, 35:25, 41:14, 43:18, 44:10, 44:16, 47:15, 47:19, 47:20, 47:21, 47:23, 49:1, 49:15, 57:17, 57:21, 58:15, 71:15, 95:14, 95:16, 97:8, 97:13, 97:22, 107:24, 108:6, 108:10, 108:11, 109:21, 112:1, 117:14, 117:18, 120:15, 120:19 environmentally \({ }_{[2]}\) 59:11, 102:2``` | environments [1] 44:5 ephemeral [4] - <br> 54:21, 54:25, 55:15, 88:17 equivalent [1] 109:13 <br> ERICKSON [6] - <br> 12:18, 62:2, 65:8, <br> 100:4, 101:11, 129:17 <br> Erickson [5] - 12:19, <br> 65:23, 76:19, 89:12, <br> 100:12 <br> erosion [1] - 97:4 <br> err [1] - 123:22 <br> erred [1] - 76:11 <br> ESA [3] - 88:11, <br> 88:13, 88:18 <br> especially [1] - 20:11 <br> essential [2] - <br> 113:20, 127:1 <br> essentially [4] - <br> 9:15, 23:21, 24:13, <br> 35:11 <br> establish [6] - 23:17, <br> 75:9, 76:8, 79:1, <br> 124:15, 124:16 established [13] - <br> 19:18, 19:23, 23:15, <br> 24:25, 26:3, 62:15, <br> 70:4, 71:1, 74:6, <br> 78:10, 79:4, 86:12, <br> 109:7 <br> establishes [3] - <br> 84:11, 114:8, 124:15 establishing [7] - <br> 48:22, 74:3, 78:1, <br> 84:14, 86:6, 102:10, <br> 102:15 <br> establishment [1] - <br> 77:20 <br> estimation [1] - <br> 108:3 <br> evenly [1] - 64:13 <br> events [1] - 51:13 <br> eventually [2] - <br> 33:24, 38:17 <br> evidence [37]-8:23, <br> 9:1, 9:2, 9:5, 9:9, <br> 9:14, 9:15, 9:16, 9:20, <br> 9:23, 9:24, 12:12, <br> 12:17, 12:22, 14:18, <br> 15:22, 30:3, 58:6, <br> 59:20, 60:19, 61:3, <br> 61:12, 61:21, 65:24, <br> 66:4, 66:19, 90:10, <br> 90:14, 100:16, <br> 103:10, 104:14, <br> 104:16, 104:18, <br> 109:18, 111:24, <br> 114:22, 125:8 <br> EVIDENCE [2] - <br> 62:5, 129:19 <br> evident [1] - 109:11 <br> evidentiary [2] - <br> 8:11, 8:22 <br> exactly [2] - 37:19, <br> 76:13 <br> examination [5] - <br> 107:6, 110:1, 111:15, <br> 117:23, 119:12 <br> EXAMINES [12] - <br> 16:7, 32:19, 40:9, <br> 46:3, 58:10, 66:14, <br> 129:6, 129:8, 129:10, <br> 129:11, 129:15, <br> 129:20 <br> examining [1] - 81:5 <br> example [15]-16:18, <br> $18: 3,28: 4,28: 17$, | ```29:7, 31:24, 36:18, 40:22, 42:1, 43:16, 87:23, 93:3, 97:16, 101:25, 112:16 exceed [4]-25:15, 41:4, 42:3, 45:15 exceeded [3] - 42:23, 117:12, 120:8 exceeding [2] - 41:12, 43:22 excel [1] - 41:6 except \({ }_{[1]}\) - 21:5 exception [1] - 80:3 exclude [1] - 14:6 excluded [1] - 91:6 excluding [1] - 114:12 exclusion [71] - 22:7, 29:4, 30:5, 42:7, 42:17, 43:4, 48:18, 48:22, 62:11, 62:12, 62:15, 62:21, 63:23, 63:25, 64:3, 64:6, 64:8, 64:16, 67:22, 67:25, 68:3, 68:6, 68:10, 68:11, 68:12, 68:13, 70:7, 70:10, 70:20, 70:21, 71:3, 74:6, 76:1, 76:7, 76:8, 77:6, 77:7, 77:20, 77:21, 78:5, 78:10, 78:14, 78:17, 78:18, 79:4, 81:8, 81:12, 81:23, 82:13, 82:19, 83:3, 83:10, 83:13, 83:17, 83:22, 85:5, 85:22, 86:11, 89:22, 90:12, 90:24, 91:11, 91:14, 98:17, 98:20, 107:22, 108:18, 119:13, 123:18, 123:23, 124:9 Exclusion [1] - 71:10 exclusionaries [1] - 107:9 exclusionary [3] - 102:11, 102:24 excuse [1]-61:20 exemption [9]- 78:16, 79:17, 79:21, 79:25, 80:1, 80:15, 80:18, 81:8 exercises [1] - 45:9 exhibit [8] - 4:24, 15:13, 15:15, 15:17, 21:9, 46:21, 94:19, 96:10 Exhibit [13]-21:8, 22:19, 52:8, 53:3, 54:16, 58:12, 69:13, 69:17, 69:21, 71:22, 71:23, 91:21, \(96: 8\) exhibited [1] - 69:15 exhibits [2] - 46:17, 68:24 exist [1] - 45:7 existing [30]-7:10, 20:16, 24:12, 45:5, 56:6, 56:18, 56:21, 68:24, 70:5, 71:1, 71:8, 72:7, 76:7, 82:23, 100:20, 100:25, 101:5, 107:16, 107:21, 107:24, 108:6, 108:9, 113:9, 114:4, 115:5, 116:17, 116:20, 117:1, 117:8, 121:2 expand [19]-7:9, \(9: 7,17: 2,26: 9,38: 21\),``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

NRCB LA21011, Volume 1, J une 29, 2021


NRCB LA21011, Volume 1, J une 29, 2021

| 66:15, 66:18, 67:16, | 58:12, 58:13, 115:12 | 121:11 | indulgence [1] - | introduced [1] - 7:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 67:18, 68:16, 69:1, | HOFER [38] - 12:6, | IDPs [7] - 45:8, | 106:22 | involve [2] - 30:9, |
| 69:6, 69:9, 69:12, | 16:6, 46:7, 46:22, | 72:24, 102:18, 110:3, | industrial [2] - 102:1 | 30:12 |
| 72:16, 73:14, 103:17, | 47:3, 47:25, 48:19, | 110:23, 110:25, | industry [4]-17:4, | involved [13] - 16:24, |
| 104:17, 105:7, | 48:23, 49:3, 49:21, | 125:11 | 35:2, 35:6, 35:15 | $17: 21,17: 23,18: 2$ |
| 105:20, 107:1, | 50:10, 50:19, 51:10, | ignoring [1] - 114:2 | inflation [2]-36:17, | 34:15, 36:12, 41:24, |
| 110:13, 116:2, 125:2, | 51:17, 51:22, 52:25, | imagine [1] - 38:19 | 36:23 | 75:18, 75:19, 76:15, |
| 129:6, 129:8, 129:10, | 53:10, 53:18, 53:22, | impact [5] - 6:3, | inflationary [5] - | 76:17, 94:3, 119:3 |
| 129:15, 129:20 | 54:5, 54:8, 54:14, | 27:2, 59:2, 98:16, | 34:15, 36:4, 36:11, | involves [1] - 118:8 |
| Harrison's [1] - | 55:2, 55:5, 55:19, | 114:14 | 109:24, 121:4 | irrigated [1] - 29:8 |
| 125:10 | 55:25, 56:13, 56:23, | impacts [5] - 26:25, | information [11] | irrigation [1] - 20:12 |
| Harvey [1] - 5:22 | 57:2, 57:23, 58:17, | 45:4, 92:25, 93:9, | 6:2, 6:10, 9:18, 46:25, | isolated [5] - 31:11, |
| HARVEY ${ }_{[1]}-5: 24$ | 58:20, 58:24, 59:3, | 109:17 | 67:20, 88:20, 96:2, | $31: 12,31: 18,31: 19$, |
| head [3]-17:18, | 59:5, 59:8, 59:15, | impacts...to [1] - | 97:25, 104:24, 127:2, | 31:21 |
| 102:25, 103:1 | 129:5 | 71:14 | 127:3 | issue [7] - 4:10, 10:6, |
| Health [1]-88:2 | hold [2] - 2:25, 7:20 | impanelled [1] - | Infrastructure [1] - | 10:19, 84:16, 116:15, |
| hear [5]-2:19, 15:1, | holders [1] - 71:8 | 14:16 | 22:11 | 123:20, 125:25 |
| 15:21, $67: 15,110: 20$ | holding [3] - 100:10, | implicit [1] - 49:17 | infrastructure [13] - | issued [1] - 6:20 |
| heard [4]-33:9, | 100:11, 123:10 | important [6]-6:1, | 19:2, 29:15, 30:12, | issues [13] - 40:24, |
| 112:22, 118:4, 119:7 | holdings [1] - 33:12 | 8:16, 23:16, 40:25, | 33:22, 34:14, 35:11 | 68:21, 92:6, 92:11, |
| hearing [45]-2:25, | home [2]-42:20, | 44:10, 108:7 | 35:14, 36:23, 37:18, | 92:15, 92:20, 92:22, |
| 3:23, 4:4, 4:11, 5:7, | 43:4 | impose [1] - 118:25 | 38:5, 44:9, 47:5, | $93: 3,93: 12,93: 13,$ |
| 5:10, 5:12, 5:25, 6:19, | hope [2] - 10:13, | improve [8] - 19:6, | 93:25 | 93:19, 94:12, 120:5 |
| 7:2, 7:5, 7:20, 7:23, | 65:12 | 26:24, 27:1, 28:19, | inherent [2] - 49:18, | issuing [1] - 127:6 |
| 7:24, 8:11, 8:19, 8:23, | hopefully [1] - 14:19 | 44:9, 115:17, 119:10, | 93:4 | itself [5] - 42:19, |
| 8:24, 13:3, 14:10, | hoping [2]-21:11, | 120:1 | inherently [1] - 6:5 | 113:13, 115:6, 117:7, |
| 15:12, 15:15, 15:19, | 110:10 | improvement [4] - | initial [2]-46:12, | 117:25 |
| 30:24, 31:4, 52:8, | host [2] - 5:2, 126:22 | 27:24, 108:4, 108:9, | 118:11 |  |
| 69:4, 74:1, 76:25, | house [5] - 46:13, | 118:18 | initiate [1] - 51:9 | J |
| 77:24, 78:8, 78:21, | 77:3, 91:16, 99:4, | improvements [9] - | initiates [1] - 51:5 |  |
| 81:15, 86:21, 90:15, | 100:10 | 24:13, 25:17, 27:15, | initiatives [1] - 3:10 | Janet [1] - 5:22 |
| 99:23, 100:11, 105:2, | housed [2] - 38:13, | 28:21, 29:1, 38:10, | innocuous [1] - | janet.harvey [1] - |
| 114:17, 117:22, | 39:10 | 107:22, 117:14 | 102:23 | 5:23 |
| 123:5, 124:5, 127:1, | houses [7] - 84:18, | improves [3] - 43:7, | input [9]-24:3, 24:7, | January [1] - 34:22 |
| 127:8, 127:10 | 87:21, 87:22, 97:2, | 43:18, 44:18 | 24:8, 87:13, 87:14, | JASON [1] - 12:15 |
| hearing.. [1] - 15:19 | 97:16, 98:7, 99:8 | improving [2] - | 87:20, 87:22, 88:7, | Jason [2]-2:13, |
| hearings [4]-32:1, $79: 34: 18,123: 10$ | housing [1] - 23:19 | 108:9, 109:3 | 99:15 | 12:13 |
| $79: 3,84: 18,123: 10$ heat [5] - 28:5, 44:3, | huge [1] - 123:20 | IN [2] - 62:5, | insofar [2] - 109:15 | job [2] - 53:6, 126:16 |
| heat [5] - 28:5, 44:3, $44: 4,44: 11,44: 13$ | humans [1] - 44:5 | inability [1]-56:7 | 116:25 | Joe [1] - 6:21 |
| 44:4, 44:11, 44:13 | hungry [1]-105:9 Hutterian [7]-2:20, | inc [1]-116:10 ${ }^{\text {incentive }} 3$ ] - 17:8, | instructions ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $\begin{gathered} \text { join } \\ 40: 3 \end{gathered}$ |
| heavily [2] - 19:2, | 7:8, 40:12, 40:17, | 29:22, 29:23 | 126:5 | judicial [1] - 6:6 |
| 113:24 | 40:18, 41:10, 42:12 | include [3]-52:17 | instructor [1] - 3:20 | jump [3] - 14:3, |
| held [6] - 16:22, | HUTTERIAN [1] - | 65:16, 114:19 | instrument [2] - | 66:15, 125:23 |
| 87:12, 87:21, 99:8, | 1:10 | included [5] - 62:10, | 112:10, 115:6 | juncture [1] - 118:23 |
| 99:23, 116:13 | Hutterite [5] - 16:11, | 62:17, 63:3, 78:8, | intend [1] - 10:9 | June [11] - 1:21, 2:5, |
| Held [1] - 1:22 | $22: 13,40: 19,40: 21$ | 86:24 | intended [1] - 114:22 | $7: 3,7: 17,7: 18,8: 1$, |
| help [10]-3:22, 4:9, | 98:21 | includes [1] - 15:15 | intent [3]-115:15, | $8: 3, ~ 8: 5, ~ 8: 6, ~ 8: 7, ~$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 6: 15,6: 17,11: 6,18: 4 \\ & 61: 25,74: 20,79: 11 \end{aligned}$ |  | including [6] - $3: 12$, $4: 14,10: 10,113: 12$, | 121:1, 121:11 <br> intention [1] - 79:8 | 128:9 |
| 98:25 |  | $117: 13,120: 8$ | intentional [1] - | $79: 23$ |
| helpful [6] - 11:15, | ice [1] - 60:23 | incoming [2]-17:19, | 76:13 | jurisdictional [1] - |
| 14:12, 80:11, 80:16, | idea [6]-35:22, | 38:7 | interact [1] - 125:14 | 75:12 |
| 86:17, 127:2 | 51:21, 108:20, | inconsistency [3]- | interest [1] - 75:15 | jurisprudence [1] - |
| helps [1] - 17:10 | 113:19, 114:2, 125:24 | 111:6, 111:13, 111:16 | interested [2] - 51:3, | 116:8 |
| hen [2]-34:24, | identical [1] - 76:12 | inconsistent [1] - | 85:12 | justification [1] - |
| 38:13 | identically [1] - | 111:10 | interests [1] - 85:18 | 78:3 |
| hens [3]-39:7, | 84:24 | incorporated [1] - | interject [1] - 6:13 | justified [1] - 124:13 |
| 39:10, 120:18 | identified [4] - 21:17, | 88:8 | intermunicipal [18] - | justify [3] - 38:23, |
| hereby [1] - 128:3 | 22:25, 85:21, 102:17 | increase [4]-7:12, | 45:16, 62:18, 63:1, | $77: 5,77: 7$ |
| higher [1] - 94:17 | identify [8] - 3:22, | 27:1, 35:4, 43:9 | 65:11, 66:21, 72:13, | Justin [3]-5:3, 5:5 |
| highlight [2]-8:16, | 5:12, 43:15, 49:6, | increased [3] - | 72:19, 73:8, 73:9, |  |
| 9:7 | 74:2, 74:7, 77:25, | 36:13, 37:16, 56:4 | 85:14, 106:8, 106:19, | K |
| highlighted [6]- | 83:15 | increases [1] - 35:1 | 110:21, 111:4, |  |
| 67:5, 68:2, 70:17, | IDP [47] - 22:7, 42:9, | increasing [2] - | 113:15, 113:19, | Kaminski [4]-2:10, |
| 85:23, 86:1 | 63:16, 68:1, 68:3, | 57:18, 57:19 | 113:25, 114:19 | 4:20, 4:22, 126:19 |
| highlighting [1] - | 68:10, 68:13, 69:12, | indefinitely [1] - 19:7 | internal [2]-28:9, | keep [12] - 17:11, |
| 70:16 | 69:18, 69:22, 71:6, | indentation [1] - | 33:22 | 17:18, 33:20, 37:15, |
| Highway [1] - 21:16 | 72:4, 73:3, 74:24, | 53:22 | interpretation [8] - | 37:21, 38:2, 38:8, |
| historical [2]-24:15, | 76:3, 76:6, 76:8, 83:2, | independent [1] - | 106:7, 106:18, 112:9, | 51:12, 97:3, 113:6 |
| 24:17 | 83:11, 85:20, 85:24, | 106:14 | 112:11, 116:7, | keeping [1] - 38:23 |
| history [3] - 119:1, | 85:25, 106:23, 107:4, | independently [1] - | 125:15, 125:17, | keeps [1] - 17:11 |
| 119:2, 119:18 | 107:10, 107:11, | 91:12 | 125:19 | KENNEDY [22] - |
| hit [1] - 61:15 | 109:12, 111:12, | indication [1] - 114:9 | interpreting [1] - | 14:3, 15:8, 48:12, |
| Hofer [19]-11:24, | 111:20, 111:22, | indiscernible [2] - | 108:14 | 48:14, 50:6, 51:24, |
| 12:6, 16:3, 16:10, | 113:22, 114:3, 114:6, | 2:22, 59:2 | intimidating [1] - | 60:8, 61:14, 68:23, |
| 16:16, 21:16, 22:9, | 114:8, 114:9, 114:22, | individual [3]- | 126:13 | 69:2, 69:7, 69:11, |
| 23:9, 32:10, 44:8, | 114:25, 115:3, 115:5, | 80:23, 88:3, 115:19 | introduce [6] - 3:1, | 73:23, 73:24, 76:19, |
| 48:16, 50:13, 51:4, | 115:15, 117:6, 118:9, | individuals [1] - | $3: 5,5: 2,9: 15,13: 8$ | $87: 2,103: 25,110: 9,$ |
| 51:14, 52:10, 52:22, | 118:24, 118:25, | 108:22 | 110:10 | $125: 23,126: 8$ |

NRCB LA21011, Volume 1, J une 29, 2021

| 129:12, 129:21 | laws [1] - 103:6 | 22:3, 24:15, 24:19, | 89:24, 99:9 | :12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kennedy [19]-2:8, | Laycraft [1]-11:22 | 24:24, 25:7, 26:18, | [1] - 53:5 | 88:17, |
| 3:25, 6:15, 6:16, 14:1, | layer [3]-7:11, 7:12, | 26:19, 26:20, 30:13, | manage [2]-22:11, | :20, 100:5, 101:15, |
| 15:7, 48:10, 52:2, | 36:19 | 33:10, 42:10, 43:11, |  | :22, |
| 56:2, 58:22, $60: 7$, | lead [2]-61:13, | 43:13, 51:18, 56:5, | managed [3] - 34:17, | 107:9, 107:10, |
| 68:21, 73:22, 87:5, | 121:24 | 56:18, 58:23, 89:24, | 35:2, 50:8 | 107:15, 108:13, |
| 103:24, 110:7, 112:5, | leaderships [1] - | 118:15, 118:21, | management [2] | 108:25, 109:10, |
| 119:13, 126:24 | 40:21 | 119:2, 119:4, 119:11 | 4:19, 23:7 | 109:14, 111:21, |
| Kennedy's [1] - 90:4 | lease [4]-18:18, | locations [1] - 44:2 | manager [10]-3:7, | 112:4, 112:7, 113:16, |
| kids [1] - 24:20 | 33:13, 33:16, 34:8 | long-range [2] - | 4:1, 11:25, 12:16, | 113:17, 113:18, |
| kilometre [3] - 26:15, | leasing [1]-18:14 | 92:7, 93:15 | 12:19, 16:1 | 3:23, 113:24, |
| 26:22, 120:14 | least [3] - 101:20, | long-standing [1] - | 99:25, 101:7, 126:24 | 114:10, 114:23, |
| kilometres [2]-25:8, | 111:13, 111:14 | 127:6 | Manager [7] - 4:21, | 114:25, 115:15, |
| 31:14 | leave [4]-15:22, | long-term [1] - 92:13 | 4:25, 52:7 | 7:3, 117:8, 118 |
| kind [11] - 55:12, | 47:22, 116:12, 122:6 | look [14]-6:1, 54:18, | 53:12, 54:1, 91:20 | 8:24, 118:25, |
| 57:13, 64:15, 80:12, | left [5]-69:13, | 78:2, 88:14, 99:13, | Managers [1]-53:5 | 119:5, 119:15, |
| 85:11, 85:13, 91:7, | 75:17, 107:2, 118:16, | 101:18, 103:3, | managing [1] - 49:4 | 119:17, 119:23, |
| 98:24, 99:11, 105:3, | 120:2 | 107:15, 108:2, 111:1, | mandate [5] - 40:20, | 119:24, 121:2, 121:11 |
| 105:24 | left-hand [1] - 107:2 | 111:12, 112:12, | 81:19, 81:22, 82:3, | MDPs [5] - 45:8, |
| kinds [1] - 51:13 | legal [2]-4:15, 13:17 | 112:16, 114:18 | 123:19 ${ }^{\text {mandated }}$ [1]-83 | 110:3, 110:25, 125:11 |
| knowledge [4]-- | legislation $[4]-$ | looked [10] - 43:14, | mandated [1] - 83:2 | mean [3]-31:12, |
| $67: 20,79: 21,95: 8$, 96.3 | 25:15, 85:1, 108:14, | 72:22, 72:23, 83:7, | mandates [1] - 73:6 | 121:6, 125:23 |
| 96:3 | 110:15 | 84:20, 90:11, 90:21, | mandatory [2] - | meaningful [1] - |
| Kozak [7] - 12:1, | legislative | 94:21, 117:4, 118:11 | 17:25, 18:1 |  |
| 12:6, 32:14, 32:20, | 108:15, 112:10, 115:6 | looking [23]-13:12, | manual [1] - 19:3 | means [2] - 14:13, |
| 39:24, 56:7, 56:23 | lengthy [1] - 43:10 | 22:20, 64:18, $67: 18$, | manually [1] - 28:11 | 110:9 |
| ${ }_{32} \operatorname{KOZAK}_{[3]}-12: 7$, | Ienient [1]-76:2 | 73:2, 75:8, 76:6, | manure [18]-7:11, | meant [1] - 27:12 |
| 32:18, 129:7 | less [6]-28:13, 39:6, | 76:20, 77:11, 77:18, | 49:9, 49:10, 49:24, 50:5, 50:8, 50:11 | mechanism [1] - |
| L | 79:5 | 96:1, 97:22, 102:24, | 54:3, 54:7, 54:10, | media [1] - 5:20 |
|  | letter [11] - 22:14, | 103:3, 106:2, 107:12, | 54:13, 57:19, 58:1 | meet [6]-17:9, |
| LA21011 [3] - 1:6, | 22:18, 61:18, $33: 20$, | 107:13, 108:3, | 59:2, 59:6, 59:8, | 25:15, 45:14, 56:19, |
| 2:20, 6:20 | 64:24, 80:6, 100:9, | 115:16, 124:3 | 59:14 | 108:4, 108:10 |
| lack [5] - 56:7, 57:17, | 100:19, 122:12, | looks [3]-76:11, | Map [2]-21:11, | meeting [4]-41:11, |
| 117:9, 118:12, 121:13 | 123:14, 124:7 | 79:5, 105:14 | 21:13 | $43: 21,90: 21,123: 6$ |
| ladder $[1]-75: 18$ | letters [4]-87: | lose [2]-29:12, | map [9] | meetings [1]-87:12 |
| ${ }_{\text {lag }}{ }^{[2]}$-10:25, 11:6 | 88:3, 99:4, 99:23 | 30:15 | 21:20, 70:7, 70:11, | meets [2]-49:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { laid [1]-97:19 } \\ & \text { lakes }[1]-97: 12 \end{aligned}$ | level $[7]-6: 7,28: 14$, $44: 14,56: 17,56: 19$, | losing [2]-37:6, | 70:12, 70:13, 71:4, | 109:6 |
| Land [1]-63:19 | 94:13, 94:14' | lost ${ }_{[1]}$ - 24:21 | mapping [2] - 16:15, | 3:15, 41:18, 41:19 |
| land [36]-20:14, | licence [2]-26:6, | lovely [1] - 60:24 | 51:19 | Member [4]-2:7, |
| 25:21, 27:9, 27:11, | 26:10 | lower [1] - 37:14 | margin [2] - 43:9, | 2:7, 11:20 |
| 29:5, 29:9, 29:10, | licences [1] - 20:25 | lunch [2]-10:11, | 91:6 | members [18] - 3:4, |
|  | ${ }_{26}$ licensing [2]-26:5, | 104:23 | margins [2] - 36:16, | $3: 23,4: 18,5: 17,5: 20$ |
| 42:15, 42:20, 47:4, | ${ }^{\text {life }}$ [1] - 82:24 | M | market [7] - 19:9, | 16:1, 17:15, 24:1 |
| 54:1, 75:9, 82:25, | lifespan [1] - 35:16 |  | 37:21, 38:3, 39:14, | 40:13, 40:19, 99:16, |
| 83:15, 83:18, 88:11, | lifestyle [2] - 92:3, | M. D [1] - 114:15 | 39:16, 39:19, 121:3 | 105:21, 121:18, 122:1 |
| 89:2, 89:24, 91:17, |  | Madam [42]-2:22, | marketplace [1] - | memories [1]-24:19 |
| 97:19, 98:2, 101:25, | light [2] | 11:19, 13:5, 13:10, | 39:19 | mention [3] - 13:6, |
| 102:10, 102:15, | 113:17 | 13:20, 15:11, 15:25, | match [1]-84:23 | 41:10, 91:1 |
| 111:9, 112:18, | limited [1] - 76:15 | 21:7, 39:22, 46:18, | material [1] - 52:15 | mentioned [17] - |
| 112:20, 112:24, | ${ }_{113}^{\text {limiting [2] - 103:2, }}$ | 47:11, 48:6, 48:12, | materials [2]-8:11, | 17:19, 19:22, 23:23, |
| 113:1, 113:9 land-use | 113:9 | 52:1, 52:5, 57:6, 58:9, | 8:13 | 24:6, 27:25, 28:16, |
| 83:18 ${ }^{\text {land-use }}$ [2]-83: |  | 61 | 125:15 | 8.72, $31.12,37$. |
| landowner [2] - | 52:21 | 68:16, 73:23, 74:12 | matters [5] - 5:7, | 64:17, $64: 18,68: 13$, |
| 63:18, 122:25 | lined [1] - 59:10 | 87:4, 89:4, 89:8, | 8:21, 13:16, 13:19, | 68:14, 88:16 |
| landowners [3] - | liner [1]-49:11 | 96:18, 100:4, 101:12, | 15:3 | meridian [1] - 6:23 |
| 63:3, lands | lines [3] - 79:9, | 103:18, 104:7, | maximum [1] - 18:19 | met [6]-7:18, 42:23, |
| ${ }_{90}^{\text {lands [2] - 85:24, }}$ | 94:11, 120:1 | 105:20, 106:21, 110:4, 115:24, | McDougall [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 94: 10,117: 12,119: 8, \\ & 120: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| landscape [1] - 41:8 | liquid [1]-50:11 | 121:17, 122:1, 125:2, | McDouga | method [1] - 98:4 |
| Lane [2]-12:3, | list [4] - 15:13, 15:15, | 125:5 | 6:25 | metres [19]-26:13, |
| 41:19 | 15:18, 46:21 | mail [2] - 31:10, 32:5 | MD [4]-26 | 27:8, 29:21, 51:19, |
| language [2] - 69:16, | LITTLE [1] - 1:10 | iling [1] - 63:6 | 26:16, 26:22, 107:5 | 51:20, 52:19, 52:20 |
| 69:17 | lives [1] - 118:18 | mailout [1] - 63:4 | MDP [83] - 30:25, | 56:5, 57:16, 79:5, |
| large [2] - 3:7, 99:14 | livestock[3]-17:2, | mailouts [1] - 98:10 | 31:4, 62:23, 65:12, | 79:7, 79:11, 82:4, |
| larger [4]-34:20, | 44:4, 44:6 | main [2] - 5:18, $21: 6$ | 65:19, 68:10, 68:12, | 82:5, 82:6, 82:12, |
| 83:5, 93:9 | loaded [1] - 5:1 | maintain [6]-56:16, | 69:15, 69:16, 70:2, | 82:18, 84:14 |
| last [14]-10:2, | local [6]-20:13, | 56:17, 56:18, 109:22, | 70:23, 72:4, 72:22, | MGA [15] - 63:10, |
| 11:16, 16:25, 21:9, | 41:1, 43:17, 92:22, | 109:23, 115:9 | 72:25, 73:2, 74:4, | 63:22, 73:10, 78:9, |
| 21:12, 22:20, 25:24, | 94:13, 98:11 | maintained [1] - 92:3 | 74:5, 74:10, 74:23, | 79:2, 81:20, 81:24, |
| 32:24, 33:2, 36:3, | locally [1] - 19:10 | maintaining [3] | 76:2, 76:8, 76:17, | 84:24, 91:13, 110:2, |
| 36:13, 96:7, 113:14, | located [5]-6:22, | 109:2, 109:8, 111:25 | 76:22, 78:1, 78:2, | 110:5, 110:6, 123:9, |
| 114:5 | 21:3, 21:5, 48:17, | maintenance [4] | 78:4, 78:7, 78:11, | 124:15, 125:14 |
| late [1] - 99:20 | 69:18 | 33:18, 107:23, 108:5, | 78:22, 78:25, 79:14, | mid [3]-19:25, 20:5, |
| laudable [1] - 113:25 | location [30] - 19:21, | 108:11 | 84:14, 86:24, 87:10, | 23:14 |
| Laura [2]-2:9, 4:1 | 20:16, 20:18, 20:21, | major [1] - 34:12 | 87:18, 87:21, 88:8, | middle [1] - 21:19 |
| law [1]-75:6 | 21:2, 21:25, 22:2, | majority [3] - 81:3, | $89: 16,90: 5,90: 23,$ | might [14]-49:18, |

NRCB LA21011, Volume 1, J une 29, 2021

| 49:20, 50:18, 74:10, | 3:12, 3:19, 30:18, | 27:12, 27:16, 28:6, | 125:6 | 85:2, 122:7, 122:9, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 75:21, 80:14, 84:23, | 31:25, 45:16, 50:13, | 28:8, 30:12, 30:13, | NRCB's [4] - 5:10, | 122:20, 122:21, |
| 85:13, 92:20, 99:13, | 50:16, 50:23, 51:6, | 35:17, 35:20, 37:4, | 5:18, 8:7, 79:23 | 124:20 |
| 102:22, 125:25 | 52:13, 62:16, 63:2, | 38:5, 38:6, 38:10, | nrcb.ca [1] - 5:24 | One [1] - 111:17 |
| mile [3] - 101:21, | $63: 11,65: 9,66: 20,$ | $38: 25,39: 11,43: 7,$ | nuisance [1]-25:10 | one [46] - 13:6, |
| 101:24, 102:2 | 67:22, 69:13, 72:12, | 43:13, 43:15, 44:8, | Number [6]-7:19, | 13:21, 17:6, 17:17, |
| Milo [1] - 87:24 | 72:18, 73:7, 74:3, | 44:18, 46:5, 51:15, | 52:12, 54:16, 96:11, | 18:6, 22:12, 23:15, |
| minds [1] - 95:1 | 75:9, 77:13, 77:19 | 58:19, 59:13, 70:3 | 96:13, 96:14 | 28:24, 34:14, 41:23, |
| minimal [2] - 25:11, | 77:25, 86:7, 86:14 | 76:8, 93:22, 100:20, | number [11] - | 48:13, 48:15, 49:13, |
| 50:10 | 86:17, 100:6, 102:10, | 100:22, 101:4, | 4:7, 4:13, 4:24, 4:25, | 63:20, 64:21, 66:25, |
| minimize [2] - 6:8, | 102:15, 106:7, | 102:18, 107:20 | 21:22, 34:2, 52:16, | 67:11, 71:25, 72:7 |
| 108:18 | 106:18, 107:2, 107:3, | 119:2, 119:3 | 74:9, 82:16, 89:9 | 72:9, 72:21, 79:15, |
| minimum [1] - 79:7 | 108:15, 110:14, | Newell [1] - 88:2 | numbered [1] - 21:8 | 79:20, 80:23, 81:4, |
| minute [1]-74:9 | 110:17, 110:22, | newly [1] - 114:1 | numbers [3]-7:12, | 83:8, 84:6, 84:9, |
| minutes [10] - 6:17, | 111:6, 112:13, 113:5, | news [1] - 110:23 | 70:1, 84:23 | $88: 10,88: 25,92: 5$ |
| 78:8, 78:21, 82:16, | $113: 21,116: 6$ | newspaper [2] - |  | $93: 20,94: 6,95: 10$ |
| 82:22, 87:21, 88:5, | 116:18, 116:21, | 63:12, 100:9 |  | 95:24, 96:6, 96:23, |
| 90:21, 123:5, 123:6 | 117:1, 117:10, | next [10] - 3:11, |  | 97:2, 100:22, 101:3, |
| missed [1] - 72:14 | 118:10, 122:19 | 12:10, 32:12, 32:13, | object [3]-47:10, | 101:12, 102:9, |
| mitigate [5]-44:7, | municipalities [7] - | 34:14, 46:14, 51:6, | 79:17, 112:9 | 103:21, 107:18 |
| 92:20, 92:24, 94:16, | 41:7, 63:25, 64:3, | 87:6, 92:5, 104:13 | objection [4] - 69:2, | onerous [1] - 43:5 |
| 120:19 | 71:17, 73:4, 75:10, | nine [2]-23:20, | 113:4, 113:12, 118:6 | ones [1] - 93:20 |
| mitigated [4] - 92:7, | 75:14 | 123:12 | objections [1] - | ngoing [1] - 42: |
| $92: 12,93: 13,93: 19$ | municipalities' [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { non [3]-40:23, } \\ & 70 \cdot 17 \end{aligned}$ | $15: 17$ | onscreen [2]-4:19, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { mitigation [2] } \\ & 93: 14,107: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 86:6 municipal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 70:17, 93:16 } \\ & \text { non-CFO [1] - 93:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { objectiv } \\ & \text { 112:12. } 11 \end{aligned}$ | 126:20 onsite [1] - 19:9 |
| MNP [4] - 5:6, 12:2, | 41:2, 64:21, 85:17 | non-governmental | 113:14, 113:16 | open [13] - 9:10, |
| 32:23, 33:1 | must [1] - 116:4 | [1] - 40:23 | objectives [3] - 86:7, | 59:9, 59:10, 77:3, |
| mobile [1]-23:21 | mute [2]-61:16, | non-highlighted [1] | 86:13, 113:6 | 84:18, 87:20, 87:21, |
| models [1] - 41:7 | 121:22 | - 70:17 | obligations [1] - | 98:7, 99:4, 99:8, |
| modernization [1] - | muting [1] - 10:19 | none [2] - 15:19 | $18: 22$ | 99:18, 100:10 |
| $117: 17$ | my.. [1]-69:8 | 86:2 | obliged [1] - 20:6 | operate [1] - 56:22 |
| mod | N |  | 53:15 |  |
| modernizing [1] - |  | North [1] - 116:10 | observe [1] - 5:17 | 17:20, 18:11, 18:22, |
| 44:15 | name [5] - 2:18 | north [1] - 29:8 | observers [1] - 12:25 | $19: 13,19: 14,21: 6,$ |
| modified [1] - 64:22 | $11: 16,11: 21,12: 18$ | note [11] - 10:24 | observing [1] - 13:23 | $22: 4,22: 6,24: 23$ |
| moment [1] - 40:4 | 13:8 | 44:11, 45:5, 52:15, | obsolete [2] - 35:15, | 25:22, 26:3, 26:25, |
| moments [1] - 5:1 | names [2]-11:16, | 53:13, 53:14, 62:20, | 37:20 | 27:6, 27:10, 30:5, |
| monitored [1] - 19:5 | $12: 5$ | $62: 24,107: 18$ | obtain [1] - 34 | $33: 9,34: 16,36: 19$ |
| monitoring [1] - 28:2 | narrow [1] - 75:10 | 118:12, 121:13 | obvious [2] - 90:9, | 38:15, 38:17, 42:17, |
| monitors [1] - 28:8 | NATURAL [1] - 1:1 | Note [1] - 53:13 | 101:14 | 42:24, 43:19, 44:18, |
| months [1] - 40:16 | natural [4]-10:11, | noted [12] - 16:2 | obviously [9] - 28:4 | 44:20, 45:11, 45:14, |
| morning [4]-2:17, | 34:24, 34:25, 35:23 | 28:24, 62:18, 62:22, | 37:22, 40:2, 65:15, | 46:5, 46:8, 48:17, |
| $16: 4,16: 10,40: 10$ | Natural [2]-2:1, | $106: 10,107: 6,110: 1 \text {, }$ | 79:10, 92:21, 94:8, | 48:18, 49:7, 56:15, |
| most [5] - 21:5, | 2:19 | 113:10, 115:20, | $118: 22,125: 6$ | $59: 13,93: 6,93: 16$ |
| 23:16, 44:23, 92:21, | naturally [2] - 34:25, | 119:12, 120:7, 121:1 | occasion [1] - 75:25 | 109:25, 112:1, |
| 120:22 | 49:25 | notes [9]-13:25, | occur [1] - 112:19 | 115:13, 117:18, |
| mountain [1] - 3:24 | nature [4] - 55:15 | 14:12, 14:13, 81:15, | occurred [1] - | 120:11, 120:21, |
| mouse [1] - 104:3 | 92:23, 94:11, 103:1 | 83:25, 86:22, 89:10, | 123:17 | 121:7, 121:9 |
| move [11]-29:3, | near [3]-12:3, | 90:15, 128:6 | occurs [1] - 55:17 | Operation [2]-43:2, |
| 29:21, 30:4, 30:6, | 58:19, 91:16 | nothing [4]-15:4, | odour [1] - 94:14 | 84:6 |
| 30:9, 49:24, 50:5, | nearby [1] - 92:8 | 15:8, 15:11, 90:15 | OF [1] - 1:10 | operational [1] - |
| 56:10, 57:15, 125:4, | nearest [1] - 27:4 | notice [7]-31:5, | offer [1] - 96:4 | 33:19 |
| 126:10 | necessarily [2] - | 66:20, 67:9, 117:9, | office [2]-31:25 | operations [29]- |
| moved [2] - 24:19, | 90:4, 94:15 | 118:12, 119:22, | 102:8 | 4:15, 16:12, 16:24, |
| 25:1 | necessary [5] | 119:23 | Officer [1] - 6:21 | 17:2, 19:23, 20:1, |
| movement [3] - | 10:19, 57:2, 82:13, | noticed [1] - 35:16 | officer [11] - 3:18, | 23:14, 23:17, 24:5, |
| $54: 23,55: 4,55: 16$ | 117:16 | notification [15] - | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 15,7: 4,7: 8,48: 19 \\ & 53: 13,55: 9,55: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 9,38: 23,45: 6, \\ & 50: 20,50: 21.59: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| moves [2] - 55:5, | need [17] - 6:16, | 32:3, 62:25, 63:10, | $53: 13,55: 9,55: 21$ | $50: 20,50: 21,59: 1$ |
| 55:12 movin | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 12,10: 13,10: 17 \\ & 11: 7.13: 13,14: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63: 11,63: 14,63: 16, \\ & 63: 17,63: 22.66: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 67:11, } 88: 22,95: 4 \\ \text { officer's [2]-25:6, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65: 16,70: 3,70: 5, \\ & 70: 25,71: 2 \quad 71: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| 29:10, 49:16, 102:19, | 33:20, 36:5, 36:8, | 67:6, 98:4, 98:11, | 95:20 | 77:15, 83:4, 92:4, |
| 119:1, 119:3, 120:1, | 36:11, 61:21, 75:5, | 100:9, 123:10 | official [1] - 22:10 | 107:12, 115:9, |
| 120:13 | 85:9, 86:19, 108:22, | notifications [1] - | Official [2]-2:14, | 115:17, 119:10 |
| multi [2]-7:10, | 121:6 | 31:8 | 128:14 | Operations [1] - |
| $75: 12$ <br> multi-jurisdict | $\begin{aligned} & \text { needs }[3]-19: 4, \\ & 36: 10,122: 16 \end{aligned}$ | notified [3]-31:3, | officials [1] - 20:14 offset [1] - 43:12 | 91:24 |
| $[1]-75: 12$ | negative $[3]$ - 51:17, | notify [1] - 123 | often [1] - 101:2 | 28:12, 93:22, 93:23, |
| multi-species [1] - | 71:13, 109:17 | NRCB [36]-2:8, 2:9, | old [11] - 19:1, 19:15, | 94:16 |
| 7:10 | neglect [1] - 13:5 | 2:11, 3:2, 3:18, 4:13, | 19:24, 20:16, 20:24, | operators [2] - |
| multifamily [2] - | neighbours [4] - | 5:16, 5:22, 9:11, 9:25, | 24:23, 28:6, 28:10, | 65:16, 94:1 |
| 44:20, 44:22 | 25:11, 92:25, 121:14, | 14:10, 15:13, 16:17, | $33: 17,37: 19,118: 5$ | opinion [2] - 81:17, |
| multiple [1] - 3:9 | 123:15 | $25: 16,26: 2,45: 9,$ | older [1] - 93:21 | 122:8 |
| Municipal [10]-6:24, | net [1] - 33:25 | 45:12, 62:7, 71:18, | Oldman [1] - 13:7 | opportunities [1] - |
| 21:4, 64:2, 73:6, 75:1, | never [2]-79:22, | 73:21, 75:16, 79:20, | Olds [1] - 3:21 | 113:7 |
| 110:16, 110:17, | 124:4 | 87:25, 88:1, 88:21, | on-site [1] - 49:6 | opportunity [15] - |
| 110:19, 114:12, | New [1] - 70:25 | 92:21, 94:14, 95:20, | on.. [1] - 69:5 | 8:21, 9:14, 10:1, 10:2, |
| $122: 19$ <br> municipal [50] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { new [39]-9:4, 20:16, } \\ & 24: 7,26: 3,27: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100: 23,102: 8, \\ & 116: 10,124: 5,124: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { once [11]-9:4, 9:13, } \\ & 9: 20,62: 18,73: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 6,30: 17,45: 24 \\ & 59: 21,65: 18,66: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| municipal [50] - | 24:7, 26:3, 27:9, | 116:10, 124:5, 124:6, | 9:20, 62:18, 73:2, | $59: 21,65: 18,66: 8$ |

NRCB LA21011, Volume 1, J une 29, 2021


NRCB LA21011, Volume 1, J une 29, 2021

| proceedings [8] <br> 2:2, 5:18, 10:12, 14:7, <br> 14:8, 60:22, 126:13, <br> 128:5 <br> process [31]-5:21, <br> 6:5, 6:12, 7:7, 8:19, <br> 10:9, 29:11, 30:23, <br> 42:9, 42:24, 51:3, <br> 51:9, 62:8, 62:25, <br> 66:24, 67:6, 73:3, <br> 75:19, 76:23, 77:3, <br> 83:2, 87:18, 88:6, <br> 90:22, 99:5, 99:20, <br> 117:10, 118:14, <br> 119:16, 122:3, 126:12 produce [1]-17:11 producer ${ }^{[1]}$ - $34: 18$ producers [9] - 17:9, <br> 17:11, 18:18, 27:18, <br> 27:22, 34:17, 36:5, <br> 36:8, 36:11 producing [1] - 90:1 product [1]-94:5 production [5] - <br> 24:5, 29:9, 29:20, <br> 30:10, 113:2 <br> products [1]-39:15 <br> profit [1] - 43:9 <br> profits [1]-33:25 <br> progression [1] - <br> 34:24 <br> prohibit [1]-111:17 prohibited [1] - <br> 107:21 <br> project [10]-16:15, <br> 20:2, 20:7, 20:10, <br> 22:12, 25:19, 52:18, <br> 65:20, 118:19, 118:20 <br> promote [3]-81:20, <br> 113:15, 123:19 <br> promoted [1] - 92:3 <br> proper $[1]-88: 14$ <br> property [2]-52:21, <br> 119:21 <br> proportion [1] - <br> 21:19 <br> propose [1] - 15:14 <br> proposed [22]-20:2, <br> 25:18, 26:20, 26:21, <br> 28:18, 28:19, 46:4, <br> 46:7, 46:16, 47:16, <br> 49:10, 51:15, 52:23, <br> 53:8, 55:12, 58:18, <br> 59:11, 90:8, 91:2, <br> 94:22, 114:11 <br> proposing [4]-27:3, <br> 47:2, 47:3, 57:22 <br> protect [6]-64:12, <br> 81:17, 82:13, 84:7, <br> 90:25, 112:17 <br> protecting [2] - <br> 81:21, 85:12 <br> protection [12]- <br> 46:13, 48:24, 57:17, <br> 57:18, 64:6, 71:15, <br> 82:2, 82:21, 91:3, <br> 107:24, 108:6, 123:20 <br> prove [2]-88:25, <br> 95:10 <br> provide [17]-5:9, <br> 8:18, 9:2, 9:22, 10:3, <br> 22:14, 22:18, 40:20, <br> 42:12, 46:17, 74:15, <br> 77:4, 78:24, 81:7, <br> 100:7, 116:10, 127:4 provided [12] - 5:16, <br> 7:21, 9:24, 65:1, <br> 66:20, 72:2, 75:10, <br> 81:16, 88:5, 119:20, <br> 120:4, 123:25 | ```provides [4]-61:21, 106:14, 113:21, 116:2 providing [6] - 6:2, 12:17, 14:18, 46:20, 65:24, 66:19 Province [1] - 128:8 province [2] - 40:20, 121:4 provincial [5]- 19:25, 20:5, 24:10, 75:15, 84:21 provincially \({ }_{[1]}\) - 83:2 provision [5] - 81:5, 113:17, 114:5, 116:8 provisions \([7]\) - 74:4, 75:9, 78:1, 78:3, 102:11, 102:15, 108:17 proximity \([11]\) - 25:14, 25:20, 49:5, 49:22, 57:23, 83:12, 84:1, 90:17, 92:17, 94:10, 97:15 public [30]-5:17, 30:24, 31:4, 32:1, 64:25, 76:25, 78:8, 78:21, 79:3, 81:15, 84:17, 86:21, 87:13, 87:15, 87:20, 88:6, 90:15, 90:21, 94:2, 99:17, 99:18, 99:23, 100:6, 100:11, 114:16, 119:22, 123:5, 123:6, 123:10 pull \([8]-21: 8,52: 8\), 53:3, 106:21, 110:4, 114:25, 115:23, 115:24 pumping [2]-29:16 purchase [2] - 34:24, 35:23 purely [2]-49:1, 125:19 purpose [6] - 6:19, 48:21, 78:18, 84:5, 112:7, 121:11 purposes [6] - 78:14, 82:21, 83:18, 84:7, 86:6, 86:13 purview [1] - 92:16 puts [1] - 63:21 putting [3]-64:2, 64:5, 68:25 qualifications [1] - 111:19 qualify [1] - 108:7 quality [2] - 82:24, 112:17 quarter [10]-42:15, 42:21, 43:5, 47:5, 54:4, 54:7, 79:6, 79:9, 89:19, 94:11 quarters [1]-29:7 quasi [1]-6:6 quasi-judicial [1] - 6:6 query [2] - 10:25, 47:18 questioning \([2]\) - 9:13, 9:21 QUESTIONS \({ }_{[14]}\) - 48:14, 52:6, 57:12, 73:24, 87:9, 89:14, 96:22, 129:12, 129:13, 129:14, 129:21, 129:22,``` | ```129:23, 129:24 questions [73] - 6:11, 7:7, 7:22, 9:10, 9:17, 10:1, 10:8, 13:13, 13:22, 32:7, 39:21, 45:20, 46:2, 48:2, 48:5, 48:7, 48:10, 48:13, 51:25, 52:3, 57:6, 57:8, 58:13, 58:21, 59:17, 59:24, 59:25, 60:4, 60:8, 60:11, 60:14, 60:16, 62:7, 62:10, 65:2, 65:3, 65:7, 66:10, 66:13, 73:14, 73:19, 74:1, 74:2, 74:18, 77:3, 79:20, 79:24, 80:9, 81:4, 87:4, 87:7, 89:6, 94:20, 95:13, 96:19, 96:21, 96:24, 100:13, 100:23, 101:23, 103:13, 103:16, 103:17, 103:22, 103:25, 104:4, 104:8, 104:11, 112:6, 121:17, 124:6, 124:12, 124:22 quick [2] - 13:21, 49:6 quicker [1] - 110:11 quickly [1] - 101:13 quite [9]-20:21, 69:25, 70:17, 71:21, 75:17, 86:22, 92:19, 94:3 quota [25] - 18:12, 18:13, 18:14, 18:16, 18:18, 18:19, 18:20, 18:23, 33:11, 33:15, 34:1, 34:4, 34:5, 34:13, 34:16, 34:18, 34:22, 34:23, 35:2, 35:3, 35:23, 36:11, 38:1, 39:2, 39:17```  |  | ```83:1 refer [13] - 14:13, 61:18, 63:24, 71:22, 76:6, 77:14, 78:11, 78:20, 88:12, 88:19, 92:14, 97:10 reference [9]-3:1, 15:14, 74:10, 76:7, 78:25, 82:23, 91:14, 101:4, 101:5 referenced [6] - 75:3, 86:20, 88:1, 91:11, 122:7, 122:21 references [3] - 110:10, 110:14, 110:15 referral [3]-64:24, 100:19 referred [10] - 55:8, 56:2, 84:19, 85:9, 95:12, \(97: 13,97: 14\), 97:20, 114:15, 114:20 referring \([7]-41: 12\), 55:7, 55:8, 55:21, 70:12, 77:16, 86:20 refers [2]-52:13, 54:19 reflect [1] - 81:9 reflective [1] - 81:6 reflects [1] - 81:10 regard [5]-7:23, 10:9, 84:15, 98:25, 116:5 regarding [1] - 5:21 regardless [1] - 42:18 regards [7] - 18:17, 62:24, 83:12, 84:1, 95:20, 122:13, 122:22 regime [3]-39:1, 75:13 region [3] - 20:10, 41:1, 102:13 Regional [1] - 13:7 regional [2]-25:22, 43:17 regions [1] - 41:20 register [1]-11:14 registered [5] - 8:20, 31:10, 32:5, 63:18, 63:19 regular [1] - 101:1 regulates [1]-25:16 regulations [8] - 17:4, 17:20, 17:22, 38:6, 38:7, 49:11, 121:7, 124:14 Regulations [1] - 71:12 regulatory [8] - 35:18, 35:25, 38:10, 39:1, 39:11, 42:25, 43:3, 121:8 reiterated [1] - 66:23 related [3]-5:7, 50:7, 125:11 relates [1] - 91:4 relating [1] - 112:3 relation [1] - 125:13 relationship [2]- 32:20, 32:22 relationships [1] - 41:1 relative [2]-8:17, 112:8 relatively [1] - 75:10 relevance [1] - 114:6 relevant [8]-15:16, 37:23, 74:4, 75:11, \(78: 1,78: 2,81: 5\)``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

NRCB LA21011, Volume 1, J une 29, 2021


NRCB LA21011, Volume 1, J une 29, 2021


NRCB LA21011, Volume 1, J une 29, 2021

| transitioning [1] - | unexpanded [1] - | 103:21, 125:5, | 26:5, 26:6, 26:10, | $22: 19,74: 14$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27:17 | 56:8 | 125:22, 126:3 | 29:10, 29:12, 29:13, | wondering [1] - |
| transitory [2] - 55:16 | UNIDENTIFIED [1] - | variety [1] - 112:19 | 29:14, 30:15, 47:6, | 56:14 |
| translated [1] - 42:16 | 2:22 | various [1] - 84:21 | 47:19, 54:23, 55:3, | word [3] - 10:5, 72:6 |
| transparency [1] - | uniform [4]-79:10, | vast [1] - 99:9 | 55:16, 55:20, 55:23, | works [3]-84:25, |
| 41:16 | 81:12, 81:13, 83:21 | venture [1] - 83:24 | 55:24, 60:24, 81:21, | $94: 2,122: 20$ |
| transportation [2] - | uniformity [1] - | versus [1] - 28:6 | 91:17, 97:15, 97:18, | world [1] - 126:14 |
| 92:16, 93:3 | 81:25 | viability [1] - 38:14 | 123:20, 123:23 | writes [1] - 22:23 |
| treated [2]-64:10, | uniformly [2] | viable [7] - 36:7, | waterbodies [18] - | writing [1] - 53:12 |
| 90:16 | 81:11, 91:7 | 37:15, 38:2, 81:20 | 64:7, 64:8, 64:12, | written [5] - 8:1, |
| tributary [3]-54:20, | unique [1] - 45:12 | 82:1, 115:13, 123:19 | 81:13, 81:18, 81:19, | 8:17, 9:4, 126:2, |
| $54: 25,55: 10$ | units [10]-18:11, | Vice [2] - 40:12, | $82: 2,82: 21,83: 22$ | 127:5 |
| true [1] - 85:7 | 18:13, 33:11, 33:12, | 41:22 | 84:1, 84:7, 84:12, |  |
| try [7] - 6:7, 10:11, | $34: 3,34: 19,34: 20$, | Vice-Chair [2] - | 90:17, 90:25, 91:10, |  |
| 69:6, 92:20, 92:24, | 35:3, 37:12 | 40:12, 41:22 | 96:25, 97:8 |  |
| 93:22, 94:4 | unless [1] - 99:12 | video [3]-5:4, 11:6, | waterbody [7] - | year [3]-18:25, |
| try.. [1] - 67:16 | unnamed [3] - 54:20, | 14:22 | $64: 10,82: 14,85: 12$ | $36: 15,102: 18$ |
| $\text { trying }[8]-14: 9$ | $54: 25,55: 10$ | videoconference [1] | $88: 17,90: 13,91: 3,$ | years [18] - 3:13, |
| 49:19, 71:20, 76:5, | unreasonable [1] - | - 1:22 | 97:10 | 16:25, 18:19, 19:1, |
| 78:13, 80:7, 93:17, | 43:6 | Village [4] - 25:10, | watercourses [1] - | 27:21, 32:24, 33:2, |
| 102:6 | unreasonably [1] - | 31:14, 87:24 | 101:21 | 33:3, 33:11, 33:17, |
| TSCHETTER [3] - | 45:15 | villages [4]-20:23, | waterway [4] - 27:4, | 35:17, 36:13, 37:23, |
| 40:8, 51:2, 129:9 | unsure [2]-6:12, | 82:20, 83:8, 87:23 | 49:22, 57:24, 58:2 | 45:1, 50:15, 99:7, |
| Tschetter [8] - 12:3, | 65:17 | virtual [5] - 3:23, | waterways [3] - | 99:8, 123:12 |
| 12:7, 39:25, 40:2, | unto [1] - 117:7 | 4:19, 5:7, 7:24, 127:1 | 25:14, 48:25, 120:12 | you.. [1] - 107:3 |
| 40:10, 45:19, 45:22, | unusual [1] - 14:9 | virtually [1] - 2:2 | wave [2]-3:4, 28:5 | young [2]-46:12, |
| $50: 22$ | up [37] - 4:22, 17:9, | visible [1] - 53:22 | waves [4] - 44:3, | 56:10 |
| turkeys [2] - 46:10, | 21:8, 21:14, 24:17, | VOLUME [1] - 129:3 | 44:4, 44:11, 44:13 | yourself [2]-5:13, |
| 56:10 | 24:20, 28:11, 33:18, | Volume [2]-1:20, | ways [3]-17:17, | $41: 24$ |
| turn [3]-9:2, 22:19, | 33:20, 35:4, 37:21, |  | 20:21, 102:10 | YouTube [2]-5:16, |
| 59:3 turned [2] | $38: 1,41: 4,42: 3$, $45: 25,52: 8,53: 3$ | VULCAN ${ }_{[2]}$ - 62:5, 129:19 | weather [1]-60:24 <br> website [5]-3:3 | 5:20 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { turr } \\ \text { 61:9 } \end{gathered}$ | 45:25, $52: 8,53.3$, ${ }^{\text {53:11, } 66: 98: 25,}$ | Vulcan [89] - 2:13, | $5: 10,5: 17,5: 18$ | Z |
| turning [1] - 69:22 | 82:16, $85: 13,91: 21$, | 6:24, 8:4, 9:1, 9:22, | 15:14 |  |
| Twin [6]-19:16, | 92:21, 94:5, 94:19, | 9:24, 10:4, 10:7, | weekly [1] - 31:25 | zone[47] |
| 19:24, 20:2, 22:11, | 96:10, 97:5, 98:17, | 10:16, 12:10, 12:11, | weeks [3] - 63:12, | 22:7, 29:4, 30:5, 42:7, |
| 43:12, 118:20 | 105:19, 106:21, | 12:14, 12:20, 12:22, | 98:11, 127:7 | 42:17, 43:4, 48:18, |
| two [14] - 12:23, | 110:5, 114:25, | 13:6, 13:11, 15:2, | welcome [2]-2:17, | 48:22, 62:11, 62:12, |
| 13:22, 23:12, 23:23, | 115:17, 115:23, | 15:4, 25:23, 30:18, | 5:11 | 62:15, 62:21, 63:23, |
| 29:7, 48:13, 63:12, | 115:24 | 31:9, 31:15, 32:4, | welfare [8] - 17:5, | 67:22, 67:25, 68:4, |
| 68:17, 101:13, | update [2]-65:12, | 42:9, 45:25, 52:8, | 19:6, 25:19, 27:14, | 68:10, 68:11, 68:12, |
| 102:18, 106:5, | 65:19 | 52:17, 58:13, 59:23, | 27:23, 109:20, 112:2, | 68:13, 70:11, 70:20, |
| 106:13, 111:16, | updated [4] - 50:15, | 59:25, 61:3, 61:12, | 117:19 | 77:20, 77:21, 78:18, |
| 114:25 | 51:12, 72:23, 86:19 | 61:17, 61:19, 62:2, | wellbeing [2] - | 79:4, 79:21, 79:25, |
| type [10]-29:6, 30:2, | updates [1] - 50:16 | 62:25, 63:8, 63:9, | 44:19, 56:20 | 80:1, 80:15, 80:18, |
| 31:5, 41:9, 44:20, | updating [2] - 28:1, | 63:13, 63:20, 64:7, | west [1] - 6:23 | 81:9, 82:13, 82:19, |
| 44:22, 47:12, 47:23, | 73:2 | 64:9, 64:11, 65:25, | wetland [2] - 47:20, | 83:14, 83:17, 83:22, |
| 58:25, 97:17 | upgrade [2] - 71:10, | 66:9, 66:19, 66:24, | 58:19 | 85:6, 86:12, 89:22, |
| types [4] - 36:22, | 100:20 | 67:6, 72:11, 72:17, | whereas [4] - 28:10, | 90:24, 98:17, 98:20, |
| 75:14, 91:10, 97:7 | upgraded [3] - 19:4, | 73:5, 73:15, 78:19, | 59:10, 107:11, 115:4 | 108:18, 124:9 |
| typically [9] - 31:10, | 56:19 | 79:23, 80:14, 80:20, | whole [1] - 100:18 | zoned [2] - 89:21, |
| 64:19, 93:22, 94:2, | upgrades [3]-57:2, | 81:7, 81:14, 82:10, | widely [1] - 44:12 | 89:25 |
| 94:6, 94:12, 98:22, | 109:20, 112:3 | 82:11, 83:8, 83:15, | Wiebe [3]-5:3, | zones [27] - 63:25, |
| 99:10, 102:13 | upgrading [4] $101 \cdot 5,109 \cdot 3,109:$ | $84: 15,85: 11,85: 25$, $87.7,89: 24,90 \cdot 13$ | 11:11, 126:22 | $64: 3,64: 6,64: 8$ |
| U | $\begin{aligned} & 101: 5,1 \\ & 111: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 87: 7,89: 24,90: 13, \\ & 90: 18,93: 21,100: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $11: 12,121: 22$ | $74: 6,77: 6,77: 7,78: 5$ |
|  | uplift [1] - 112:14 | 102:14, 102:17, | Willow [20]-6:25, | 78:10, 78:14, 78:17, |
|  | uprooting [1] - 23:25 | 103:10, 103:16, | 21:4, 21:5, 26:14, | $81: 11,81: 13,81: 23,$ |
| $67: 12,85: 17$ | urban [4]-73:4, | 105:10, 107:5, 113:8, | 26:16, 26:22, 48:24, | $83: 3,83: 10,85: 22$ |
| unable [1] - 95:25 | 83:6, 83:12, 92:18 | 113:13, 114:11, | 62:19, 63:16, 67:25, | 91:12, 91:15, 119:13, |
| unaware [1] - 42:6 | urbans [1] - 83:5 | 117:22, 117:25, | 68:3, 74:24, 85:6, | 123:18, 123:23, |
| uncertainty [1] - | uses [3] - 67:7, | 118:2, 121:20, | 85:9, 85:25, 107:5, | 124:15, 124:16 |
| 109:9 | 112:20, 113:9 | 122:10, 124:7, | 114:3, 114:15, | zoning [5] - 89:18, |
| under [13] - 20:20, |  | 126:15, 129:17 | 118:16, 119:12 | 89:21, 102:11, |
| 26:8, 63:10, 78:9, | $V$ |  | Wilson [1] - 11:22 | 102:12, 102:24 |
| 79:2, 84:24, 89:19, |  | V | wishes [1] - 105:4 | Zoom [6]-3:22, |
| 89:20, 114:24, 115:3, | valid [1] - 119:16 |  | WITNESS [6] - 16:7, | $3: 24,5: 2,7: 25,$ |
| 116:13, 124:13 | Valley [6] - 19:16, | waive [1] - 118:5 | 32:19, 40:9, 129:6, | 126:14, 126:22 |
| underlining [1] - | 19:24, 20:2, 22:11, | waiver [7] - 79:22, | 129:8, 129:10 |  |
| 112:13 | 43:12, 118:20 | 122:9, 122:11, | witness [16] - 11:24, |  |
| undersigned [1] - | valleys [1] - 102:4 | 122:14, 122:23, | 12:1, 12:2, 14:6, 14:7, |  |
| 128:3 | value [4]-17:7, | 124:4, 124:5 | 16:2, 32:8, 32:12, |  |
| understood [2] - | 17:14, 24:15, 24:17 | walk [3] - 18:9, | 32:13, 39:22, 40:1, |  |
| 20:9, 27:12 | Vance [13] - 2:11, | 19:19, 25:2 | 43:8, 45:21, 46:18, |  |
| undertaken [3] - | 4:14, 7:5, 15:9, 48:4, | walked [1] - 116:22 | 46:21, 68:17 |  |
| 90:22, 95:14, 100:8 | 48:9, 60:3, 73:17, | wants [2] - 17:1, 86:5 | witnesses [9] - |  |
| undeveloped [2] - | 73:20, 103:20, 125:5, | watch [1] - 51:8 | 11:23, 13:23, 13:24, |  |
| 29:22, 30:14 | 125:21, 126:1 | Water [1]-26:8 | 14:15, 14:17, 15:24, |  |
| unequivocal [1] - | VANCE [8] - 15:10, | water [28] - 17:18, | 51:24, 73:15, 73:19 |  |
| 115:13 | 48:6, 60:4, 73:18, | 20:23, 20:25, 23:7, | wonder [3]-21:7, |  |

