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(PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 9:04 A.M.)
THE CHAIR: Good morning, everyone.
Technology is fantastic, and I think it's working, but
there's always seems to be opportunity for glitches. So welcome everyone, and good morning again.

So we'11 get started. My name is Peter Woloshyn, and I'11 be chairing this panel, the Natural Resources Conservation Board, to hear the review of Approval Officer Decision LA21033 for Double H Feeders.

Now, to help you identify the Pane1, and I think you might be able to move tiles around anyway, and Kevin I think was going to do that for the participants down in Lethbridge, but the Pane1 and Bill Kennedy, our
welcome, Page.
Sandi Roberts -- and Sandi, there you go -- Sandi is an agricultural engineer and was an approval officer with the NRCB up until 2010. When she left the NRCB, she decided to get into some municipal politics and was municipal councillor for the Town of Carstairs and also has been an instructor with Olds College.

Ear1 Graham -- and Ear1, you're there -- so we've got a different view from here, so $I$ don't see all the panels -- but Earl has extensive experience in municipal politics, including serving as a deputy reeve for Clearwater County and central zone director for AAMDC, which is now RMA, as you know, and is a member of the subdivision and development appeal board in his region.

And my name again, Peter Woloshyn. I grew up on a forage and beef farm near Devon, Alberta, and I was the CEO of the NRCB from 2006 up until my appointment as Chair in late 2017. I have a background in resource economics and policy, and have led several research divisions in both crops and livestock.

So assisting the Panel today -- and you've been chatting with these folks over the last number of weeks -- is Bill Kennedy, the board's general counse1 -- and, Bil1, are you there? I don't see
-- there you are. Okay, perfect, thank you.
Bill has been with the Board now 30 years, we just gave him a 30-year-long service award, and has a ton of experience obviously with the NRCB and in assisting Panels through reviews.

Laura Friend is our manager of Board reviews and has been with the Board for 20 years. So if you have any technical difficulties today during the hearing, you can just phone or text Laura at 403-620-8294. So once again, that number for Laura if you have difficulties is 403-620-8294.

And depending on the issue and what's happening, we may have to pause the hearing briefly to get folks, if it's an IT issue and it's somebody that needs to be obviously participating in the hearing so we may have to pause. Hopefully we'll have no glitches today.

With Field Services, we've got a number of folks. Carina Weisbach -- welcome, Carina -- Carina was the approval officer who handled the application.

Fiona Vance, who is the chief legal officer for Field Services.

MS. VANCE:
THE CHAIR:

Good morning.
Good morning, Fiona. Andy Cumming, and Andy is the director of Field Services and applications.

MR. CUMMING:
THE CHAIR: two staff that will be doing the virtual on-screen document management. So when we're operating in a virtual hearing, we have the ability to have our documents up if and when we need them, and Sylvia Kaminski and Carolyn Taylor will be assisting us. And Carolyn and Sylvia, are you online?

MS. KAMINSKI :
MS. TAYLOR:
THE CHAIR: our expert document managers from Springbank, so they've had a ton of experience, they ran that document manager, along with some other folks, on our Springbank hearing, which was an 11-day hearing. So welcome and thank you, Sylvia and Carolyn.

So when you do want a document shared on the screen, please clearly say the exhibit number and the pdf page number that you'd like to refer to, and we'11 just give the document managers a few moments. They'11 get the document loaded and on the screen at the right page.

So for -- our Zoom host is with MNP, Meyers Norris Penny, who is our IT deliverer, and we have Mak Elhakim. And, Mak, are you online?

Yeah, I'm with you.
Perfect. Okay, well, thank you very much for your patience and getting everybody onboard and into the hearing. Thank you very much.

MR. ELHAKIM:
You're welcome. No problem.
And our court reporters for today, Ms. Vespa and Ms. DiPaolo. And who's on this morning? THE COURT REPORTER: It's Ms. Vespa, Lorelee.

THE CHAIR:
Lorelee Vespa, okay, welcome. And Ms. Vespa and Ms. DiPaolo were also court reporters with the Springbank hearing. We're thrilled to have you back, you did a great job. So thank you very much.

And so during the hearing, we are transcribing. We would ask when you're speaking, just identify yourself and speak relatively slowly so that they can get it. It's a tough job on the court reporter side, and so if you can speak clearly and make sure you're not speaking too quickly, it's a lot easier for our court reporters, and we can ensure we get the transcript right.

So we've also provided a YouTube link, and it's on our website for members of the public to observe the proceedings. These are typically -- well, they're always open to the public, and if there's anyone that wants to join, or if you were hoping that somebody
would be able to watch, you can just let them know that they can go to our website and our main page, there will be a link there to the YouTube channel that they can view the hearing live.

And if there's any members of the media on the YouTube feed, and if you have a question regarding today's process, you can contact Janet Harvey, NRCB communications specialist, and Janet can be reached by email at janet.harvey, and that's H-A-R-V-E-Y, janet. harvey@nrcb.ca, or you can reach her by telephone at 780-720-2317.

So the purpose of the hearing is to review Decision LA21033, dated November 25th, 2021, and was issued by approval officer, Carina Weisbach.

The confined feeding operation is located at NE Section 22, Township 9, Range 22, west of the 4 th meridian in Lethbridge County, near the Town of Coalhurst.

So the approval officer denied the Double H Feeders' application to expand an existing poultry CFO. The application was to construct two barns and increase chicken broiler numbers by 65,000 to a total of 120,000 birds.

So, following that denial, a request for review or RFR from the operator, Double $H$, was received by the
filing deadline of December 16, 2021.
We received three rebuttals by the deadline December 23rd, 2021, from Ms. Schmid, Mr. and Mrs. Bedster, Mr. Clifton, who are all directly affected parties as determined by the approval officer.

So the Panel met on January 5th, 2022, and in its RFR Decision 2022-01 dated January 7th, 2022, advised that it made a decision to grant the RFR and hold a oral hearing, and that decision report provided the reasons for granting a review and the core issues that the Panel would have regard for at this hearing.

So the letter also directed that written submissions by directly affected parties were to be filed to the Board by no later than January 27th of 2022. Submissions were received from Field Services of the NRCB, the Town of Coalhurst, County of Lethbridge, Double H Farms, and Mr. Clifton.

Mr. Clifton did submit one submission by the deadline, and he did submit one submission after the filing deadline, and the Board allowed that late filing, sent out the reasons for allowing the filing, and we heard no objections to it.

So all Panel members have and are familiar with the documents that parties have submitted as evidentiary materials for this hearing, and so given
this, there is no need for you to reread into the record materials that you've already submitted. So in order to make the best use of our time, we request that each party use their presentation time to high1ight or clarify the important and salient points that are relevant to the written submission.

Your participation in this hearing is very important to the Pane1, and we look forward to the information you'11 be providing, and recognize that our decision will have a significant impact on you and your community.

The process that we follow is inherently formal, it's a quasi-judicial proceeding, and so a certain level of formality is appropriate. However, we do try to minimize that formality to the extent possible so that participants are comfortable presenting their information to the Panel and also asking other parties questions.

But we do encourage you to ask questions if you're unsure about the process or when you're allowed to interject. You know, the Panel gets that this is likely the first time at a hearing for many of you and many of the parties, and we have -- and we're here to -- for you to participate. So this is about you folks and about getting the best information we can to
make our decision.
So if you're unsure about the process at any time, please don't be shy. Just you can ask me the question, or you can ask for Mr. Kennedy for a few minutes to understand the process. Mr. Kennedy does this all the time. It's not an issue. And we would much rather you interrupt us and ask questions about the process if you're unsure than sort of go through the process and then feel afterwards that, you know, you may have had, you know, missed an opportunity that you should have taken. So please don't be shy and ask questions at any point.

So just a brief overview of the process for today: We'11 register all parties, and then each participant will have an opportunity to address any preliminary matters that you may have.

We will then begin the evidentiary or direct evidence portion of the hearing, and the Board believes it's beneficial for -- we have done this in the past for NRCB Field Services to present their direct evidence first, followed by Lethbridge County, Town of Coalhurst, directly affected parties, and we'11 have Double H -- oh, sorry, we'11 have Double H Feeders follow the approval officer.

When it's your turn -- and we'11 be high1ighting
this as we go through the hearing -- when it's your turn, you'11 be sworn in or affirmed. So it's your choice whether you're sworn in or affirmed by the court reporter. And once you're sworn or affirmed, any new evidence that you want us to consider can be entered into the record on request. So if you have any paper copies or electronic copies of evidence that you would like us to review for the purpose of the hearing, you can enter that at that time, and we'11 give it an exhibit number.

And then we'll give you a chance to highlight or expand upon any points in your submission that you fee1 are particularly significant for the Panel. After you've presented that evidence, you'11 be open to questions from other parties, including NRCB Field Services, the Board counse1, Mr. Kennedy, and Pane1 members.

Once questioning is complete, the party will then -- that presented the evidence will have an opportunity to reintroduce or redirect any evidence. So, essentially, you know, once you've been asked all the questions, we'11 give you a chance to submit any further evidence or comments to address areas that may have been raised in the questions that were posed to you that you believe there's some additional
information that the Panel should have that you may have missed during the questioning.

Once we've completed the direct evidence and questioning of all parties, then Double H Feeders may provide any rebuttal evidence, and if there's any rebuttal evidence that's provided by Double H at the very end of the proceeding or near the end of the proceeding, then the other parties will have an opportunity to ask questions based on that rebuttal evidence. And once that's done, every party will have an opportunity to provide a final argument.

So it's a lot to absorb. Hopefully you've had a chance to go through our hearing guide, but, once again, as we move through the process, if you have any questions, please don't hesitate to ask.

So we'11 take a couple of breaks during the day. It's always a bit of a guess as to how long a hearing wil1 take, but we'11 take some breaks. We won't necessarily set them now because if we're in the middle of somebody's direct evidence, as an example, we'd like to get through that. So, you know, we'11 try to get lunch around noon, if we're not done by lunch, and it's hard to know when we'11 finish up. I think in our letter, we indicated that it would be 9 to 4:00. If for some reason we needed to go past 4:00-- and I'm
confident that we can get done by then -- but if we need to go past 4:00, are there any other parties that are -- have other commitments that would prevent us from going a little bit later than 4:00 today?

MR. VAN'T LAND: I have a hard out at 5:00, so just to make note of that.

THE CHAIR:
At 5:00?
MR. VAN'T LAND:
Yes.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you.
THE COURT REPORTER:
I'm sorry, who spoke?
THE CHAIR:
Who was that speaking?
MR. VAN'T LAND:
I'm sorry, this is
Scott Van't Land from Double H Feeders.
THE CHAIR: Okay. And so we'11 do our best to obviously be done by 5 , and that would mean that we would need to move to another day if we can't wrap up, but let's all do our best to see if we can wrap this up by, at the latest, 5:00.

Any other parties have time commitments that we should know about?

MS. HORVATH:
Mr. Chairman, it's Diane Horvath from the Town of Coalhurst. I won't be able to participate past 4:30 today.

THE CHAIR:
4:30. Okay. Thank you.
Other parties?

Okay. Hearing none, let's do our best to finish up by $4: 30$ and it may be the case, and Mr. Kennedy, if we needed to go past 4:30 and Ms. Horvath had to leave, that may still be possible, depending on where we're at with the evidentiary portion. Is that fair?

MR. KENNEDY: Yeah, I think we -- I'll keep an eye on the time and perhaps have a conversation with Ms. Horvath at some point in terms of what she might be missing should it look like $4: 30$ is an issue.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Great. Thank you very much.

Okay. So 1et's -- we need to formally register the parties.

And for Field Services, Ms. Vance and Ms. Weisbach; correct?

MS. VANCE: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. And we also have Mr. Cumming.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Mr. Cumming will be registered, then? A party?

MS. VANCE:
Yes.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you. And for
Double H Feeders, Mr. Van't Land; correct?
MR. VAN'T LAND:
Yes, that's me.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you. And for Lethbridge County, Ms. Janzen. my list wrong. So it's Ms. Horvath only; is that correct?

MS. HORVATH:
THE CHAIR: parties, Ms. Schmid, Mr. Clifton, Mr. Bedster. Are we missing anyone?

MS. SCHMID:
THE CHAIR: else? That's it. Okay. Thank you very much.

All right. So if I missed no one, that's our official registered participant list for today. Thank you.

So are there any preliminary matters that anyone has or any questions before we get started with the direct evidence?
ms. VANCE:
Mr. Chair, this is Fiona Vance from NRCB Field Services. This is a really minor procedural point, but in the order of proceedings under Number 12, which is closing arguments, Field Services is not listed.

At this point, I don't actually anticipate having a closing argument, but I would like to just reserve the opportunity to do so if necessary.

THE CHAIR:
Agreed.
Thank you.
Thank you. I'11 just make a note now. Thank you.

Any other matters? Okay. Hearing none. The exhibit list. We'd like to formally adopt the exhibit
list that is on our website, and just so that everybody is clear about what that is, document managers, do you have that handy? Could you throw that up on the screen for us?

Boom, there we go. Thank you very much.
So all parties, this is the listing that is on the website, and there is a document on the website that summarizes, just as you've seen on the screen. So if there are no objections, we'd like to adopt that as our exhibit list. And if there's anything new added, we would start numbering, of course. And I think -- is 23 -- that is our last exhibit number. I think we would start at 24 if there's anything new.

MS. FRIEND: That's correct, Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIR: So are there any objections? Hearing none, we'll adopt that as our exhibit list.

Thank you.
Thanks, document managers. Appreciate it.
So we'11 start with Field Services, the approval officer, Ms. Weisbach, and Ms. Vance. Are you ready?

MS. VANCE:
We are. Thank you. I wonder if it would be helpful -- maybe I'11 just speak extremely briefly just as by way of introduction. I act for both the approval officer and NRCB Field Services in this hearing.

As I explained in the submissions we made, we take no position on the outcome of this hearing. In other words, we don't take a position on whether the Board should be upholding the denial or directing the approval officer to issue a permit. The decision documents from the approval officer speak for themselves.

That said, I did bring two witnesses today, and the purpose of them is to assist the board in this hearing. So I will have all of two questions for Ms. Weisbach and probably none in direct for Mr . Cumming, but I wanted to make them available for questions from other parties.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.
MS. VANCE: So before moving -- we11, Ms. Weisbach, of course, is the approval officer. She

## C. WEISBACH, A. CUMMING <br> Ms. Vance examines the pane1

prepared the documents that are Exhibits 2 and 3; that's the decision summary and the technical document. Mr. Cumming is the director of Field Services applications. He will not answer questions about this application in particular. It could be he will not have to answer any questions at all.

The reason Mr . Cumming is potentially here as a witness is to answer questions about how the NRCB might consider Intermunicipal Development Plans and Municipal Development Plans if the Board decides to consider that issue.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

MS. VANCE:
And if there's no questions for me, then maybe we could get to affirming the witnesses.

THE CHAIR:
Yes, thank you. Please proceed, Court Reporter. Ms. Vespa.
C. WEISBACH, A. CUMMING (For NRCB Field Services), affirmed MS. VANCE EXAMINES THE PANEL:

MS. VANCE: Thank you, Madam Reporter.
Q. Ms. Weisbach, I'11 ask you a couple of short questions first.

And my first question is, this operation is located on a northwest quarter. There's also some discussion about an operation on the northeast quarter.

## C. WEISBACH, A. CUMMING <br> Ms. Vance examines the pane1

To your knowledge, does the operation on the northeast quarter hold an NRCB-issued permit?
A. MS. WEISBACH: No, it doesn't.
Q. Thank you. And when you received the application for LA21033, and you worked through that process in getting to your decision, did you consider the operation on that northwest quarter at all.
A. MS. WEISBACH: No, I did not. It holds an MD permit at this point, which for us, it's deemed -- it's a deemed permit. So I did not consider this.
Q. And just to clarify, the northwest quarter was not part of this application?
A. MS. WEISBACH: No, it was not.
Q. Okay. Thank you. That's actually all the questions I have for you. But please answer any questions that other parties or the Board may have.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, thank you. Thank you, Ms. Vance.

Ms. Weisbach, thank you.
So Lethbridge County, do you have any questions

## C. WEISBACH, A. CUMMING <br> Ms. Vance examines the pane 1

1 MS. SCHMID:
2 THE CHAIR:

4 THE CHAIR:
5 MR. BEDSTER:
6 THE CHAIR:
7 MR. CLIFTON:
8 THE CHAIR:
9 MR. VAN'T LAND:
10 MR. KENNEDY: people said "no questions at this time." This is the only time that you would have to ask questions of the approval officer. So I guess the advice is don't hold back.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Kennedy.
MR. KENNEDY: And I'm also wondering, we didn't -- I don't know whether we were going to receive any direct evidence from Mr. Cumming, and whether parties, you know, whether this would be the time to ask questions of Mr. Cumming as well so we move through both witnesses from this particular panel before --

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Vance, was Mr. Cumming going to provide any direct?

MS. VANCE:
So I have no direct questions for

## C. WEISBACH, A. CUMMING <br> Cross-examined by Mr. Clifton

Mr. Cumming. As to whether the questions from other parties should go to both or one at a time, I'm in the board's hand on that one.

THE CHAIR: And often, I know in the past, we've had, say, Mr. Cumming and Ms. Weisbach sitting as the Panel, they can decide sometimes even who best might answer the question.

But I guess the question is based on Mr. Kennedy's advice and direction, folks, this is your chance to ask Mr. Cumming or Ms. Weisbach, the NRCB, questions. Are there any questions from directly affected parties or the Town or the County for that matter?

MR. CLIFTON:
I have a question.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. This is -- please identify yourself.

MR. CLIFTON: It's Mr. Clifton.

THE CHAIR: Go ahead, Mr. Clifton.

MR. CLIFTON CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. In the approval officer's -- what she wrote there, she said there was no permit issued from the NRCB for this
A. MS. WEISBACH: Mrs. Vance asked me if there was an NRCB-issued permit for the northwest, and there is not.

The northwest, however, holds an MD permit, a

## C. WEISBACH, A. CUMMING

Cross-examined by Mr. Clifton
municipal permit or a development permit as it's also called. Those are deemed permits, but they are not NRCB-issued permits.

So this -- the northwest holds a grandfathered or deemed permit at this point.
Q. Okay. And there was some conditions on that permit. Would they be carried forward if a new permit was issued?
A. MS. WEISBACH: So we do have a policy when we do carry over municipal permit conditions into NRCB-issued permits. And it says that any conditions that are written in these old permits, as I say, or grand -deemed permits, if they are above and beyond AOPA, they will be carried over. That's what the policy says at this point.

So I would carry over these permit conditions into a new permit.
Q. Okay. That's all I have.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Clifton.
Other parties? Before we get to Board counsel and

Panel questions?
Hearing none, okay.
Mr. Kennedy?
MR. KENNEDY: Yes, thank you. I will have questions for both of the witnesses.
C. WEISBACH, A. CUMMING

Questioned by Mr. Kennedy

1 MR. KENNEDY QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. My first set of questions goes to you, Ms. Weisbach.

So if I could get the document managers to pull up Exhibit 7, pdf page 78. And Exhibit 7 is the Intermunicipal Development Plan, and it's pdf page 78. There is no numbered page 78. We11, there's on1y 19 pages.

So there is, in fact, if we use the -- I think we use the link in the -- here's what we have is the Intermunicipal Development Plan that has been pulled up, and I'm not sure whether that's the link from the exhibit we've gotten. When I click on the link to the exhibit page, I get the full Intermunicipal Development Plan. This is a consolidated version, so yeah, Exhibit 7. So can we click on that and just see what comes up.

MS. FRIEND: This is Laura, Bill. I can confirm that the document does only have 19 pages, the one that is linked.

MR. KENNEDY:
Al1 right.

C. WEISBACH, A. CUMMING

Questioned by Mr. Kennedy
being permitted and then a provision that deals with the expansion of existing CFO operations.

And so it's just the page --
MS. KAMINSKI: Sorry, Bill, it lets me pull it up, but it won't show -- I don't know if it's too 1 arge.

MR. KENNEDY
Ah, okay.
MS. FRIEND:
And this is Laura, and yeah, when I look in the other file, there's 541 pages in the -- at another place where it's saved. But in the

MR. KENNEDY: I'd like to be helpful, but I can't because I've got the whole document that keeps coming up on my page, but somewhere in here...

MS. KAMINSKI: Sorry, which page?
MR. KENNEDY: Oh, you've got the whole thing --
MS. KAMINSKI: I do.
MR. KENNEDY: Pdf page 78, and I may also be referring to page 79 which is a map, but we may not go there.
Q. But, Ms. Weisbach, you're familiar with this provision?
A. MS. WEISBACH: I am.
Q. But just to be clear, you didn't consider this decision when you were considering the Double H Feeders' application?

## C. WEISBACH, A. CUMMING

Questioned by Mr. Kennedy
A. MS. WEISBACH: No, I didn't, because I came -- as I described in my decision summary, Exhibit 2, Appendix A, which should be page 6, my analysis was that the IDP is not sufficiently referenced in the MDP, and therefore on the AOPA, I would not consider the IDP for my final determination, consistency determination.
Q. Fair. And I think that is clear in your decision report.

I'm going to ask you, though, in wearing your approval officer hat, to visit some of these conditions and perhaps venture your opinion as to how, if you had considered this, they might be -- might apply to the Double H Feeders' expansion operation. And if I'm going beyond your level of comfort and asking you to answer a question that you just frankly don't feel comfortable answering, please let me know.

But my questions are going to be pretty general, and they're going to focus on those kind of qualifier provisions that are stated in the last -- you know, the second part of Section 4 -- or Article 4.1.5, dealing with the CFO expansion operations.

So as if you were considering -- again, I'm going to ask you to answer these questions as if you were considering the Double H Feeders' application, but applying this IDP provision -- so without -- I don't

C. WEISBACH, A. CUMMING

Questioned by Mr. Kennedy
know that we need to pull up the next page, but the next page is a map, and it includes the exclusion zone for CFOs. Is it clear that the Double H Feeders' operation, both the west and east barns that are referred to, are within that exclusion zone?
A. MS. WEISBACH: Yeah, they're both within.
Q. In your opinion, would the expansion as proposed upgrade or modernize the operation?
A. MS. WEISBACH: So you're asking if the proposed expansion would be a monetization upgrade?
Q. Yes. So in Section 4.1.5, it says, you know, if it is to upgrade and modernize, and then it's got within brackets --

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Kennedy, sorry to interrupt. Maybe if document managers could just go back up to 4.1.5, and then Carina can kind of continue to read, Ms. Weisbach. There we go. Thank you, yeah. Thanks. Okay, please proceed.
Q. MR. KENNEDY:

So expansions are permitted under these kind of qualified conditions, and one of them is to upgrade and modernize. And then it says: (as read) "...within the requirements of the Agricultural Operation Practices Act and Regulations."

So, within that context, would this application be

C. WEISBACH, A. CUMMING

Questioned by Mr. Kennedy
considered an upgrade and modernization?
A. MS. WEISBACH: To say I'm carrying the approval officer hat. So, for me, it's strictly -- does it meet the AOPA regulations. We do not look at facilities if they're being proposed if they're a modernization or an upgrade per se. We look at if these facilities do meet AOPA requirements in respect to liners, that is our primary goal I would say, and if they meet MDS, or the minimum distance separation, and if they're consistent with the MDP land use provisions.

So if I look at land use provisions, upgrade and modernize is the request that things can be approved if they're an upgrade or modernized, that would not be a land use provision per se.

So, as an approval officer, I don't believe that I would look at a proposal in that respect.
Q. And then the next one is an outcome-based assessment, and it says: (as read)
"Demonstrating changes will reduce
negative impacts."
Could you venture an opinion as to whether the expansion will reduce negative impacts? And they use the example of odours, and I assume this is to nearby neighbours, residents.
A. MS. WEISBACH: When -- mmm.
Q. And, in fairness, it might be a bit of a challenge because what we are talking about is an expansion on one site and perhaps the decommissioning of another site. And so the effects on neighbours, depending on their proximity to either site, might be quite different.
A. MS. WEISBACH: When -- when I look at that provision, $I$ could not -- I would not be able to consider the -- the CFO on the northeast parcels, I think that's what you're referring to in respect to decommissioning.

So on the northwest, which is the site of the proposed expansion, to me demonstrating changes will reduce negative impacts. That, when I read that, I would -- I would interpret that as if you do have an existing facilities and you do upgrade that existing facility, that would not necessarily apply to an expansion, if you know what I mean.
Q. Yes. And part of the challenge -- and maybe I should back up a little bit because when we talked about upgrading and modernizing, you said it's not a land use planning provision. But, overal1, is 4.1 .5 a land use planning provision?
A. MS. WEISBACH: Mmm. I would interpret that as not being exactly a land use provision. Having said

C. WEISBACH, A. CUMMING

Questioned by Mr. Kennedy
that, I -- that was a quick assessment of a section that $I$ have not really thought about that in such detail, so...
Q. Yeah, it's not my intention to put you in an awkward situation, but it's -- certainly when I put my questions together, I did so on the assumption that this was a land use planning provision. And that's why I kind of circled back when you said that subcomponent, that qualifier, was not a land use planning provision. So I'll move on. And one of the final qualifiers is "Additional environmental protection will be considered." Do you have a sense as to what that might mean?
A. MS. WEISBACH: As I said, you asked me if I read the provision; yes, I did. Did I interpret every little detail of that provision? No, I did not because I did not consider it in my MDP consistency determination and, therefore, I would -- I'm not very comfortable to interpret that on a fly, so to say.
Q. Okay. And, in part, I'm asking all of these questions because -- and we've seen your decision, we understand why you didn't consider the provision of the IDP. But there is an outstanding question perhaps in terms of how the Board may be looking at this, where they may well, when they're reviewing this, look and say, the
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IDP provision is or is not a land use provision, and does it or does it not prevail over the provision of the MDP.

So, my final question, and I'm not going to ask it with -- requiring as much detail as I originally wrote it. Is it fair to say that the IDP provision is -- contemplates potential expansions where the MDP provision is an absolute exclusion of new and expanding operations?
A. MS. WEISBACH: Yes, there is a definite difference.

MR. KENNEDY: Okay. Mr. Chair, those are al1 the questions I have for Ms. Weisbach.

I do have some questions for Mr. Cumming related to the proposed approval officer policy as to how to -- you know, how to go forward.

THE CHAIR: Why don't the Panel ask questions of Ms. Weisbach, and then we could circle back to questions to Mr. Cumming? Does that work for you?

MR. KENNEDY: Yeah, I don't see anything that
I -- the only challenge might be if I had questions of Mr. Cumming that would lead me back to Ms. Weisbach, but $I$ can't see that happening.

THE CHAIR:
And I think they're both basically sitting as a pane1, so we can circle back to
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Ms. Weisbach if we need to after Mr. Cumming.
So Pane1 members, Ms. Roberts, do you have questions for Ms. Weisbach?

MS. ROBERTS: Yeah, I have a couple of questions.

MS. ROBERTS QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. First of all, Ms. Weisbach, there seems to be a little bit of a discrepancy in the number of broilers that I guess we'11 say are actually at the -- let's see -- that are at the proposed location, and it's not a huge discrepancy, but $I$ just would like to clarify because the various documents we're looking at besides just yours state different things.

For instance -- and I don't believe we need these documents put up on the screen unless somebody wishes to actually see them, but in the technical document, the approval officer makes the comment that says it's about 55,000. In the decision summary in Appendix D, it talks about what the deemed capacity of the site would be, which would be 50,000 based on the current municipal permit, and then -- perhaps this is more proper to Mr. Van't Land -- but just to kind of complete the various numbers we're looking at, there's a comment made by him that there are 58,000 broilers at NE 22.

C. WEISBACH, A. CUMMING<br>Questioned by Ms. Roberts

So I'm just curious with these various numbers, $55,000,50,000,58,000$, what is your understanding of what the number of broilers currently allowed at NE 22 is?
A. MS. WEISBACH: Municipal permit that was issued says 50,000 , and that's the number I went with.
Q. Okay. Thank you. It was more a point of clarification because of all these various numbers that were out there.

I also just have a question for you regarding surface runoff because that is a concern that was raised by the neighbours. And in your decision summary, which is Exhibit Number 2 and on, I believe it's on page 6 -- no, it's not -- sorry, page 3, Bullet Number 3-- sorry, page 3, and Bullet Number 3 there, when you're talking about whether the AOPA requirements have been met, it says: (as read)
"The proposed expansion would have
sufficient means to control surface runoff from the CFO facilities."

Can you explain to me how that determination was made and how we try and correlate it with some of the concerns that were raised by the neighbours about surface runoff?
A. MS. WEISBACH: So the pullet barns are completely
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indoor, so they're surrounded by a concrete wall and protected by a roof. So there is no runoff coming from that facility. So when -- as Mr. Van't Land also explained in his manure management plan that he submitted to us is, once the barns are being cleaned out, the manure will be transported offsite. So there is no manure from -- no manure contaminated runoff from manure storage on site.

So, therefore -- and that is what I'm saying here when I say, "There is no manure contaminated runoff from the CFO facilities," the runoff that directly affected parties talk about, I believe, is from manure spreading, and this is a compliance issue.
Q. Okay. Thank you for that clarification. And perhaps those parties will -- will further explain what their concerns are, but I do understand how you made the determination you did, which is kind of what I was -- what I was after.

And one more thing, and this was something I believe it was Mr. Bedster had asked previously about, and that's potential conditions and carrying over conditions, which is in your decision summary, and it is, I believe, page 9, it's Appendix C. So yeah, Number 2: (as read)
"Conditions to be potentially carried
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forward from Development Permit 98-189." Would you mind just briefly explaining those conditions that, if the -- if the Board overturns this and a permit is issued, I think it's important for us to understand what those potential conditions that you're recommending the Board to consider be.

So if you wouldn't mind, I really would appreciate just a brief description of them.
A. MS. WEISBACH: So condition -- so those are the conditions that $I$ changed or that were -- yeah, changed or recommended to carry over.

So Condition 2, land area for manure utilization. And in the development permit, they mentioned, as you can read here, a specific area that is -- should be available for manure spreading.

So Mr. Van't Land submitted in his application a manure management plan with manure management records that will -- that will take care of all of the 120,000 broiler birds that he proposed to expand to.

So Condition 2 would only apply to the 50,000 that
birds. So that's an update.
Then the next part in that condition is, "Manure must not be applied to snow and frozen ground," that is similar to what AOPA describes, so that is carried over as is.

MS. ROBERTS:
Excuse me, document manager, if you can just go to the top of the next page. That's what Ms. Weisbach is referring to now. Thank you.
A. MS. WEISBACH: So in the opening paragraph of the permits when we issue those permits, it always states that any operator or permit holder has to adhere to a11 -- to al1 requirements under AOPA and its regulations, and that is one of the requirements and other regulations for manure spreading. So that would be redundant.

The third part now is incorporation of manure within 48 hours of land spreading. That is a condition that will be carried over as it is -- or would be carried over. And the reason for that is that AOPA allows for several ways, and one of them is if you have minimum till or zero till lands, it allows for manure spreading without incorporation.

So the condition as it stands here in the MD permit is more stringent than $A O P A$ requirements and, therefore, according to NRCB policy or approval policy,
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I would have to carry that over as it is, as written.
So the fourth part is consideration for neighbouring residences, including a separation distance from such residences during manure spreading, that part is very subjective and very reg (phonetic) and can't really enforce this because there are no concrete numbers that inspectors could go with, or the operator for that matter.

So I replaced that with the regulations as they are in AOPA, and that's why I determined that this condition -- this part of the condition should not be carried forward and is being replaced by $A O P A$ and its regulations.

And similar to Condition 4 with dead disposal, they are regulations under Alberta Environment -sorry, Alberta Agriculture. They have their own Act that is to be enforced and the operator has to adhere to.
Q. Okay. Thank you very much for that clarification. It's much appreciated.

MS. ROBERTS:
Mr. Chair, that's al1 my
questions. Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Roberts.
Ms. Stuart, any questions?
MS. STUART:
Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, I do
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have a couple.
MS. STUART QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. Hi, Ms. Weisbach. Just as a follow on to Ms. Roberts' questions about runoff, I wonder if we could pull up Exhibit 3, page 6 of 32 . It should be the technical document, if I've got that right. That's perfect. Thank you, document manager.

So that high1ighted blue area that is labelled "runoff" identifies, you know, this area around the existing barns on NE 22-9-22 that appear to drain as per this diagram to the northeast of the existing barns into a catchment area on SW 26-9-22. And then, as Ms. Roberts addressed, both the Bedster and Clifton rebuttals expressed concerns that you I think said you believe are due to manure spreading rather than that facility; is that right?
A. MS. WEISBACH: Correct.
Q. And I'm just wondering, do any of those concerns -when Mr. Bedster, for example, expresses concern that the runoff possibly flows from NE 22-9-22 through SE
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right after cleaning the barn to either other fields where it's going to be spread to a dry corner or to the other operation.

So he -- he stated that manure is not stockpiled in front of the barns for an extended period of time to cause runoff.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Changing directions a bit, and I appreciate that you explained some of this in the decision summary, and just for a little clarification, recognizing fully that you are bound by AOPA legislation and that AOPA does not specifically talk about Intermunicipal Development Plans, is it your understanding that in the Municipal Government Act that IDPs have a hierarchy relative to municipal development plans?
A. MS. WEISBACH: I do understand that, yeah.
Q. So my question is, because I think some of the policy documents, there's discussion about if the municipal development plan includes a reference to the Intermunicipal Development Plan, then you, as the approval officer, would consider it; is that right?
A. MS. WEISBACH: Under AOPA, we are bound to look under MDP, as you know, right? So if the -- if other planning documents are sufficiently referenced in the MDP, then we will consider. But at this point, I'm
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strictly bound to AOPA.
Q. Okay. Understood, and I appreciate that.

And so just to clarify, had the MDP specifically or more robustly referenced the IDP relative to the CFO exclusion zone and the IDP's description of potential to improve operations, then that would have been a consideration for you potentially?
A. MS. WEISBACH: If it had been, yes, I would have to consider it.
Q. Okay. I appreciate that. Thank you very much.

MS. STUART: That's al1 I have, Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Stuart.
Mr. Graham, any questions for Ms. Weisbach?
MR. GRAHAM :
Yes, I do.
MR. GRAHAM QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. Ms. Weisbach, on page - it would be on page 3 of the MDP. If we could bring that up, please?

THE CHAIR:
I imagine you know which exhibit that is. It's probably labelled, but just in case.

MS. FRIEND:
This is Laura. I believe it's Exhibit 8.

THE CHAIR:
Q. MR. GRAHAM:

Thank you.
Actually, the numbered page 3 . It's kind of confusing because some of these pages are numbered and some are not. It's the page that shows
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the hierarchy of plans.
THE CHAIR:
May need a bit of help here,
Mr. Graham. Is it towards the beginning or is it --
MR. GRAHAM: Yes, it's right near the beginning. It's page 3 of the actual document. At 1east --

THE CHAIR:
Here we go. Here we go. Yeah.
Q. MR. GRAHAM :

Okay. That shows -- just go up a little bit. No, it must be down, then. I missed it on my screen. Right there.

Ms. Weisbach, did you view this when you looked at the MDP for the hierarchy of plan, and how would you -- how did you deal with this?
A. MS. WEISBACH: AOPA is very specific on the planning documents that $I$ must consider when $I$ make the decision on an application. And it very specifically says the MDP, so municipal development plan that must be considered and it has to be consistent with the land use provisions in that plan.

So if the MDP incorporates other documents such as land use bylaws or IDPs, Intermunicipal Development Plans, then -- then I must consider them as well, and -- so that is how we deal with considering IDPs. It hinges on the reference of a specific document, if it's part of the MDP.
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Q. Okay. Thank you.

One other question, and I don't believe we have to bring up a document for this one, when you're going through this, what was the timeline or the time frame that Coalhurst or Lethbridge County sent replies? Do you recall?
A. MS. WEISBACH: We -- we deem an application and that day the application is being sent to the referral agencies and the County. So by then, they have 20 working days to respond. Typically, I think that's the time frame they do have.

And the County, I don't know the specific date, but the County responded. Now the Town of Coalhurst did not receive because they are not within the notification radius.
Q. Okay. And the response from Lethbridge County, can you just talk about that a little bit, please?
A. MS. WEISBACH: Do you have any specific questions in respect to their --
Q. Did they reference the IDP or anything there? That's
A. MS. WEISBACH: I believe they did.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Right now, that's all. Thank you, Ms. Weisbach.

THE CHAIR:
Thanks, Mr. Graham.
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1 THE CHAIR QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
2 Q. Good morning, Ms. Weisbach. I have a couple of questions. And some of the questions you've probably noticed are sort of being put to you because if the Board does overturn their decision and approve it despite a potential inconsistency, then some of these questions may be important in terms of conditions or better understanding of what might have to be in that approval.

So with that in mind, the manure management plan, it seemed to incorporate, at least some of the documents we had, a third operation. Was that part of your approval process is how all those operations would be handled in manure management plan or just specifically the northeast proposed operation?
A. MS. WEISBACH: So when we look at applications, one of the requirements is to -- under the Act also, they either have to provide sufficient manure spreading lands, which is determined by the land -- the land based code, or they can -- alternatively, they can provide us with a manure management plan. So there are these two options.

And Mr. Van't Land went with the manure management plan, and this -- and that plan was prepared by an agrologist, professional agrologist, who is looking
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after the manure spreading and manure application in case of Mr. Van't Land --
Q. And you --
A. MS. WEISBACH: -- that $p$ lan as being sufficient for manure spreading or taking care of their manure production.
Q. So you take no issue with the manure management plan?
A. MS. WEISBACH: No, because it was prepared by a professional.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Does this operation have nine months' storage?
A. MS. WEISBACH: No, they don't. They do -- they go with short-term manure storage, which is an acceptable way of storing manure. And short-term manure storage is also here under the standards and admin regulations manure storage Section 5.

There are certain requirements that need to be fulfilled, so you cannot store it longer than seven months every three years. But as Mr. Van't Land pointed out, manure is being carried to the fields where manure will be stored. So then they will be basically transported to various areas of those fields that will receive that manure.
Q. Okay. So just perhaps help me or remind me, is there a variance or something that's required if there is not
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nine months' storage available?
A. MS. WEISBACH: No. No. Short-term manure storage is an acceptable way to store your manure.
Q. Okay. And so when that happens, then really, the approval officer, do $I$ have this right, the approval officer then assumes it's not an application issue; it just moves offsite. And if there's an issue in terms of the number of fields that it could be stored on to meet the seven months and three-year requirement or runoff issues, it is now purely a compliance issue?
A. MS. WEISBACH: Right.
Q. So if it's short term, the approval officer is essentially out of the picture?
A. MS. WEISBACH: Right.
Q. And that's regardless of concerns that if there are concerns that are raised by residents in terms of the amount of land available to store or runoff issues, that would just be referred to compliance?
A. MS. WEISBACH: It would be.
Q. Okay. Is it relatively unique to have short-term used in replacement of nine months' storage, or is that fairly common?
A. MS. WEISBACH: For broiler operations, it is actually quite common. We see that a lot. Some feed lots also have short-term manure storage, so it's a
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common form of manure storage, so to say.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Just going through my notes here.

So just maybe two other questions. One of the conditions to be carried over because it's more stringent and to meet the policy that is -- you carry that forward in terms of the 48 -hour incorporation or incorporation within 48 hours, are you aware of -- or was Double $H$ using zero or minimum till? Is that their common practice, do you know?
A. MS. WEISBACH: Well, I'm not entirely sure what your question really is.
Q. So my question, I guess where $I^{\prime} m$ going with this is if they are minimum zero till, and this may be better put to -- and I will likely put this to Double H, as well -- but if a condition is being carried over, presumably, if he's on zero till, either he's going to incorporate then to meet the condition; otherwise, it's a compliance issue or he put an amendment, request for an amendment potentially.

And I guess, you know, from the Board perspective, it would be better to deal with that now perhaps, if, you know, if the application was to be approved, it might be better to deal with that now?

But that question perhaps is better for Double H . I just thought perhaps that was part of the
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conversation when you were dealing with the application in terms of their operating practice, similar to the short-term storage where the nine month, I was wondering if that was part of the conversation between you and Mr. Van't Land.

So you're unaware? You're not sure?
A. MS. WEISBACH: No, we didn't - we didn't speak on that.
Q. A11 right. Thank you.

And in your decision document, you indicated that there was no need to really move further with directly affected party concerns because the application was to be denied, yet you have a series of potential conditions that you think the Board ought to look at if -- again, if the application was to be approved.

So is that kind of common practice where you would -- you have a series of potential suggestions or conditions on a denial in case the file -- or the decision is overturned, but not concerns from the directly affected parties. Like, you don't go that far.

Is that sort of the operating procedure for applications where the conditions in existing permits, perhaps, post-construction, inspection, those are dealt with, but gap concerns essentially are left? If there
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is a hearing request, that's where you believe those would be best dealt with?
A. MS. WEISBACH: We don't -- that part isn't covered by approval policy, to my knowledge.

So what I did was to basically cover the standard -- standard conditions, what we would do with the -- with development permits.

So that is a standard that we carry them over and incorporate -- yeah, we carry them over. And the way we do that, that's covered by policy.

And then we do have the standard conditions such as the concrete, so construction conditions, as well as post-construction inspections and the deadline, construction deadline. Those are standard conditions or standard procedures.

Other conditions arising out of Statements of Concern would then be going beyond. So I did -- I did not do that because I denied the application.
Q. Okay, understood. Thank you very much. Those are my questions.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Kennedy, did you want to have -- or did you want to direct some questions to Mr. Cumming?

MR. KENNEDY: I do. Before I do so, because we seem to be splitting these out, as long as we're
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comfortable that nobody else has questions of Mr. Cumming, I'm happy to start.

THE CHAIR: Oh, in terms of other parties?
MR. KENNEDY: Yeah.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, well, let's ask the question. So are any other parties looking to ask a question of Mr. Cumming?

Hearing none, you may proceed.
MR. KENNEDY:
Thank you.
MR. KENNEDY QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. Mr. Cumming, my questions will relate to I think why you're here, and that's kind of the proposed way of dealing with statutory plans beyond the MDP on a go-forward basis, in terms of board review policy. Do I have that right?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes. Good morning, Mr. Kennedy. It's essentially Part B of the submission, which is Exhibit 16 that we put forward.
Q. And if I might, and hopefully it will be a lot easier on the document managers. Could we get Exhibit 16, pdf page 7? That's perfect, and it's really where -- it's paragraph 23 and then the following paragraphs describing the process that you're here to speak to. Is that -- did I read that correctly?
A. MR. CUMMING: That is essentially correct,

Mr. Kennedy .
I would point out to you, if we could go to pdf page 5, please, right there, Section 12, is that the Agricultural Operations Practices Act, Section $20(1)$, and you've heard this before, is quite specific about what an approval officer must consider when they are looking for the consistency, and it is municipal development plan land use provisions.

As you pointed out and as we've identified here, the Municipal Government Act was amended in late 2017 I believe it was, and there was a change in the Municipal Government Act and a change in the hierarchy of the different plans as has been previously identified.

When that change was made, there were no consequential amendments made to AOPA. So this provision about the municipal development plan and more specifically the land use provisions within that plan still applies despite the changes to the Municipal Government Act.
Q. Thank you. And, Mr. Cumming, none of my questions hopefully will be asking for a legal opinion and how Section 20 perhaps might be interpreted given the, you know, whether there's an interpretation requirement

C. WEISBACH, A. CUMMING

Questioned by Mr. Kennedy
driven by the changes to the Municipal Government Act. I won't be going there, or $I$ don't anticipate going there.

And I want to preface all of my questions with an acknowledgement of how constructive I think this approach is, you know. Put forward the policy, let's examine it in a hearing, perhaps with some, you know, a live example as to how that policy might work.
A. MR. CUMMING: Just one correction there. I think you're calling it a policy at the moment. It's actually a framework, and we're putting this thing forward to sort of update, you know, provide updates that may be helpful and may be useful for the Board, but it is certainly not in our approvals policy at this point in time.
Q. No, fair. If $I$ was suggesting that it was in the policy at this point, I didn't mean to do that. But am I fair to assume that at some point, language, you know, there could be a policy amendment driven by -- by this consideration?
A. MR. CUMMING: We are certainly looking at improving our policy with respect to how this might be considered.
Q. Sure. And all of my questions -- so we've got the 23(a), (b), and we've got a reference to statutory
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plans, and it uses the example of IDPs. My questions will all be dealing with the instance where the statutory plan under consideration, the other statutory plan under consideration, is an IDP.

So I'm not talking about land use bylaws. Does that make sense?
A. MR. CUMMING: I understand where you're coming from, yes.
Q. And is it fair to assume that we have both an (a) and a (b) because there is a potential for inconsistency between a Municipal Development Plan and other statutory plans, specifically in Intermunicipal Development Plan?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes, absolutely.
Q. And, Mr. Cumming, is there any magic -- so there's an "and" between (a) and (b). Is there any magic to the order of (a) and (b)?
A. MR. CUMMING: It comes back to the legislation that we have right now. So as I pointed out earlier, AOPA specifically references the MDP land use provisions, so we're looking at consistency with the MDP 1 and use conditions -- sorry, provisions.

Then once we've done that, then we're going to look at the next step, which is in the proposed framework here, is that that MDP specifically
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cross-references the statutory plan, IDP in this case, relevant to that particular site.
Q. So I'm going to visit -- so the approval officer didn't follow this format; is that fair? And I'11 explain why I'm saying that is -- is she found the inconsistency, the exclusion zone provision in the MDP, but then she did look to the MDP to see whether the IDP was sufficiently cross-referenced to bring it into her table of consideration?
A. MR. CUMMING: I believe if you look at the decision summary for this particular application, that the approval officer cross-referenced our existing policy which provides that direction, and that is in there.
Q. So what I'm asking is -- but the proposed policy, this is not what she -- you know, this would take a new path?
A. MR. CUMMING: It's proposed framework; it's not policy at all at this point in time, but it would take a different path to what's now current policy.
Q. If I refer to it as a proposed policy it's because that's the way I wrote it in my notes; I'm not suggesting that it is current policy, so...
A. MR. CUMMING: Forgive me if I keep on correcting you then.
Q. My question is this, is -- I think there would be a substantial difference, and maybe a constructive difference, if we started asking ourselves the (b) question before the (a) question.

So can we follow that path a little bit and explore that piece?
A. MR. CUMMING: So I'm not sure what you want me to explore. I understand --
Q. At this stage all $I$ want you to do is understand that I'm going to start with (b) and say let's do -- make the way we -- the order in which we address this the inverse.

So when I first asked, does it -- you know, is it identifying the order of which these things must be done, and I think your answer was yes, so the "and" has a qualifier. Because, generally, if you ask yourself two questions with an "and," it means you will have to answer both questions, and whereas if the "and" had the qualifier to say yes, it's consistent with the MDP 1and use provisions, then we'11 go on and consider (b). I
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes.
Q. Okay. So my proposal now is to start with (b), so just flip the order in which those two items are addressed. And I'm going to run through that using the
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Double H Feeders as an example perhaps. Do you follow me?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes, I'm waiting for you to carry on.
Q. Al1 right. Good. So what I think we heard, and the IDP provision that we're looking at, so I'm not going to pull that up again, but it's the 4.1 .5 of the Intermunicipal Development Plan that we pulled up when the approval officer was answering some questions, contemplates the potential for expansion of existing feedlots. So you don't take issue with that?
A. MR. CUMMING: No. My look and observation of 4.1 .5 is that it actually has several sections within it, even though it calls itself one section. So I think you need to be careful as to how you deal with each one of those particular questions or set of circumstances that it's suggesting.
Q. Yeah. So, clearly, it provides no new operations, but that's not a relevant consideration to the Double H Feeders. Is that fair?
A. MR. CUMMING: The Double H Feeders' application is what we would consider to be an expansion.
Q. So in that sense, the first part doesn't apply?
A. MR. CUMMING: Correct.
Q. It's not a new operation.
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So the second part is really one provision with a number of, you know, directions to have regard for various things, qualifiers, caveats, whatever you might characterize them; is that fair?
A. MR. CUMMING: We would potentially characterize those as tests or conditions which is expressly excluded from what an approval officer has to consider under AOPA.
Q. Now, if those tests or provisions are driven to a planning and exemption, are they still tests or conditions that an approval officer cannot look to?
A. MR. CUMMING: I think the part in AOPA is pretty clear about having to exclude test of conditions. I just need to pull up that part of AOPA, unless you have it handy?
Q. I do have it handy.
A. MR. CUMMING: I have it here. It's

Section 20(1.1) if that helps. And I don't know that AOPA is an exhibit and I don't know if it is there and available to be pulled up.
Q. So maybe very briefly, we could pull up pdf page 78 again of Exhibit -- Exhibit 7. And I apologize to the document managers. Again, this is -- my reference is going to cause a bit of a delay because just the magnitude, the size of that document. Thank you.
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So the current policy -- you know, there is a provision in this IDP that says: (as read)
"No new operations within the exclusion
area in Map 11."
So that's a clear land use provision and there is an inconsistency if it's a new operation.

So looking at the second part of that, are those all tests or conditions? So let's just --
A. MR. CUMMING: Let me read what AOPA says, Mr. Kennedy. In 20(1).1, it says, "In considering" -under subsection 1, which deals with the consistency with the Municipal Development Plan, amongst other things: (as read)
"...whether an application is consistent with the Municipal Development Plan land use provisions, an approval officer
shall not consider any provisions
respecting tests or conditions related
to the construction of or the site for a
confined feeding operation or a manure storage facility, nor any provisions respecting the application of manure composting materials or compost."
Q. Right. So let's just look at the very first one, you know, upgrade or modernize, because, presumably, if
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we're expanding an operation that's been around for a while, I think the municipal development permit for the northeast quarter operation which is being expanded was -- it predated the NRCB. Is that your understanding?
A. MR. CUMMING: That is correct, yes.
Q. So it might be that some of -- some of the facilities, and I think what Double H Feeders is saying is we are, in fact, replacing facilities from the 1993 operation, which is on a different land location?
A. MR. CUMMING: Under a different permit.
Q. Under a different permit. But if it were considered to be one -- one application and you were looking at both operations falling under the purview of this operation, is -- and my question is very specific.

So this upgrade and modernize -- and this is why I think this qualifier might be relevant because I think it has to be understood with respect to Section 1.1, within the requirements of $A O P A$ and the regulations.

So perhaps all it's calling for is an acknowledgement and an understanding as to whether the expansion will take out manure storage facilities and replace them -- that don't meet the current standards with facilities that do meet the current standards. So that's an upgrade and a modernization. And that's
why -- you know, I'm trying to understand what those bracketed terms mean, but it could mean that. And if it means that, is it -- it's onside with 1.1; correct?
A. MR. CUMMING: You are making a large number of assumptions there which aren't necessarily part of what was originally applied for.

What was originally applied for deals specifically with the northeast barns at this particular facility. None of the existing barns are proposed to be upgraded or changed.

Your assumption is that the separate operation, which is on the northwest part of the property is -- is part of this whole application, and that's certainly not the application that was in front of the approval officer.
Q. But let's -- so let's put Double H Feeders and consider it -- I just want your interpretation of 1.1 and this very provision.

If there were manure storage facilities that were being replaced during the expansion that would bring them current with $A O P A$, does that mean that they are a land use provision? So not a -- you know, it's just an acknowledgement that $A O P A$ is going to bring them up to standard.
A. MR. CUMMING: I think you're making an
C. WEISBACH, A. CUMMING

Questioned by Mr. Kennedy
assumption there as well. And I don't want to be argumentative here, but you're assuming that whatever is constructed right now doesn't meet AOPA requirements, and I don't know that for a fact. So I can't make that assumption.
Q. And neither am -- well, I'm using an example. I'm trying to understand Section 4.1 .5 of the IDP and how it might work when we're dealing with the second part of that which deals with expansion facilities and AOPA, and the proposed policy that you're putting forward.

So we've got a live IDP that is a little more relaxed than the MDP, so it might allow an expansion where the MDP says no.

So my question is, the --
A. MR. CUMMING: I think what -- you're jumping to a conclusion there because in the example that you're using, we don't get past what is Section -- subsection 22 on pdf 7 of Exhibit 16.

MS. VANCE:
Mr. Cumming, this is Fiona Vance. I might just suggest you wait for Mr. Kennedy to ask his question.
A. MR. CUMMING: Okay.

MS. VANCE:
Q. MR. KENNEDY:

Thank you.
So take me back, sorry, subsection? What am I missing?
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A. MR. CUMMING: Sorry, it's not on that one; it's in the proposed framework that we have there, which is paragraph 22 on pdf page 7. And you're talking about paragraph 23 , but in order to get to paragraph 23 , we have to go through paragraph 22.
Q. Okay.
A. MR. CUMMING: The way I understand what you're suggesting now is we wouldn't get through paragraph 22 to get to paragraph 23.
Q. Maybe if we can pull that up, and it's Exhibit 16 --
A. MR. CUMMING: Pdf 7.
Q. Yeah. So I'm sorry, Mr. Cumming, I understand paragraph 22, and it relates to my question to you in terms of the priority of (a) and (b), and it's simply a statement that says, "we're going to start with (a)." So it's not just an "and." It's an "and" with a qualifier that will only go on to (b) if (a) doesn't eliminate the application; correct?
A. MR. CUMMING: Correct. The example that you're using, though, however, I understand if we don't get
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At least if it applies to IDPs and, again, none of this discussion relates to land use, bylaws or other statutory plans.

So, with that, and I'm not taking issue with the statement in paragraph 22. I understand that's what's being done and I understand that's what is being proposed as potential policy, not current policy, but potential policy. And that's why I'm visiting that is I think it -- at the very least, we may want to ask ourselves the question as an organization as to whether there's merit in asking (b) first.

And I do that because we all -- I think everybody acknowledges that the MGA now has a provision that says IDPs prevail over MDPs if there is -- in the case there is an inconsistency. I have that right?
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't disagree with you that that's what the MGA says. The challenge is that AOPA doesn't specify that.
Q. Yeah, so when people read -- I mean, there could be an explanation that when people now read an MDP and there is a provision in an MDP that is inconsistent with the provision that applies in an IDP, it could be that you cannot simply read the MDP. It makes no sense to apply a provision that doesn't apply anymore. If it doesn't prevail, you've got an issue.
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That's what I'm trying to explore with you, in terms of reversing the order of (b) and (a). Because I think if you reverse the order, you in fact would identify those situations where the provision in the MDP that you're applying may not carry the day anymore.

So -- and, again, it's not for me to give evidence. But if we were to apply (b) first, would it address the situation where the IDP had a provision that maybe softened an MDP exclusion zone? Because I think that's what we have here with the Double H Feeders IDP and not necessarily their fact situation because, again, we're talking about two different operations under different permits.

But we've got an IDP that applies to these lands, and we've got an MDP that applies to these lands, and there is an inconsistency. I have that correct?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes, it would certainly identify it. Would it address it? I don't know that it would.
Q. Well, if you like, we can have a quick look at that and maybe identify. That was why $I$ was going with the caveat pieces, and I think your suggestion is those caveat pieces are not relevant considerations for an approval officer. Is that what you told -- is that --
A. MR. CUMMING: If I understand what you mean by the "caveat pieces," yes. The approval officer is very
limited under the AOPA legislation as to what they can consider.
Q. Right. But they could consider, for example, an upgrade of existing manure storage facilities to $A O P A$ standards and probably would in every application to expand an operation?
A. MR. CUMMING: If those -- if those upgrades were proposed as part of the application, yes, they would consider them. Normally existing operations are looked at purely on the risk to the environment posed by those operations. I think that's different.
Q. But if the risk to the environment was identified and there was a need to upgrade -- upgrade to respond to that risk, the approval officer would typically apply the current AOPA standards and requirements?
A. MR. CUMMING: That's not -- that's not what's set out in the legislation. The risk needs to be addressed, but it doesn't necessarily have to meet the AOPA standard. So they could be slightly different.
Q. But -- well, they could be slightly different. How often are they slightly different, do you have any sense?
A. MR. CUMMING: I can't give you an honest opinion on that point.
Q. But it's commonly the approval officer might look at
C. WEISBACH, A. CUMMING

Questioned by Mr. Kennedy
that application and say, "Here's what the current AOPA standard is and the purpose for those requirements. If there's a risk and we're addressing it, let's look at the current standard." Is that a starting point that you would typically find in an approval officer decision summary?
A. MR. CUMMING: I think that that conversation happens prior to a decision being issued with the applicant for them to figure out what they want to do as part of their application, which the approval officer would then consider.
Q. Okay. So -- okay. We11, I have further questions, but frankly, I'm not sure whether they're constructive at this point because I think we've -- I understand your position is you don't think there's any merit in moving (b) in advance of (a), identifying whether there's an IDP provision that prevails over an MDP provision?
A. MR. CUMMING: I think if you do swap what we have identified as (a) and (b) around, certainly that would identify an IDP -- potential difference with an MDP, but it wouldn't necessarily address it.
Q. So let's do that for the moment. And if we identify an IDP provision that would be more permissive than an MDP provision, so the MDP provision --

Well, let's do it a little differently. Let's use
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in our example an MDP provision that is permissive of a CFO expansion. So the approval officer goes forward -no that gets us to (b).

My problem is this: We are applying an MDP provision that would say no to an operation when that MDP provision may not be the statutory provision that applies to the operation. That's what happens when we exclude consideration of a statutory plan that in hierarchy is at a higher level, so prevails. Am I wrong in that statement? Is that --
A. MR. CUMMING: No, I think you're right. You know, I wanted to also point out to you that the way that this framework is set out, it wouldn't matter if that IDP provision was less stringent or more stringent than the MDP provision.

So I think you have to consider that as well. It's not just always that it's going to be less stringent and less permissive, if you will.
Q. Well, here, it would always -- if it's more restrictive, then it's important that we consider it, because if it says no to the application and the approval officer says "I'm not looking at it because the MDP tells me that it's okay to build a CFO on this site and the IDP isn't sufficiently referenced in the MDP for me to get there and look at that under
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statutory plan," then you are -- then we're approving an operation that's inconsistent with a land use provision that prevails over the MDP. Is there something wrong with my logic in running through that scenario?
A. MR. CUMMING: Under the MGA, you're absolutely right. Under $A O P A$, the approval officer would be doing the right thing at that point in time as to they're required to do under that statute.
Q. And not that this requires an answer, but, you know, the MGA applies throughout this province whether -- and if there is a provision that affects the interpretation of a statutory pl an in the $M G A$, you know, we can't ignore the fact that the $M G A$ exists $I$ would suggest. And, again, does this policy meet that expectation?

And I'm not looking for a legal opinion. And that's why this question is a bit awkward, and if you want to just decline answering it, that's fine. Perhaps Ms. Vance can address this in final argument or in redirect, more of a legal question so perhaps final argument, but $I$ think there's a real question that needs to be addressed.
A. MR. CUMMING: I agree that it does put approval officers in an awkward position from time to time.
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Q. Well, and perhaps it puts neighbours and municipalities in an awkward position as well because our decisions affect not only the Board; they affect operators, they affect neighbours.

Our legislation is to address communities, and the fact that we put an approval officer or legal counsel or the Board in an awkward situation should not be our priority. That's not our main concern.

So, thank you, Mr. Cumming, those are my questions.

Ms. Weisbach, I overlooked thanking you. I was thinking that $I$ should have thanked you, and I missed that. Your answers are very helpful, and Mr. Cumming, thank you. Those are my questions.

THE CHAIR: Mr. Kennedy, thank you.
Mr. Cumming, I just have one question.

## THE CHAIR QUESTIONS THE PANEL:

Q. And I would agree, you know, Mr. Kennedy's outlined it; there's a bunch of legal interpretation that has to happen here. And this is probably not, you know, maybe perhaps even the forum. The Board will have to struggle with this for sure, but it's when we need to struggle about it is really the question.

But my question to you is if -- there's statutory interpretation rules that you may or may not be
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familiar with, but $I$ think one that you might be familiar with is if an outcome would lead to an absurdity as an example, then even regulators that need to interpret the law can interpret it somewhat differently if it leads to an absurd answer as an example.

Are you aware of where AOPA directs you very specifically in many places that you have said, "Well, in this case we're not going to follow AOPA." Has your policy recognized any potential inconsistencies or absurdities in $A O P A$, and therefore you've said, "Well, this time we're not going to follow very prescriptive direction from AOPA"?
A. MR. CUMMING: What $I$ can say is that $A O P A$ does allow for variances to be utilized, and our policy outlines that if a variance is going to be considered, that it needs to be explained as to why a variance is being used and being proposed.

So it needs to be very clear as to why something is not going to be -- not going to be done.
Q. Okay. So I guess I could be a little more specific; I thought you might just jump to it.

But as you know in your policy under deemed incapacity, Section $18.2(b)$ states, you know, that the numbers in a municipal permit are the numbers that are
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to be used. But there was some potential outcomes from strictly applying that very prescriptive piece of legislation that led to a policy shift, and, you know, I would think that rightly so.

But it essentially directs approval officers to ignore that piece or maybe not ignore but to apply a different provision in terms of using capacity rather than strictly municipal numbers. Does that kind of ring a bell?
A. MR. CUMMING: Are you talking about the Act and not the policy when -- I assume that you're referring to Section $18 ?$
Q. Yeah, sorry, the Act under Section 18.2, but the policy is -- I wrote it down here somewhere. Deeming capacity for grandfathered operations, I think it's 216-5; I'm just kind of going by memory there. I was looking at it, and I thought I had written it down here, so my apologies.

So in that policy, it -- you know, approval officers are directed to -- or basically the policy says that that one piece of the legislation does not need to apply because strict application of the act in that section will lead to potentially an absurd outcome.

So my question isn't to debate that; it's really
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to say if a statutory interpretation were presented or if you worked through with legal counsel, statutory interpretation rules that would allow you to sort of say, "Yeah, you know, perhaps the MGA -- the changes in the MGA now could be reflected in policy."

And in terms of, as Mr. Kennedy points out, flipping those around, there would be -- you would be open to -- to making that change in policy or change a policy to reflect that if the statutory interpretation rules opened the door for you. Would that be fair?
A. MR. CUMMING: I want to be very careful how I respond to this because it does have potential implications and, typically, anything that we're going to put into policy which may be in conflict with the legislation, we would want to have those discussions with the owner of the legislation and probably also our policy advisory group before we ran through that.

So you know, I don't want to say no, but I think that there is quite a number of steps to take place before that happens.

The one thing that does typically happen when an act is changed is that there are consequential amendments that are done to different pieces of legislation that it applies to or may impact.

And when the Municipal Government Act was changed,
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those consequential amendments, excuse me, were not made to change any of the AOPA requirements, which leaves us in this position that we're happening right now. My presumption would be that that was done knowingly.
Q. Right. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Cumming.

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Stuart?
MS. STUART:
Thank you, Mr. Chair.
MS. STUART QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. You know, one of the clear challenges in this discussion is that -- and, Mr. Cumming, please confirm my interpretation of this is correct, that under AOPA, the approval officer is currently bound to disregard anything other than the Municipal Development Plan; is that correct?
A. MR. CUMMING: It's very specific about what they have to consider, and it is the Municipal Development Plan land use provisions.
Q. And do you agree that in Section -- and I apologize, I'm just trying to bring up my Act to make sure I've
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A. MR. CUMMING: Yes.
Q. Can you speak to how you view that statute, that piece of statute?
A. MR. CUMMING: In my opinion, that essentially says that the Board has more authority and more power than an approval officer and may choose to do something that may not be included as part of the Municipal Development Plan, which is different to what the approval officer has to consider under Section 20.
Q. And my only other question is -- and recognizing and respecting your comments about proper process of interpretation and the involvement of policy change -- I do note that you said -- and I, of course, don't have the exact wording in front of me, but it was around 25 minutes after 10, you alluded to Field Services revisiting policy in terms of those statutory plans and you did -- you did use the word "looking at improving our policy" and I just wondered if you could expand on that slightly to help the Panel understand when you use that word "improving," do you see a current deficiency in the policy? And, again, I recognize you may have some question in wanting to answer this.
A. MR. CUMMING: I think I recall what you're referring to, and our current policy is -- is really
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not perhaps as clear as it could potentially be and some of our approval officers have asked for additional clarity as far as those concerns.

So that's what we're trying to do is to add clarity, and by adding clarity, obviously, improve how considerations, Municipal Development Plans, other statutory plans are made.

So our objective here is to continuously improve and provide that clarity that everyone is seeking. The framework that we proposed in the submission is just that; it's a proposed framework for consideration.
Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Cumming.

MS. STUART
Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Stuart.
Mr. Graham?
MR. GRAHAM :
Not at this time. Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Graham.
And, Ms. Roberts.
MS. ROBERTS:
I have no questions for
Mr. Cumming. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. So I think we are at the end of our questioning for Field Services.

MR. VAN'T LAND:
Mr. Chair, I wonder if -- through the discussion, I had one question that came to mind, and I wondered if I could offer some points of
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clarification on two other items?
THE CHAIR:
Who's speaking, please?
MR. VAN'T LAND:
Sorry. This is Scott Van't Land from Double H Feeders.

THE CHAIR:
Well, I'm kind of wondering is this something you can bring up during your direct or is this a direct question for Mr. Cumming?

If it's clarification, I think you'11 have an opportunity to perhaps do that.

MR. VAN'T LAND: This is a question about the detailed permit for Ms. Weisbach.

So whether that's now or later --
THE CHAIR:
Oh, I see. Well, Mr. Kennedy? I mean --

MR. KENNEDY: Wel1, it's high1y unusual. And, you know, of course, it's in the Panel's hands as to how they're going to field this and rule on it.

But just so all the parties understand, and I think our guides are pretty clear is you have an opportunity, once that opportunity is passed, typically it doesn't come back to you. So when you had an opportunity to ask questions of the approval officer and Mr . Cumming and you declined to do so, that's it in the normal process.

You know, and to be fair, is these proceedings
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have to move along in an orderly fashion and there's a reason why we've established the order that we have established and we follow.

You know, if we conduct an open house, which we do from time to time, it's a far different format, but a public hearing has rules and the rules are there for a reason.

And with that, I'11 leave it to the Chair and the Panel as to how they're going to rule on your specific request, and not knowing what your question is, and it could be that you put that question to the Panel and determine whether they are prepared to put it to the witness.

THE CHAIR:
And I guess a quick question I had, Mr. Van't Land, is this something that you could just address in your direct if it's a clarification that you -- or is it something you just don't know and want an answer to?

MR. VAN'T LAND: It's a clarification.
THE CHAIR: Why don't you make that in your
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1 THE CHAIR:
Well, Mr. Kennedy, I think he has -- that's his opportunity when he's presenting. Do I have that right?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes. So, Mr. Van't Land, just so you understand, the evidence that other parties provide, typically other parties may not agree with it, they may take issue with that and that's the reason why you get a chance to present your evidence and why you get an opportunity to question them when your opportunity to question arises.

And, you know, hearings become very awkward if we start circling back. You know, I heard something in the response to the next parties' questions that I think I want to clarify. No, you had your chance, and it's passed, and that's a typical feeling. It happens to me all the time when I'm in a public hearing is I hear somebody further down the road ask a question and I think, "Boy, there's a follow-up that I'd just love to ask." I don't get to do that.

So find a way, and there probably is a way when you are giving your direct evidence, you can make your statement as to -- or qualification as to how you -you know, what your evidence is, and then, of course, you get to final argument. And that's your opportunity to say, "You heard this as the evidence, and you heard
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conflicting evidence perhaps, but here's how I want you to consider and factor that evidence," and you get to persuade the Board as to why your interpretation should be -- should carry the day. So that's the final argument piece.

You don't get to put in new evidence at that point, but you get to present your case as to why the Board should reach a certain decision based on the evidence they've heard through the course of the hearing prior to final argument. Does that help you.

THE CHAIR: Yes, great explanation, Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. Van't Land, do you understand where Mr. Kennedy is going? And my sense, unless the Panel is in disagreement, and I'11 hear from them, but is to have you during direct evidence, if there's some evidence that you want to put in front of us, that's the best spot for you to do that, and then we can, you know, as Mr. Kennedy says, avoid the circling of wagons because that could go on all day, of course.

Pane1 members, are you in agreement with that approach?

MS. STUART:
MS. ROBERTS:
MR. VAN'T LAND:

Yes, I am.
Yes, I am.
My apologies to the Pane1, and not
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following procedure. So I will take lots of notes and make sure to address the concerns that I have.

THE CHAIR: No apology required. I mean, at the start I encourage people to ask questions, and you've done that. You've said -- and I think we've provided an avenue for you, but it's a learning experience for folks that, you know, this is -- a hearing process is new to you, so no apology required. And we'll look forward to those -- your direct evidence in just a few minutes, actually.

Okay. We11, thank you. Thanks, Panel members and Mr. Kennedy.

Field Services, do you -- Ms. Vance, do you have any redirect?

MS. VANCE:
I do not.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you. It is about seven minutes after 11. Getting sort of close to the lunch hour, but probably a little too early for lunch. But I think some folks might be looking for a bio break if nothing else, and maybe grab a coffee. In particular, I notice that some of us are sort of locked into these screens and we can't really get away from them. So why don't we break until 20 after 11, but we'11 -Oh, I'm sorry. Ms. Vance?

MS. VANCE:
Sorry, just before we break, I

6 (PANEL STANDS DOWN)
7 THE CHAIR: take until 11:20, a quick bio break and resume at that time.
(ADJOURNMENT)
(DISCUSSION OFF THE RECORD)
THE CHAIR:
So we've got everybody back.
Thank you, all.
So, Mr. Van't Land, with Double H, you are up, and your turn to present direct evidence, and then we'11 have an opportunity to ask you questions just as we did with the approval officer.

So are you ready to proceed?
MR. VAN'T LAND: I am.
THE CHAIR: Great. The floor is yours.
THE WITNESS: I wonder --
THE COURT REPORTER: Sorry, excuse me. Would you like the witness sworn in?

THE CHAIR:
Yes, I would.
Thank you.
S. VAN'T LAND (For Double H Feeders), affirmed
A. I wonder if I could have the people preparing the documents bring up Document Number 18, which is the document that I submitted.

My plan is roughly to walk through and offer clarification and a few more details around various aspects of that document, if that's okay.

So starting on the first page here, there was some question about the number of birds that are at each location. And one of the challenging things, I don't know how familiar everyone is with the broiler industry, but when $I$ first started growing birds, a typical chicken would weigh somewhere in the neighbourhood of 1.95 kilos. Today, we're typically shipping a chicken that is in the neighbourhood of 2.3 kilos, and that depends on what market we're shipping into. Sometimes that chicken, if we're shipping into a KFC market, could be a 1.7 kilogram bird.

So the presumption of issuing a permit based on birds is a very fuzzy number. And when we're allocated our quota from -- through the Alberta Chicken Producers, it's actually done in kilos instead of chickens to try to alleviate that process.

And also, there -- I don't know how these numbers get updated over time, but it's also worth noting that when $I$ first started raising birds, the feed conversion on a chicken was somewhere around 1.8, 1.85, kind of in that range. And, today, we're typically shipping with a feed conversion of 1.5.

And the reason I feel that's relevant is because, obviously, if you're feeding a chicken a kilo of feed and more of that kilo becomes part of the chicken rather than goes out the tail end and out into the manure pile, that's relevant to how much manure we're generating.

So that being the case, I hope that clarifies some of the numbers that seem to be thrown around. And I realize that a permit number that was issued 20 years ago is relevant, but from a technical point of view, we also have to understand that the industry, when my dad first built the barns on the west quarter, the typical stocking density of a chicken barn was one chicken per square foot. As time moved on, that commonly became three-quarters of a square foot per chicken, and in some operations it got as dense as half-a-square foot per chicken.

The industry has moved back from that, and we actually target now, because of the weight variation,
we target a density of 38 kilograms per square metre.
So the allocation of the stocking of a chicken barn isn't a static number and isn't perhaps as simple as it might be in a hog or a feedlot scenario. So that being the case, I think that answers any of the questions that might happen on the first page.

If we move to the second page of that document, just to talk a little bit about the rational for going through this process, $I$ don't know if it's because of the details of the legalities of dealing with the different permits or if it's a misunderstanding. But we're essentially looking to -- to move one operation onto another.

I know there's some questions about the relationship of the northwest versus the northeast quarter. And when we applied for that permit, we did apply for a modest increase, to go from a total of 226,000 birds to 238,000 birds, which represents roughly a 5 percent increase.

And to be honest, there's a portion of me that doesn't like odd numbers and that's where 120,000 came from. And that fits within the proposed square footage in current technical standards that we place our birds to.

So, from an operational point of view, we look at
this as a moving of our operations away from the Town of Coalhurst onto a more appropriate location.

That ties into the - on the second half of this page, I referenced the Intermunicipal Development P1an, and I'm just going to go to, would be page -- there's a map in the plan that $I$ think best illustrates this, and that would be, in this document, it's on page 5. If I could have that brought up and kind of just centre the operation there.

And so I've taken this straight from the Intermunicipa1 Development P1an, and I just annotated it with the location of the land we own within that area. Where "Trevor's Yard" is, which is the operation that we're planning on decommissioning, and "Scott's Yard" is the yard where we're proposing to add the -to move the production to.

And you can see in the bottom left corner there the proximity we are to Coalhurst and how that yard, when you stand on that yard and look around, there's -fortunately my grandparents and dad had the foresight to plant a lot of trees, so a lot of people can't see the barns there. And a lot of neighbours are quite frankly surprised that there is an operational -operation there.

But it's also sited in an area which, according to
the IDP, is -- is destined to be potential group country residential, which we can see that there is already a dense smattering of acreages and whatnot there, and in the future, $I$ can see where that might lead to some friction.

And that's why we're making this move to move that production over to what is deemed in the IDP to be primarily agricultural land. And you can see the pink semicircle on that page where it's actually slated perhaps for industrial development, if not agricultural. So what that communicated to us as well is that that area is not destined to be residentially developed, regardless of what the current determination is.

There's been a lot of concern about runoff, and with that, $I$ would like to go to page 17 I think shows it the clearest. And this map is a topographical map which I obtained from -- the Lethbridge Northern Irrigation District was good enough to provide that to me. And you can see in the bottom left corner is our current operation, that quarter section where our operation is. And on the bottom right-hand corner is where Mr. Clifton's operation is.

In one of the previous documents, there is -- it demonstrated where the runoff runs, and it shows the
runoff is running -- from our quarter section, there is no culvert going directly east, but there is a culvert going north and then east into the southwest of 26-9-22. And it was alluded to $I$ thought that that might be considered Mr. Bedster's land, and that is not where Mr. Bedster lives. He lives significantly further south from there.

But that neighbour has approached us about the drainage, and we've had some good conversations, and he's looking to make some improvements there, and we've offered to work with him on that, and the ball is in his court on that. So we're looking to work with our neighbour on that.

THE CHAIR: Excuse me, Mr. Van't Land, Document Manager, are we seeing the entire page here? Is there a way to just maybe bring that down a bit, yeah, and maybe just a little bit more? Thank you very much.

Sorry, Mr. Van't Land, I thought it might be easier to kind of follow your descriptions if we could
A. Yes, I appreciate that.

What can also be seen when you look at the drainage on that parce1, the purple lines are indicative of where the lines would run. On a
topographical map when you run perpendicular to the lines, you're walking straight downhill. So the middle of the bottom left-hand quarter is where my barns are. And it's on a hill, and drainage runs both east and west from there.

So the drainage that runs west does run into a low area where we have put a swale, and that ends near the what locally is known as the Kipp Highway, the Township Road 9-4, which is on the north side of our property. That swale and the tile ends in the position that is lower than the culvert where the water from that drainage runs.

So the mindset behind that is simply to try and take some of our problem land and consolidate the problem in one area, as opposed to having it spread over a larger area. So that is the mindset with that particular drainage.

And then when you move to the east side of the parcel, you can see again that the water runs generally speaking towards Highway 25, and from Highway 25 it runs north.

And if you go to the -- if you can high1ight the south side of this picture, I know Mr. Bedster has a significant amount of drainage that runs through his land. I've seen it; I've seen virtual rivers running
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through there. But that water all comes -- "all" is a strong word -- but most of that water comes from south of him.

There is some water from the quarter section that is directly north of us that will also run through there. But if we move to the south side of this picture, you can see that there is an elevation rise. Actually, it's probably better shown on picture -- the page previous to this is a wider area. There we go. You can see along our southern border there that that's a rising elevation. And part of that is because that's an old irrigation ditch that was decommissioned. And they tended to run the irrigation ditches along the high points of the land.

And as that crosses Highway 25, there is no culvert there, so there is no place for our water to run south in that regard.

So I just wanted to make that clear, yeah, that none of the water from here is ending up there. All of the water that runs from our southern border runs to the north. None of that water runs onto our southern neighbours' land. It -- the elevations are just not adequate for that.

So that covers, I think, the drainage, and I imagine there will be questions about that.

The IDP, I think I'11 just -- any questions that people had about how the IDP associated with this, because $I$ think it's pretty clear in the documentation in the IDP.

And the nutrient management plan that was incorporated into our application, we have been working with a certified crop advisor for over 15 years. And he's been working with us to make sure that our manure application is appropriate. And in our particular case, we don't look at the manure as a waste product; we look at it as a valuable asset. I mean especially in a year like this when fertilizer prices are approaching what they will be, we're looking to utilize productively every last truckload of manure that we generate.

To do that, we work with him to make sure that that manure gets utilized properly. We do work in a direct-seeding method of crop production. We do spread the manure on the land, and given the provisions in AOPA, we do not turn it over. We wait for it to be incorporated.

The direct-seeding pool that we use is -- does disturb the land a fair amount, so $I$ would probably estimate that the ground is 75 percent disturbed by the time that grows over. But it's a single-pass
operation.
And part of that is because we're really looking to maintain soil structure. We're looking to maintain -- there's a lot of science that's still in process as far as what bacteriological and fungal networks are occurring in the land, not to mention the soil structure itself that every time you turn that land over, you disturb it. And it has implications for resiliency for water and carbon storage and just for the resilience of the land as far as the health of the crop is concerned.

So that, we sample every field every year. It's -- we feel it's a valid cost to get that done, and that way, we always know where every parcel is as far as the nutrient factor is available to us. We don't like guessing, so we -- we do that.

And yeah, I'm trying to think what else to hightight here.

One of the provisions in the IDP referred to -there's a fair bit of discussion about Point 4.1.5 in the last session. And one of the provisions in there was reducing negative impacts to rural and urban residents. And that is a significant portion of why we're approaching this project the way we are.

We've been weighing the tradeoff of improving the
barns that are on the northwest location to a modern standard. They're currently double-standard --double-decker barns that are for modern broiler production is inefficient and inconvenient and not -- not the current standard of operation, which we would be building on the northeast quarter.

But to put investment into building barns there where in the foreseeable future, I mean within 20 to 30 years I can anticipate that area being much more closed in with residential development.

And on the east quarter we're much more open. There -- for some reason, there seems to be some kind of a dividing line between the east and the west quarter even when you look to the subdivision map, there are dozens of subdivisions out of the different quarter sections that are on the west side of that line. When you come to east side, most of the quarters are whole.

And keeping that production close to Highway 25 , close to areas that are slated for industrial development, close to areas that are less prone to residential development is -- is what our goal is.

So one of the questions $I$ had regarding the permit, which $I$ was remiss in not asking earlier, is there is a provision in the previous permit that was
issued regarding the incorporation of manure. And my question would be, I think when that permit was issued, I think we only had the 200 acres that we colloquially call the home place. We have about three or four times that amount of 1 and now, and if that were to be incorporated -- we're not interested in incorporating all our manure for the -- I mean for the amount of diesel fuel, iron, and just waste that that incorporates.

So I'm wondering what the specific details around that particular provision would be, and if there's a way to amend the permit to remove that, as long as we're -- we're committed to following AOPA guidelines from start to finish, and if those guidelines change, obviously the requirements will be changing as well anyway just as a legislative reality of that. But I'm curious what the appetite and procedure would be for removing that clause from the permit. So, and with that, I think I've covered my notes anyways. So with that, I'm open to questions.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Van't Land.
Lethbridge County. Ms. Janzen, any questions?
MS. JANZEN:
No, I have no questions.
THE CHAIR: And, Ms. Horvath, Town of Coalhurst.

MS. HORVATH:
THE CHAIR:
MS. SCHMID: questions. I'm not sure how pertinent they are.

MS. SCHMID CROSS-EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
Q. My question kind of goes back to compliance issue, just when Matt [verbatim] is speaking about how they figure out numbers. Like, it says they have 58,000 birds currently, but they operate by kgs. So if you have a permit in place for 50,000 birds, and you have to assume a kg amount, why couldn't you back off the total kg amount to get closer to what you were permitted as opposed to going over?
A. I guess my question would be there's a perceived intent to a limitation on how much livestock can be produced on any particular location. And in order to -- to achieve the market conditions that we're looking to ship into, it -- it can make as much as a 25 to 30 percent difference in the stocking density that's available to us with no discernible difference.

When we're operating our chickens, we operate on an eight-week cycle. Typically the birds with their current genetic development, when we're operating with a 2-- 2 and a quarter kilo bird, we're stocked for 38 days and then we have the balance of the time to
clean up the barns and prepare for the new flock.
If we're only shipping a 1.7 kilo bird, we only have birds in there for 30,31 days which is roughly half the time. And I would suggest that if we're going to look strictly at stocking density, then we should also be looking somehow to accommodate for the time that the birds are in the barn.

When the permits were initially issued, we would routinely have birds in for 42 to 43 days, but the development of the genetic potential of them birds has improved that much over the last 25 years that we're able to get much more bird out of the same physical facilities.

And I don't think it is necessarily the intent of the permit to -- to arbitrarily limit the production in these barns.

MS. FRIEND: This is Laura. I think you're on mute, Mellissa.

MS. SCHMID: Yes, I'm just trying to figure out how I want to ask a follow-up question for this.
THE CHAIR: I sort of figured that you were just doing a little caucus there, so.

MS. SCHMID:
Yes.
Q. I guess what I'm trying to sort out in my mind here, and maybe somebody else can clarify this better than I
can, is you had the permit for the 50,000 birds. We spoke about like reducing the total kg to be more compliant with that permit, but then you're kind of saying that you'11 set your own parameters even if it does mean exceeding what you were approved for.

So I don't really know how to frame my question, but in my mind, it just comes across as, okay, so we're permitted for so many birds, but this is what I'm going to do anyway.
A. The requirements that are indicated under manure spreading and what have you make sort of assumptions as to the size of the bird and the amount of manure they're going to produce. And in my working with the NRCB through this and previous projects, it almost seems like there's more of a concern over the manure than the actual birds.

Any welfare or production concerns are dealt with by other arms of government, but here we're looking to make sure that everything is done in an environmentally sustainable manner, and that's always the attitude that we've looked at it under is to make sure that we're following the spirit of the permit.

To be honest, we produce less manure now than we did 20 years ago.

THE CHAIR:
I think, Ms. Schmid, your
questions are valid, and my sense is that, even on a go-forward basis on the existing operations, if there's an issue around density, population, exceeding permit numbers, that ought to be issued as a complaint to the NRCB and they can follow up, and if Mr. Van't Land's interpretation of what's allowed is different from the NRCB's, I mean the NRCB will prevail.

It isn't -- we don't have somebody right here, and that question might have been suitable for the approval officer too in terms of how they handle numbers and that, but that time has passed, and this wasn't brought up as a key -- we don't have a compliance -- anybody from compliance here as an example because this was not brought up as a key issue for the hearing.

So I get your question. I think it's been answered, but in the future, if -- you know, if you feel that there's an issue that needs to be addressed, you know, I think you should feel free to call the NRCB and make sure that issue is addressed appropriately.

MS. SCHMID: Okay. That's definitely fair.
Q. I just do have two more questions for Matt -- or, sorry, Scott -- if you could just maybe outline to me, like, the long-term impacts ecologically, like, the positive and the negative aspects if you get approved for expansion and what that looks like.
A. Right now when we operate in the older barns, they're double decker barns, they're older wood construction, the energy efficiency in those barns is verging on laughable. The age of the barns is such that the insulation is mostly out of the walls and to bring them up to current standards is difficult.

The operations that are involved in cleaning out the manure in those barns -- just for a point of comparison, we built a set of new barns in a different location about five years ago, and the amount of time and equipment, operational hours that it takes us to clean out -- what takes us an easy day in the new facility takes us about three days in the old facility probably -- and that's strictly manure clean-out, and then there's sweeping, blowout, disinfection.

I would say that it probably doubles the amount of equipment time, doubles the amount of work time, and at the same time, the barns, because of the modern construction, are much more energy efficient. We burn a lot less fuel, the birds are a lot more comfortable, we're able to keep the environmental conditions inside the barns a lot more suitable in extreme weather. So those are a number of the improvements that we're targeting.

As far as the implications regarding the amount of
manure produced, we're talking about a 5 percent difference, which is -- when it comes to something like spreading manure is somewhere in the neighbourhood a rounding error.

We continue to -- we spread the manure based on the soil samples that we get and how much manure is appropriate for -- for those quarter sections. So in our particular operation, that tends to mean that we operate on a four-parcel rotation.

Canola has been an integral part of our rotation for many years, and the most suitable place for the manure in our rotation is the head of the canola. It seems to use it the best, and it's a heavy nutrient user, reacts the best to having the manure on, and that's how we've been managing that.

So I think in the grand scheme of things, it would be a net positive from an environmental point of view because we're using -- it's a much more energy efficient construction, it's a much more labour efficient construction. The utilization of the manure is going to be status quo. It's essentially the same as it is now.

Five percent increase or decrease, that has to do with if we adjust our bedding depth by a fraction of an inch eats up that percentage. So the net implications
of the operation are positive of this project.
Q. One final question is my concern around air quality, what you guys are doing regarding that, and I guess your rebuttal for, like, the long-term health concerns or health exacerbation on community and neighbours with your expansion and existing barns.
A. Right now both operations are upwind of you. And in the new operation, there is better handling, there's better ventilation. Because of the efficiency of the heating and what not, we -- we have better air movement, we have better air control. As far as the actual direct impact of the barns, $I$ honestly don't recall ever getting a single complaint about the direct location of the barns.

As Mr. Clifton is certainly aware, these barns were converted from hog barns somewhere in the neighbourhood of 20 -- 22 years ago I think. You'11 have to forgive me if $I$ don't have the exact date right. They stank. There's no argument about it. There was frequent concerns from the neighbours downwind and we -- we appreciated that and that had something to do with our move at that time to shift from pork to poultry operation in that facility. Since then, $I$ don't recall ever getting a note or complaint.

In one of the documents $I$ was submitted there was
a concern about poultry manure being extremely odorific.

I have been in laying egg barns where the manure is handled in a wet manner where there is no litter, where the litter is just kept wet and I have never smelt a stench quite like it, and that is definitely true. But when you shift to broiler manure, it's -the barns are dry.

For bird health, we have to move enough air to keep the litter dry so that the birds don't develop any kind of adverse effects on their feet or lung quality, any of those issues. The birds are in a dry environment.

When that manure is handled, it's dry and that's why it doesn't have the same odour that's associated particularly with wet chicken manure.

Hog manure can be bad. Even feedlot manure can be particularly smelly because of the nature of -- when you disturb it, then there's a lot of moisture in the cattle manure.

But poultry manure, when it's pushed out of the barn, it's a layer - it starts off as a layer that's about 2 to 3 inches thick. It's dry and it doesn't have the same odour associated as other types of manure.
Q. Thank you. Could you just clarify, though, like as far as air quality and modifications on this expansion, like what's in place to reduce, like, fluctuations in odour, like if your fans are running because you're going to have two exponentially larger barns running plus the three. And I'm just curious how you guys are modifying and upgrading things to make this downwind smell better and how that will impact health exacerbations for people with respiratory conditions?
A. We are not planning to make any significant changes to the existing barns, and the new barns have, yeah, the ventilation. As far as the outside world is concerned is you draw in fresh air, and you move out stale air.

We -- we manage the humidity in the barns. One of the most recent developments in poultry ventilation is we used to operate more on a minimum ventilation system where we tended to just move enough air to keep it dry. And when it comes to heating barns, that's a very inefficient way to run a barn.

So now what we do is we typically target a 40 or
50 percent relative humidity in the bird living space. When you run a barn at that humidity, it produces far less dust. There isn't a lot of dust inside the barn at that level of humidity.

And the nuisance complaints, I would put the
question to the NRCB as to how many nuisance complaints they get from broiler chicken operations. On the grand scheme of intensive livestock, $I$ consider it to be a relatively low impact development in any neighbourhood.

One of the things that $I$ can point to is just the current location of the west barns, we've had neighbours that have lived within several hundred feet of those barns that are surprised they're occupied.

So $I$ don't know what to tell you as far as the nuisance factor is concerned. It hasn't been a big problem.
Q. Okay. So just so I'm clear, like there is no air quality compliances you guys need to do moving forward?
A. We can't react to a complaint we don't get. I -- in our own -- yeah. There have been a lot of complaints about the air quality downwind of the barns.
Q. Thank you. Those are my questions.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Schmid. Mr. and Mrs. Bedster, do you have questions?

MR. BEDSTER: Yes, I do.
MR. BEDSTER CROSS-EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
Q. You suggested that there is the page where you had the maps here of your 1and location. And on the NE 22-9-22 West of 4 , you show a swale coming from the north to the south. Page 16, yeah, sorry about that. And when
S. VAN'T LAND

Cross-examined by Mr. Bedster
was that tile, that weeping tile, put in there?
A. I think we put that tile in two or three years ago. We had some -- some line left over from a previous project, and rather than let it go to waste, then we thought we would see if we could improve.

There's a little bit of a collection area in the south -- southwest corner of that field, and we thought we would try and consolidate some of our -- our wasteland.
Q. So water that comes down that swale is water that comes off the roof of the barns, plus the water -- or I'm assuming when you clean the barns, that would wash them down, that that water comes out of the back of the barn and goes down into that swale also; is that correct or not?
A. The water off the roof of the barns will definitely run where it runs. The roof of the barns are clean, so I'm not sure what the concern would be there.

When we wash the barns, we're not washing the material in the barn that's out. The cleaning process for the barns is first we go in heavy equipment, we push out the manure. Then we go in with backpack blowers and air compressors, and we blow all the dust off the equipment. Then we go through the barn and sweep up all the dust that we've accumulated.

And then the final step before preparing for the new flock is to wash. And that's a pressure washer situation where typically what happens is you wash down the equipment and the walls and the floor, and the water evaporates out. You might get, I don't know, five or ten wheelbarrows of water.

In our new facility in a barn that is a similar size to all of my barns combined, I don't know, we might get 100 litres of water out the back door. It doesn't even run off the yard when we push it out.
Q. So the second swale you've got there that runs east and west, where does that water go?
A. That water runs eventually towards Highway 25 and then north and ends up going through SW 26-9-22.
Q. And so none of that water out of that swale can come south, is that what you're indicating?
A. Yeah, if you go -- next time you're going by, go look under Matt's driveway; there's no culvert there.
Q. But -- okay. There's no culvert there. But what's the pump doing there in Matt's location there? And that's
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So he walks across the field and comes over. And he indicated to me that "That water is not from my field." "Well, where did it come from? And if it's not from your field..." my question was to him, "Why aren't you sprinkling that on your 1and?" And which I got no response.

And that day, he said, "We11, you know, this will quit around early afternoon." And it had been running the day before, I'm fairly sure, but not a hundred percent sure. And so the water was as grey as chicken manure, and not just a little bit of water, because he says, "My pump can't do that."

And I said, "We11, Matt, when you've got a 4-inch line or whatever you're using up there that's coming down your roadway coming out of Mr. Van't Land's place and going into the culverts or into the water pit of Highway 25 on the west side and comes down, then it goes into the north culvert close to my property, and none of this water is coming from the south." He says, "It will be shut off by early afternoon." And he said,
"Yeah, that's pretty bad." And I said, "You're right." And you know, that water was still running at midnight.

So where can it come from? I hate to say it, sir, but it come off your property. It come down that swale, and how it accumulated over there, I have no
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idea.
But all I'm saying to you is I don't need that water coming through my property to use on my garden when I've had three kids get cancer and somebody says, "We11, I just don't know." Please don't say you just don't know; you know.
A. I -- if there's issues between you and Matt, I can appreciate --
Q. No, there's no issue between Matt and I.
A. All I can say is when $I$ was in school, $I$ remember my first year of engineering school, the professor told us there's two things you need to know: One, you can't push on a rope, and two, water runs downhil1.

And Matt's driveway is higher than all my fields, that water doesn't run into his place. It can't. The drainage doesn't facilitate that.
Q. Okay.
A. That swale is where it is because the water runs downhill from Matt's driveway towards that swale, and the beginning of that swale is to kind of get over one hill to another. But the natural drain of that area is towards Highway 25, and from there, the water runs north.
Q. With a pump?
A. There's no way -- well, then Matt's pump is higher than
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my field.
Q. I don't care. The suction is in the ground or in a vault or a hollow in the ground and was pumped out. I walked up there, and I seen it coming out down to my property.
A. Our water does not run south, so that's all I can tell you.
Q. We11, maybe we should -- okay. If you want to say that, you must remember we11, that's al1 I gotta say right now, sir.

But -- oh, one other fact. On that pipeline, how did you ever get that in the ground? How did you get that -- how did the Environment allow that because of where it is and the manure you're putting on your 1 and and the medication that comes out of the birds' back end, where does all that go?
A. There's no manure coming out -- there's no medication coming out the back end of the birds. That's something that's carefully monitored.
Q. Are you telling me your broilers aren't medicated?
A. Not for anything that's for human concern, that's for sure.
Q. We11, Eramycin or Terramycin for the first two to three weeks, maybe four. If they get any other disease, they get medicated.
A. That's something my dad did 20 years ago, but we don't do any prophylactic antibiotics at all in the barns.

The last time I had an antibiotic in the barn, I think I got an expired pail on the shelf that expired five years ago. We just don't use it.
Q. All I know is NEP companies that produce feed, pre-starters, starters, and probably 21 percent has some medication in it automatically in there, unless that has changed?
A. It has changed. The industry is being very proactive as far as improving both for being responsible and for perception from our customers.

There's an obvious concern with antibiotics in animal production, and that has been -- started being addressed -- the first I remember hearing of it was 15 or 20 years ago, and there's been a constant march in the environment, in the livestock production, particularly in broiler chicken production; I can't speak as much for cattle or for pork.

But to remove the prophylactic use of antibiotics in our production, it just is not acceptable anymore. And we've been improving our methods, and that has a lot to do with why we've been focusing so much on improving the barn environment is a healthy bird is a happy bird and grows better and produces better. And
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if we can do those things without using prophylactic antibiotics, then we're all for it.
Q. Right. I've been retired 12 years now. It must have changed in the last 12 years no medication in broiler feeds; is that correct?
A. I think it went under the microscope probably five or six years ago, and I think two years ago, because when they're classing antibiotics as far as they're relevant for human relevance, they have a four-stage -- four categorizations: There's Class 1, 2, 3, and 4, Class 1 being primarily is for human antibiotic -- human use. Class 4 being not used in human at all.

And Class 1 stopped being used probably seven or eight years ago, and they're in the process, I think they've phased out Phase 2 now.

So we're moving in the direction of being definitely antibiotic reduced throughout the whole process and we don't use -- we don't use them in the barn. We don't have a lot of antibiotics there.

And when it comes to your concerns about drainage and manure spreading, I mean those questions, we, again, if we have manure running off our land, that's a waste of manure, and we want that manure to be properly used by the crops.

So we're very careful to try and use it in a way
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that it - the crop can take full advantage of it.
So that is the best I can tell you about those two particular concerns.
Q. Can you see these pictures down here?

MS. SCHMID:
You'11 have to hold them.
MR. BEDSTER:
Do I have to hold them up? Can you see this picture?

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Bedster, are these on the record now, or can we --

MR. BEDSTER:
Yes, they're on record now.
THE CHAIR:
And where are they?
MR. BEDSTER:
You people have them, sir.
THE CHAIR:
In our submission. Which
submission is that? Maybe the document managers could bring them up, that might be a lot easier.

MS. SCHMID:
Exhibit 6.
Q. MR. BEDSTER: This particular picture here comes from the north. It can't come from the south. And the reason I say that is on the north end there, on the west side, the ground is raised up 3 to 4 feet higher at the back, higher than the pipe going underneath the road.

THE CHAIR:
So, Mr. Bedster, you'11 need to refer -- we don't have -- there's no directions on this map. Are you talking right or left?
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MR. BEDSTER: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay.
Q. Where the cement is, that's south. Going to the end where the water where it starts, that way is north. To the left of the picture is to the west, and that's where the water comes from. And it comes down on the west side of Highway 25 from Matt Grisnick's driveway, which, in my belief, comes out of Mr. Van't Land's 1 and.

And if you look, you can see on the second picture there, or even on the first picture I guess, yeah, that one right there. You can see, we had a rain before, a little bit of a rain. And you see the material on the left of the picture there, shows how high that water was coming down there. And again, that's on1y from the north.

The next picture $I$ have here is this one. Yeah. Isn't that nice water? Why would the water be brown? You know, it's not -- I know what soil water looks like, and I know what cow manure water looks like. But this, I must have missed this before because I believe, in all truthfulness, sir, that's happened a few times.

So $I$ put it in your ballpark.
A. I can only say that from our piece of land, I mean you can look at the topographical map on the east side -- or rather, the west side of the piece, we get
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some water from Matt. When you move closer to Highway 25, the water doesn't run over where the old irrigation canal used to be.

That's a peak in elevation, and any of that water that's coming from across the road from you from Matt, I'm not familiar with exactly where the water flows on his land, where it comes from, how much he gets from upstream, and how much is his water, but that's something you'11 have to take up with him. But he doesn't -- our water doesn't go to a place where he pumps out of.

I know where the pump you're referring to, I know where it's sitting, and it's -- every direction from there is that downhill to our 1 and.
Q. Okay. Then please enlighten me how that pump can run for 24 to 30 to 40 hours with a 40 or 50 horsepower tractor and 4 HP old pump? It magically must be coming out of an artesian well that's there.
A. I suppose that must be the case.
Q. Well, I don't think so, sir.

MR. BEDSTER: That's al1 I got to say right now, thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Bedster.
MR. BEDSTER:
You're welcome.
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Clifton?
S. VAN'T LAND Cross-examined by Mr. Clifton

MR. CLIFTON:
Yes, I have a couple of questions.
MR. CLIFTON CROSS-EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
Q. I'm kind of referring back to that $I$ believe it's the 4.5.1 thing where it talked about the modernizing, improving, and reducing impacts to neighbouring landowners, or I can't remember how it said it there.

But Mr. Van't Land just stated that he's not interested in incorporating any manure into the land. And what that says in that 4.5 .1 is that the expansion, whatever, should reduce the impacts.

He already has a condition on the existing permit to do it, which is he not being, which is a compliance issue, but stating that he's not interested in incorporating any manure in future kind of goes against reducing the impacts part?
A. The challenge of managing impact is a fascinating one. It has been fascinating as we've been working with our certified crop advisor since we started direct seeding our crops.

There's a 50-pound nitrogen credit that, as far as

The benefits of incorporating the manure into the soil, not to mention the degradation of the quality of the soil, the extra diesel fuel and equipment required is -- in our estimation, the tradeoff is definitely towards not incorporating the manure. We spread it in a fashion that is evenly spread, we leave our stubble fairly high on the crop where we're going to be -- where we're going to be utilizing the manure so that the wind does minimal chance of taking it.

I mean, obviously, some of the winds we've been having lately, $I$ mean, it's been fascinating to me to watch even zero till land blow in some cases, but we take every step that we can in order to make the best use of that manure. And for that manure to run off the 1and, I mean, that -- to me, that's money running off. So we do everything we can to make sure that that's available for our crops.
Q. So wouldn't by incorporating that manure into the land prevent it from running off?
A. I would contend that it doesn't run off right now, and I would also contend that the damage to the soil by turning it over does more damage than the perceived benefit of turning the manure in, especially a product like broiler manure where the nuisance factor is minimal at best.
Q. On that topography map that you had there, it's page 16 with the tile and swales, if that could be brought up again.

THE CHAIR:
So, document manager, that was in --

MR. CLIFTON: That was in Mr. Van't Land's submission.
A. It's Document Number 18.

THE CHAIR:
18, thank you.
Q. MR. CLIFTON: You're saying the gravel
dispersion pit is lower than the culvert and you're concentrating all your water to that area to make your land better, but that gravel dispersion pit is right on the property 1 ine of the county ditch and your property. Why couldn't you make this go to somewhere contained on your property as opposed to making it drain right to the county ditch where it can all run off?
A. To be honest, that is somewhere contained on our property. If I were interested in getting that water off the field in the most efficient way possible, I would have continued that tile line permissible distance from the county ditch and continued running further east of it until we got to where the elevation worked with us. But we stopped it where we did because
we are not interested in doing that.
Q. You have the tile run right to the county ditch. The dispersion pit, if it is lower, it's only inches lower than the culvert. Like any accumulation of water will run. So I'm just curious why you didn't concentrate it more centralized on your property as opposed to exposing it to the county ditch and neighbours?
A. The county ditch at that location is higher than our dispersion pit. We're working with the topography of the land. I can't -- the amount of dirt I would have to move in order to make a central location on that quarter section to store matter would be massive.

We're working with the existing topography, and, like I say, if we'd been interested in removing that water as efficiently as possible, we'd have continued that tile further east. Get through that hill, and then have it run into the ditch and down along whatever path it follows into marketplace and then onto the river.
Q. So were there any consultations with Alberta Environment before all this was done?
A. No. Since then, we've been contacted by both the NRCB compliance officer in the neighbourhood, Denny Puskar and Logan Huscroft also was interested.

So I have taken both of them around. They've both
S. VAN'T LAND
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seen with their own eyes firsthand the work that we've done. I asked them if there were any concerns, if there was anything that needed to be done or anything to move forward on to get ahold of me, and that has not been something they followed up on.

Denny Puskar from the NRCB seemed content with what he saw. Alberta Environment $I$ think will probably have a larger stake in any changes that are made as far as drainage are concerned. I showed him around. He took a lot of pictures. He advised me at the time that he was going to consult with a number of historical aerial photos to see what changes have been made to the land since -- since the beginning of those things being recorded, and $I$ have not heard from him since and that occurred on November 10th was when I took him around, and he's had four months to -- to address the file, and I've taken the silence to mean that there are no concerns.
Q. Okay. I have a letter from him that's in my submission, but we can get to that later.

Are you also saying that any or all of your runoff does not affect me at all?
A. I am saying that when I look at the drainage maps and I've gone down and looked where the water runs, the one thing which I didn't -- wasn't even aware of until I
looked closer was that there is no culvert directly between you and me. So all the water that accumulates in that road ditch down at that intersection does run north into Paragon's Corner there. From there, it runs across east into Mark Davis's quarter.

Just looking at the topography, it's downhill from there, so it would have to run uphill to get to your place. So I'm not saying that it's impossible. I'm saying that when there's a massive rain, then some of the pictures you submitted were interesting, they brought back some difficult memories as far as the amounts of water we got in that case.

It was also interesting to me -- I'm not sure how old those pictures are, but they're over ten years old we're thinking, because of the equipment we see in the pictures. It is not something certainly that happens on any kind of a continual basis or -- and in the case where we get massive amounts of water, then I would also argue that there is water everywhere.

And as far as if it's going to run back from
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across to the north and then across Highway 25 to the east into the ditch on the southwest 26 , but from there, there's a culvert to the south and to my northwest 23 where the water backs up in the county ditch and then comes into me.
A. If you say. My eye, when I look at it, the road ditch is lot lower than your field there.

So I can imagine the volume of water it would take to run back onto your 1 and.
Q. When the ditch fills up, it backs up. I've got the pictures in my submission.
A. I would ask you how much of that water is your water.
Q. Very little.

MR. CLIFTON:
THE CHAIR:
I guess that's it for now.
Thanks, Mr. Clifton.
It's just about 12:30. So -- and I know that Mr. Kennedy and Panel members do have a few questions for you, Mr. Van't Land, that would take probably, you know, more than just a couple of minutes.

So I would suggest that maybe we break for lunch now. You would remain sworn, Mr. Van't Land, you know, and you shouldn't be contacting any outside parties while you're essentially still being sworn in. Your testimony will continue and questions will continue after 1 unch.
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Now, I'm not sure what the arrangements are, so we're all over the place in Alberta and then including, you know, the affected parties in the Lethbridge office, so we all need to have at least enough time to grab a bite.

But I think maybe just a quick question for Ms. Janzen and Ms. Horvath, we'll likely have questions for you, but how much time did you need in terms of presenting any evidence that you have?

MS. JANZEN:
Sorry, Mr. Chair, you're asking how much time we'11 need to present our information?

THE CHAIR:
Yes.
MS. JANZEN:
I wouldn't need much at all. I just would have a really brief summary of my -- what I've already submitted to the board. So I wouldn't need much time at all, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. And Ms. Horvath?
MS. HORVATH:
Yeah, I did not have a presentation to actually make. I was looking more to be available to answer questions that might be from the participants.
THE CHAIR:
And I know we have -- we'11 have direct from the directly affected parties and neighbours as well but I think we're going to be okay for time. So why don't we take an hour and let
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 Cross-examined by Mr. Clifton> everybody have -- get their 1unch -- just under an hour. Why don't we reconvene at $1: 20$; is that right? 1:20. Get my watch right here. One day I'11 learn how to tell time. Sorry, folks. So 1:20.

So that's just barely under an hour and we'11 reconvene at that time. And you might just want to throw all of your mics on mute and that because you may be having some conversations that you don't want to have broadcast, so just remember to do that.

Thank you, everyone. See you at 1:20.
$\qquad$
P.M. Session
(PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 1:23 P.M.)
S. VAN'T LAND (For Double H Feeders), previously affirmed

THE CHAIR:
So I do believe we have everyone back. So welcome back, everyone. Thanks for the timeliness.

We finished off with Mr. Clifton which now brings us back, Mr. Van't Land, questions for you will be directed from, if any, from Field Services. I don't think I asked you previously if you had questions.

MS. VANCE: We do not, thank you, Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIR: Okay. Thanks, Ms. Vance.
Mr. Kennedy, then?
MR. KENNEDY: Thank you.
MR. KENNEDY QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. I have a couple of questions, Mr. Van't Land, and I think it's -- I think almost all of my questions are with the purpose of clarifying your submission and how you're asking the board to treat your request.

And almost all of my questions relate to the commitment that appears in relation to the operation on the northwest quarter of Section 22.

Now, in your submission, you say Double H Feeders Ltd. owns both operations. So is the ownership identical between the northwest quarter and the northeast quarter?
A. I think my dad might have his name on the title on the northwest quarter. I'm not entirely sure, but the same farm, the same corporate entity owns the barns and runs both operations.
Q. I don't mean to split legal hairs, but how would a corporation own a barn that's on the title that's owned by somebody other than that corporation, can you help me?
A. Yeah, our accountant has asked us the same question.

It -- I'm trying to think which title -- you know what, I'd honestly have to look. As far as that particular parcel where them barns are on, I don't know which name is on that title.
Q. Would you undertake to provide a copy of the title or some kind of description as to the ownership on the northwest quarter property and operation and northeast
A. I can look for that.
Q. And simply by giving that undertaking, you don't have to provide that prior to the close of the hearing, but sometime soon after the close of the hearing, if you
would provide that answer to Laura Friend, and we will make sure that that answer gets out to all of the other parties.
A. I'm just getting confirmation. My brother is chatting with me, and he's confirming that Double H does own that parce1. So he knows that better than I do, so...
Q. A11 right. So your accountant has been misled somewhere along the line.
A. It - that conversation had to deal with the shop which I do know for sure was built on my dad's land. And that's a separate issue from today so...
Q. Okay. And can you describe what manure storage facilities are on the northwest quarter?
A. On the northwest quarter, we used to run an 800-head feedlot. So we have -- and probably 80 percent of that feedlot was concrete.

So at the moment when we store our manure, it's stored on the concrete, and the drainage there is collected. It -- the drainage there does not go off property. That is an endpoint for the drainage.
Q. And what do you do with the drainage once it's captured?
A. It goes into a lake that my dad has for where he keeps some fish.
Q. So it's never pumped out; it never overflows?
A. It's at the bottom. You'd have to go probably up 4 or 5 feet for it to be...
Q. Okay. And so if you take the birds out of the property, and I think that's what you're proposing to do, is say, "We will no longer raise -- raise birds on that property," are you going to -- are you also saying you're not going to store manure on that property?
A. No, we're going to continue with our manure handling the way we have been.
Q. What does that mean for the northwest quarter?
A. We'll continue piling it on the same pile we have been.
Q. So you'11 take it from the northeast quarter to the northwest quarter?
A. When we're going to use it there. What happens right now, for example, right now, the piece of 1 and that we're going to be spreading manure on happened for the balance of this year is several miles away.

And when we have spare time, like right now when we have a flock finish, we -- for the short term, we buckle haul it to the northwest quarter. And then as we have people available, we truck it to where we're going to be spreading it.

Right now we're storing it on a dry corner. When it's compliant, then we do tend to spread it straight off.

But at the moment we're stockpiling it there on a dry corner.
Q. So one of the things that we see is the Town of Coalhurst and the County of Lethbridge saying if you decommission that site, they're prepared to support your application on the northwest quarter for an expansion. If you continue to store manure there, have you had that conversation with the Town and the County as to what the ultimate plan is for your lands on the northwest quarter?
A. We have not. Nobody's brought it up.
Q. Okay. Do you think they'd be surprised to hear that you're still going to be storing significant quantities of manure on that quarter?
A. To be honest, given the neighbours reaction, I think they'd be surprised right now that we're storing manure there.
Q. Okay. And if it's a consequence, and we'11 hear from the Town and the County later, we were to ask them the question, with this knowledge as to whether their opinion about the expansion on the northwest quarter might change given the proposal to continue activities on the northeast quarter, do you have any comment on that?
A. We11, for starters you've got it backwards. We're
expanding on the northeast; we're shutting down the northwest.

And I'm not sure if that raises a concern for them or not. They haven't raised it. It -- like I was expressing in previous questions, $I$ honestly don't recall the last time we got a nuisance complaint regarding manure.
Q. Okay. But you did read in their submissions that they're anticipating that on the northwest quarter, there would be an opportunity for country residential expansion and more -- a more urbanization of that urban fringe?
A. In that general area. And we're committed to decommissioning those barns once the new barns are built.

We may, as an act of grace, ask for a period of overlap while we're moving equipment and such over, but I mean that would be for a flock or two at most; that would not be a perpetual reality.
Q. I was going to get there as to exactly what the schedule of decommissioning of the one facility and populating the expansion facility, what that looks 1 ike.

So perhaps this is an opportunity to provide some significant detail.
A. Until we have a permit, we don't have significant detail because we need to talk logistics with our construction outfitter and our contractors.

I don't know if our builder is available. We have not done any design work because I don't want to waste people's time to do the design work required to build this project before I know there's going to be a project.

So right now everything is on the back of an envelope, and we are depending on the outcome of this hearing. Then we will pursue the detailed design work, get timelines oriented. I'm sure everybody is aware that right now, the logistics of just getting supplies for construction are not something that you can nail down.

So, as part of our application, I think I indicated something of a 2025 deadline, and there's a reason for that is because I don't know what the availability is of labour or materials to -- to build the project.

What I can say is that once the new barns are built, then we're having the internal debate right now whether to buy new equipment or move equipment over, and there's some logistics involved with that. But the reality is that we would not be raising birds in both
set of barns at the same time.
Q. So does that mean you can surrender your permit concurrent with -- you know, prior to populating the expanded barn?
A. I don't want to get myself in trouble with agreeing to some legal language that I'm not sure the implications of. What $I$ can say is that we will not be trying to temporarily increase our bird population as some kind of an overlap.
Q. So to avoid that language, the northwest quarter would be depopulated before the northwest expansion was populated?
A. The net effect would be one flock would be placed in the new barns instead of the old, and the old barns would never see another chicken.
Q. Yeah, so very specifically, and I'm hoping you can answer this, is the northwest would be depopulated before the northeast expansion was populated; is that a yes or no?
A. I'm not sure if you understand how broiler operations work, but it's all-in all-out.

So there'd be a flock where we would ship the birds out of the northwest barns and be preparing the northeast barns to accept the next flock, and the northwest barns would never see another bird.

So there would be a line, a deadline where there would not be birds anymore in the northwest quarter.
Q. And no overlap. So you wouldn't have the expansion -- again, I think this is what you're telling me and simply confirm that is there would be no birds in the northwest quarter when the northeast expansion was populated?
A. Because of the nature of flock schedules and overlapping, I might have to ask for a four-week overlap of some kind because I spent the whole morning listening to you guys argue over the order of two paragraphs.

The reality is that right now we operate under what are called three producer numbers, and those three producer numbers operate under three different schedules.

So when I'm placing barns on what is on there labelled "Scott's place," we're placing them at what's labelled "Trevor's place," so the northeast-northwest quarters we have different cycle schedules.

So depending on how those overlap on the particular time frame, there may be a period of time at most -- the most it could possibly be is five weeks when there may be birds in both locations at once, but that would be a very temporary situation. That would
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not be a perpetual.
Q. Okay. And to be clear is whoever holds the permit for the northwest quarter, and let's assume for the moment that's Double H Feeders and it's a deemed permit I think is what we heard this morning, Double H Feeders will be surrendering -- asking for that permit to be cancelled?
A. Yeah, I'm not sure what the appropriate language is. But I'm assuming that as a condition of if the Board chooses to grant this permit, that rescinding that permit will be part of the condition. That's our intention, that's our anticipation.
Q. And if that were conditional upon some restriction on a timely basis, and whether it be, you know, five-week overlap or whatever is tied to the population of the northeast quarter expansion, you would have no issue with that?
A. We would work with that, yeah.
Q. Okay. And aside from storing manure on the northwest quarter, what other manure storage facilities do you have? You have the barn. What's the future plan for those facilities?
A. For facilities? Carina had it pretty good. We operate on a temporary basis. We work on a rotation through four quarter sections, and depending on which quarter
section is getting the manure next is where the manure gets stored.
Q. No, I'm speaking about the barns. So is -Double $H$ Feeders $I$ take it is not intending to market that property, sell it?
A. Correct.
Q. And long term, if you're successful with your application today is I think you're prepared to surrender your CFO permit for that site, but it still has barns on it. What's going to happen with the barns?
A. Our current intention for that site is we're debating what kind of storage we can make for that. We've got a bunch of trucks and tractors we parked outside, and we're debating if we could park them under cover. There's other equipment that we could park inside.

The intention is some kind of storage if we keep the buildings up at all. But it would be not any kind of livestock, not any kind of manure. The intention is for equipment or supplies, but no manure would be in
Q. And should you receive an approval to expand on the northeast quarter, the way our legislation works, we're approving notwithstanding an inconsistency within the municipal planning requirement, so it means you are
operating with an approved facility perhaps on that northeast quarter, but you're probably severely limited on future expansions and those opportunities. You understand that?
A. I understand that.
Q. Okay. And I'm --
A. If you want to get into long-term plans, if the area gets developed to the extent that some hope, then quite frankly, that land will be worth much more as some kind of developable parcel as opposed to agricultural 1 and. And if we have the opportunity to market it, then we'11 take our marbles and develop somewhat further away. But to be honest, we're kind of at the point where that's going to be the next generation's call.
Q. So when you say "it's the next generation's cal1," I mean you've got two permitted operations, one that's approaching 30 years and one that's 25 years old. So with this expansion proposal, is 25 to 30 years kind of the life of one of these facilities, to your mind?
A. That all depends on how good of care you take of them. The original barns that we're looking to replace, they were -- the larger barn raised in its current state was raised in 1978. My brother manages that particular facility and he does a lot of work to keep it functional. It is showing its age. New barns were
built, and there's a lot more concrete and a lot more plastic to keep things good. My anticipation would be that 40 or 50 years would not be unreasonable.
Q. All right. And then, finally, and I'm asking this question because earlier on you talked about compliance with the AOPA, and yet $I$ think we had -- we heard a bit of a discussion on 48-hour incorporation and it's one thing complying with $A O P A$, but one of the provisions of AOPA is that you'11 also comply with your permit.

Do you think you're complying with your permit?
A. To be honest, when I saw that written there, it was a surprise to me. I wasn't aware that that condition was on the permit. That permit was applied to and written to my dad, and it's not something that I was aware of.

Since we had gotten that permit on that location, we had switched to a direct seeding model, and reading the AOPA guidelines regarding manure management in general, that was what we were following. So that was a bit of naivety on my part perhaps, and we were not aware of that.

So as part of this whole process I'd like to get some final determination on that to get some clarity on exactly what the best method is going forward on that.
Q. I know you wouldn't be the first operator that the NRCB has suggested perhaps reading your permit is a good
idea.
Do you have a sense as to what the go-forward plan is? You're not in compliance, you've still got that condition. I'm going to say it's a little late to ask the board to consider any change today because parties should be getting notice if you're asking for a change to a permit.
A. Okay.
Q. You have to initiate that appropriately. What do you do? You've got manure that you're going to be spreading, I assume, in the spring?
A. I guess my question would be to go to back to the NRCB as to what 1 and does that refer to.
Q. Well, as I read the condition, it applies to all the manure you're taking off from this operation. Do you read it any differently?
A. My interpretation of it would have been the land that we had at the time, which would have been this 200-acre home quarter and right now it's on a piece of land that is nowhere near here.
Q. I'm going to suggest if that's the interpretation you're applying, perhaps you need to have a discussion with the NRCB office in Lethbridge.
A. Okay. I will do that.
Q. Good. Mr. Van't Land, thank you. Those were my questions. Thank you for answering them.
A. You're welcome.

MR. KENNEDY:
Mr. Chair, I'm done.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Graham, do you have any questions for Mr. Van't Land?

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you .
MR. GRAHAM QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. Just for clarification for my part, where is your access to your barns on the NE 22?
A. Our driveway goes north so we're accessing off Township Road 9-4.
Q. Was that Kipp Road or Kipp Highway?
A. Yes.
Q. It doesn't go onto 25 ?
A. No. We have no direct access onto 25.
Q. One other question. Did you get an interpretation from what -- from the IDP, I think it's wrote as an IMDP, but did you get an indication from anybody on how to interpret that, or was that your own interpretation?
A. To be honest, that was our own interpretation and that's part of why we've gone through the permitting process before we've invested anything but time is to clarify that. We didn't want to waste a bunch of time and effort before finding out that the process was not going to move forward.
Q. Thank you. That's all, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Graham.
Ms. Roberts?
MS. ROBERTS QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. Yeah, Mr. Van't Land, I know we've spent a lot of time talking about permitted number of birds and so on, and I thank you for your explanation about quotas and that it's done in kilograms rather than number of birds. However, AOPA deals with number of animals, and when permits are issued, it is for number of animals, not body weight.

So, if the Board chooses to uphold the approval officer's decision, in Appendix $D$ of the decision summary, the deemed capacity at NE 22 is 50,000 birds.

I gather from some comments that you had made before that you might not agree with that deemed capacity.
A. It -- the numbers because of the way that quota is allocated, yeah, it's been shifted.

Now, to be fair, like we've been operating within 50,000 bird 1 imit as our operation prefers not to market into the KFC market, so we don't have the need to place more birds than our limit is -- is set at. If the permitted number is limited within -- if the

120,000 bird request stands, that would give us more leeway in that regard, but it also indicates to us that the KFC market is not available to us then.
Q. Okay. So -- so either way, if the Board upholds the approval officer's decision 50,000 is the number as per the decision, if the Board chooses to overturn that decision, your request is for 120,000 birds maximum at NE 22?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Great. That ends my questions. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Roberts.
Ms. Stuart?
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MS. STUART: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Q. Mr. Van't Land, I do have a couple of questions. I think they primarily pertain to your submission, Exhibit 18. If I could ask the document manager to pul1 that up. And page 2, I think. Not page 2. Hang on. Yes, page 2.

Okay. Kind of a housekeeping thing. The adjacent quarters $I$ think have created some confusion in terms of the transcript and people talking about northeast and northwest when it's been opposite. And I thought I would just take the opportunity to double check what you've written in the last two paragraphs of this -- of
this page?
A. Oh, you caught me.
Q. And I see three land locations, but I'm wondering if the northeast and northwest should be switched, but given this is your formal submission, I thought it might be prudent to give you an opportunity to just double check that?
A. No, I appreciate you catching that. I made the same mistake that has been made all day, getting northeast northwest mixed up. That last paragraph should definitely be reversed.
Q. So I'm thinking the one that says Trevor's yard, that second last paragraph, that the county are promoting further residential development. I think that should be on the northwest?
A. Yes. Trevor's yard is the northwest. So in the last paragraph where it says "northeast," it should say "northwest." You're correct.
Q. As well. Okay. Just to clarify. Thanks so much. Now, just to provide some context to my next couple of questions. And I think for the most part you've answered them, but, you know, we've heard a lot of discussion surrounding runoff, and just to clarify, you know, perhaps why we have an interest in that, given that the approval officer did not in their
decision address runoff given that the permit was denied, we are compelled as a Panel to address the directly affected parties' concerns.

And as the Chair described at the beginning, there's this formality to it, that they're directly affected parties but, really, they're your neighbours, you're all neighbours. And I guess I'm wondering, given the questions we heard from your neighbours, can you provide some insight for me why you believe there is that disconnect between your perception of where runoff is coming from and your neighbours' perception of where runoff is coming from and how you reconcile those two?
A. It is something that's interesting. I've heard it said before: The whiskey's for drinking; the water is for fighting.

And we've had drainage issues on other quarters, and $I$ know it's been a difficult thing to reconcile. That's why when I first started going down this process, I wanted to find out where does the water go because some of the pictures which Mr. Clifton showed in his submission show a lot of water in a lot of different places.

And I mean those pictures are what they are, and he's absolutely right. Those places were underwater.

You look at where the water can come from, and I look at the maps, and I look -- I've got about as much land draining into that basin as he does. And so it's open to interpretation which way that water flows.

Now, when I look at the culverts and the lay of the land, when the neighbour that is to the northeast of us, his land is lower than all three of our quarter sections, the rest of us. The water is going to flow downhill, and that -- I don't know how else to say it. That's why I got the map is because I wanted to be able to demonstrate that.
Q. Okay.
A. As far as Mr. Bedster is concerned, I share them. He has a pile of water going through his place. And regardless of whether -- and I will maintain there's no water coming from our place. But I mean you look at the amount of watering he has coming from south of him, and it is amazing the river of water that runs through there. It -- so I feel for the challenges that he has in his location.

But I just want to reinforce that we're not adding to that water. The concerns he has about my neighbour to the south pumping, that is water that gets stranded between his driveway and the edge of his field. That driveway is on the edge of what used to be an old
irrigation canal which is high point. And if anything, if that driveway was removed, that water would run further onto our field and head towards Highway 25 and north.

So there is no water running from our field into that installation.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Kennedy asked you, I think if we look back at Exhibit 18, page 3, and I think you referenced in the third paragraph under drainage that Alberta Environment and Parks had not raised any concerns. And of course, you kind of addressed this, there's a bit of a disconnect between the Alberta Environment and Parks' submission on January 31st in the email that was submitted through Mr. -- with Mr. Clifton's submission and your statement that there are no concerns.

Given that that email, does that suggest to you there may be issues to resolve on that front?
A. It -- to me it's a bit of a disconnect because I know I gave Mr. Huscroft a tour. He came down, and we went, and we got my truck, and we drove all over the field where the drainage concerns are. And he took a bunch of pictures, and I showed him all the relevant details and brought him back to the things he wanted to see and double-check on, and we did all that.

And at that point in time, I asked him where things stood, and he indicated that he was going to go back and consult some historical aerial photos of the area to find out what changes appear to have been made and the way the water used to flow back as far back as aerial pictures. And I'm not sure how far back those records exist.

But he was going to check with him, and I told him if he had any concerns or anything that he needed my attention with, to get ahold of me. So he has my email, and he has my phone number. So I'm not really sure what else to do with that.
Q. Thank you.

And then my last question in that same document, document manager, on page 2 of 37 , the 1 ast paragraph under "Rationale For Construction," you describe in the very last sentence: (as read)
"If the permit is not granted, we would
examine our options for renovating
Trevor's barns."
And that would be on that NW 22-09-22. Can you elaborate what your vision of that would be, given the country residential plan for that area?
A. It's definitely not Plan A. But right now we have a certain amount of production that we would like to
maintain. And if the powers that be deemed fit that it's best to keep it where it is, then we plan to explore our options for improving those barns to current standards.

And we haven't gone too far down that road because we are hoping that this one is the road we will take.

So if in the event that the permit is not granted and the status quo is deemed to be the best situation to move forward with, then we will explore our options for improving that operation there.
Q. Okay. Thanks very much, Mr. Van't Land.

MS. STUART: And, Mr. Chair, that concludes my questions.

THE CHAIR:
Thanks, Ms. Stuart.
Just a couple of clarification questions, Mr. Van't Land.

THE CHAIR QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. The storage that you talked about that would continue on the northwest quarter, that's been in accordance with short-term storage requirements under the act?
A. I believe so.
Q. So -- and so there's no formal storage --
A. Northwest quarter, I mean there's some storage there that, like $I$ say, it's a defunct feedlot. So we have places there where the storage is catched, and it
doesn't run off site, so...
Q. And it's -- it's this old feedlot, that's a permanent feedlot still or is that --
A. No, there's no cattle there. We stopped feeding cattle there 16 or 17 years ago, and my dad was a huge believer in using as much concrete as possible in order to maintain animal comfort.

So we've got these great big concrete pads that have managed drainage on them. We took down the corrals and the feed bunks, and we've got these pads that we use for equipment storage and some manure storage.
Q. So the manure is stored on concrete, then?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's stored every year?
A. In the event that we're going to spread it on the adjacent quarter, then it will be spread -- it will be stored there. But like right now, like there's very little manure there at the moment because we're anticipating spreading it on a different field. So we've bulk hauled it away, and it's temporarily stored on that field.
Q. Okay. Mr. Kennedy explored this a little bit with you. If it were to be the case that the County, and we'11 hear from them, but if there is concern about ongoing
storage, whether it is, you know, sort of annual or not on the northwest, in other words, if the thinking was Well, that will be abandoned in its entirety for livestock or manure associated with livestock and the Board were to approve the application and had a condition that no manure would be stored there, that would be something that would work within the operation, you would make it work for the operation?
A. If we have to make it work, we will, but it would be a detriment to -- yeah, to the logistics of the operation. I'm a logistics person.

But it -- if we're required not to store manure there, it -- yeah, I would not be happy about it, but...
Q. And it was never -- it was never a consideration when you were putting the application forward for the northeast to consider building an outside storage pad that would be essentially, you know, meet the AOPA requirements and would allow you to do some of the short-term storage on the site?
A. I guess my question would be why waste the land? It -in our operation, we're picturing this as essentially, for all intents and purposes, just moving the barns from one site to another. And the rest of the operation outside the poultry production would remain
more or less the same.
Q. Okay. That's all I have for questions. Thank you. And I appreciate the fact that it's been a bit of a long time on the stand. You've done a nice job of answering the questions, and I really appreciate it.

Did you have any redirect that you perhaps would like to make now, based on all the questions that came to you over the last -- well, since lunch and a little bit before lunch as well?
A. I think I've talked to every point I can think of at the moment, so $I$ will continue making notes, and I think I have an opportunity later on to bring things up. So I will if I have to. But I think I've addressed everything that $I$ had intended to talk about.

THE CHAIR: Right. I mean you'11 have an opportunity for closing comments for sure. Okay. Well, thank you, Mr. Van't Land, and we'll move to our next party, so for now you're done. Thank you.
(WITNESS STANDS DOWN)
THE CHAIR:
So we have Ms. Janzen from the
County. Ms. Janzen, are you there, and are you available?

MS. JANZEN:
Yes, I am.
THE CHAIR:
Okay, thank you. So you mentioned before lunch that you would have -- you had some short

## H. JANZEN

remarks to make, and here's your opportunity for presenting. And then we'll ask you some -- same folks that will be asking you questions afterwards. So take it away, thank you.

MS. JANZEN:
Do I need to be sworn or affirmed in?

THE CHAIR: Yes, you do. I'm sure glad you remembered that so thank you. Ms. Vespa usually jumps in as well so...
H. JANZEN (For Lethbridge County), affirmed
A. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So with that, I do want to -- I'm obviously not going to go through my whole submission. I'm sure everybody's had a chance to look at that.

I just wanted to highlight a few very brief points, and then $I$ will be open to any questions that anybody may have.

So we've already discussed this at length I think this morning with regards to how municipalities see the hierarchy of planning.

And so within Lethbridge County, we follow the Municipal Government Act with regards to the hierarchy of statutory plans. As per the Municipal Government Act, the Intermunicipal Development Plan prevails over
H. JANZEN
the County's Municipal Development Plan, and I had presented that in my original comments to Ms. Weisbach when the application was submitted to County for comment. And you'11 see that in my -- the submissions that are provided to the Board.

With regards to the proposed expansion, the County, in conjunction with the Town of Coalhurst, felt that the proposed expansion on the northeast quarter met the policies of the Intermunicipal Development Plan as per Section 4.1.5, as once again we've already discussed somewhat at length.

In their application, Double H Feeders did indicate that their -- they were going to be decommissioning the existing operation on the northwest quarter. As I think Mr. Van't Land said, that was a -- that's what their application is. And then it's noted in their -- the technical document, which the Board has in their exhibit packages as Exhibit Number 3 on page number 2, just indicating that that was the intent of Mr. Van't Land was to decommission that operation and consolidate his operation on the northeast quarter. With regards to -- and this is just information for the Board; it's not like you can use this as a decision-making point.

But the County is undertaking a new Municipal
H. JANZEN

Development Plan which will be going forward for County council approval in March, and it will more adequately address the hierarchy of plans indicating that the IDP supercedes and prevails over the MDP if there's any discrepancy between the two.

We noted that that was a concern. Municipalities tend to -- we follow the MGA very closely, and I guess we'd always presumed that the NRCB understood that IDPs prevailed. When we would receive the applications, referral applications, they always asked if there was any other statutory documents that would impact a proposal. And so we include Intermunicipal Development Plans frequently in our comments to the approval officer.

But with that, I think that concludes kind of my very brief comments, Mr. Chairman, so I'm open to any questions.

THE CHAIR:
A11 right. Thank you, Ms. Janzen.
Does the Town, Ms. Horvath, do you have any questions for Ms. Janzen?

MS. HORVATH:
No, I don't. Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you. And do any of the neighbours have questions for Ms. Janzen?

And if so, we can start with Ms. Schmid. But I'm not hearing any, but that doesn't necessarily mean you
don't have a question if there's a screen $I$ can't see. Oh there, now I can see. Did you have questions for Ms . Janzen?

MS. SCHMID: I do, but I just need a minute to think about how to ask it.

THE CHAIR:
Sure. We'11 give you a minute.
And Mr. and Mrs. Bedster or Mr. Clifton in the meantime, do you have a question; we can move to someone else?

Okay. A11 right just take a moment if you could, and then we'll get to you, Ms. Schmid.

Thanks for your patience, Ms. Janzen.

## A. No problem.

MS. SCHMID CROSS-EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
Q. I guess, maybe you can answer it better for me. Just with regards to the county supporting, like, Double H Feeders expansion, you mentioned, and I don't have the wording in front of me but basically if there were the negative impacts to the neighbours in the communities, like, how is that, I guess, going to be considered maybe moving forward after all of this debate?
A. So when the county is looking at a referral from the NRCB, knowing that we're not the final decision-maker, we looked at, along with the town because an

Intermunicipal Development Plan is not just the county, it is an agreement between the town and the county, we look at what's existing in the area, what are some possible best outcomes in terms of future development and planning.

And so with regards to impacts, we're looking at, especially with confined feeding operations, does an existing operation if they want to expand, would it meet the minimum distance separation, which I do believe Mr. Van't Land's application does for the expansion.

And then with the decommissioning, it was seen as a net benefit to the Coalhurst area given the country residential and the proximity to the town, and the fact that they would not be necessarily drastically increasing their feedlot numbers but they would have a marked improvement in terms of their -- the modernization of the facility from their northwest operation to their northeast.

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Schmid, do you have a

MS. SCHMID: I do, but $I$ don't know if it really is going to apply.
Q. Just speaking to the modernization and expansion, Scott had mentioned about bringing over old equipment from
the other barn due to cost reasons. And I just wondered how that works to support modernization?
A. I'm not an expert on equipment unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, so I don't believe I'm qualified to answer that particular question.
THE CHAIR:
Fair enough.
MS. SCHMID: That was my questions.
THE CHAIR: $\quad$ Sorry, that is all your questions?
MS. SCHMID: Yes.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you.
Mr. and Mrs. Bedster, you had no questions? And Mr. Clifton?

MR. CLIFTON: No questions.
THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.
Ms. Vance, Field Services?
MS. VANCE: I have no questions. Thank you.
THE CHAIR: Thank you. And, Mr. Kennedy?
MR. KENNEDY: Mr. Van't Land, I don't know whether you canvassed him. If you did, I do have questions, but...
THE CHAIR: I am sorry, I did miss Mr. Van't Land, sorry.

Do you have questions?
MR. VAN'T LAND: I don't have a question for Ms. Janzen. I can address the equipment modernization
H. JANZEN
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topic if you want --
THE CHAIR:
We're sort of - we're out of step, so I think we're going to leave that, Mr. Van't Land.

MR. VAN'T LAND:
I have no questions.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you.
MR. KENNEDY:
Mr. Van't Land has a rebuttal evidence opportunity and he can bring that forward then. So it's not an opportunity lost; it's just not the time now.

MR. KENNEDY QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. Ms. Janzen, I only have a couple of questions, and I thank you for your submission. It was very clear and very succinct. But I think we heard something that I'm not sure that the County addressed or, frankly, the Town has addressed, and that is the continued storage of manure on the northwest quarter.

As that is the described $\mathrm{plan}-$ - and it can happen in one of two ways: One is if the permit for the northwest quarter is surrendered, it would surrender the permit for even manure authorization, so any manure storage facilities would lose that capacity.

So it would probably be a temporary manure storage site, so he'd have to move it around and he can only store $X$ number of months over a period of time on that site, and -- but there will still be manure stored in
proximity to the town within the IDP constraint area. Do you have any concerns about that? Does it change your opinion or your submission to the Board in any way?
A. I mean, I wasn't aware that there was permanent storage at that particular location.

With regards to temporary storage, the county does allow for stockpiling to occur on properties that are within the fringe areas as long as it's meeting the required setbacks to county -- sorry, from roadways and also from adjacent properties.

So, I mean, we live in a rural municipal -- I'm the planner for the rural municipality, so $I$ understand that, you know, manure is something that exists and people have to store it. We do hope that operators are very considerate of their adjacent 1 andowners with regards to stockpiling. We work very closely with the NRCB with regards to compliance and making sure that there is very little impact to adjacent landowners.

So with regards to temporary storage, I don't believe the county would have any particular concerns. Permanent storage might be something that we might have more concerns on, particularly if there was any opportunities for more residential development in that area.

I did note that there are -- where the Van't Lands have the NW 22-9-22, they actually own about 1, 2, 3, 4 , 5 parcels, smaller titles in that particular quarter, so $I$ can see how things have kind of shifted around there.

So I hope that answers your question, Mr. Kennedy.
Q. It also raises a bunch more but not for you.

But as a planning authority, does it cause you to have any concern when the NRCB says there are circumstances where we would not have regard for the IDP provisions?
A. Yeah, the county, we try very hard to ensure that we're planning and working with our adjacent urban municipalities, so Intermunicipal Development Plans are very highly ranked in the county in terms of enforcement, and we rely heavily on them. They're not -- they aren't shelved documents at all.

As seen in this particular case, we want to see our agricultural operators have opportunities, but recognizing that there could be some constraints in terms of new operations.

So I think Ms. Horvath might have more from the town's perspective, but we do hope that the NRCB will reconsider how they view those higher level statutory documents going forward.
Q. And when the county now looks at a planning -- puts its mind to a planning consideration, an MDP, there's an MDP provision but there's an IDP provision which prevails over that MDP provision, do you just read the IDP provision over the MDP provision?
A. So when we're looking at amending -- or, sorry, with our new revised MDP, we are looking to bring everything into compliance with the IDP. So like I said cross-referencing those documents. We don't carbon copy policies from the MDP to the IDP but we do make reference. We understand there was maybe -- we should have made those considerations a little bit earlier on just for consistency between the documents, but we do see the need to tie them together more closely just so there is not any confusion from any other provincial agency.
Q. Not quite my question. So my question was this: If you're looking at provision in the MDP, and let's use the one we have as an example and you're trying to apply the provision that says this is an MDP exclusion zone, full stop, and an IDP provision which is a little more relaxed, I think that's what the Commission says, is do you now read the IDP provision at the end and not read the MDP provision?
A. Yeah, that would be correct. The IDP would prevail
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because of the discrepancy between the two. Sorry for the confusion.
Q. So when you look at your MDP, it's as if it's been amended by that IDP provision?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Thank you, Ms. Janzen. That's very helpful.

MR. KENNEDY: Those are all my questions.
THE CHAIR:
Thanks, Mr. Kennedy.
Ms. Roberts, do you have questions?
MS. ROBERTS: I have no questions. Thank you, Ms. Janzen, for your clear explanation.

THE CHAIR:
Thanks, Ms. Roberts.
Ms. Stuart.
MS. STUART:
THE CHAIR:
MR. GRAHAM :
I have no questions. Thank you.
And Mr. Graham.
Yeah. Just a couple of
clarifications.
MR. GRAHAM QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. In I think it's Document 7, I just would like a clarification on Section 3.4 .6 where it says: (as read)
"Primarily Ag is governed by the 1and use bylaws of Ag subdivision and policies."
So I'm assuming when that -- at least my assumption is
when that land becomes -- or Coalhurst grows, that land could be subdivided; is that what that is referring to?
A. So I do believe with regards to that particular policy in the IDP, that it's referring to that -- any lands that we've identified as primarily agriculture, such as the Van't Lands' property, that they could apply if they wanted to -- if it met the policies of the land use bylaw, they could apply to subdivide say a first parcel out of a quarter section, or if there was, but feedlots compromise the ability to subdivide under the county 1 and use bylaw.

So if there was no feedlot on there, they could apply to subdivide, they could apply to do an area structure plan or any other planning document on there. The provision of the feedlot on there does limit their opportunities for any type of subdivision on the property.

I hope that answers your question.
Q. Yeah, I think so. Thank you. I have one more. On the same document, but it's planning area 2 in the concept
on the primarily ag or -- because I was confused when I looked at that.
A. I can appreciate that. That particular area, we identified that particular node as potential for highway commercial and light industrial due to the proximity to a highway corridor. So in the future if there was a demand for more highway commercial in this area, that would be the area where we would redirect that type of development to. In order to do that type of development, they would have to rezone to an industrial or commercial use and go through that planning process to establish that.

So it would be requiring additional approvals by county council to ensure that that development was sound. That's the reason why we had that in there was to allow for some highway commercial along Highway 25.
Q. So just to follow up to that, then, these barns could be -- could hinder that, could it not?
A. Because they're non-residential, and as long as they weren't anywhere where they would have like food processing, the County wouldn't see a conflict between those two uses. Usually highway commercial is things like equipment sales, trucking companies, things of that nature. So having the feedlot close to commercial or industrial, there isn't necessarily a conflict of
use.
MR. GRAHAM :
Thank you, Mr. Chair, that's all.
Thank you, Mr. Graham.

And sometimes the frustration of going last, but sometimes the luxury of going last is all the questions have been asked and answered.

So I have no further questions, Ms. Janzen, but I do thank you for and agree with the Panel members, with their compliments, that were very concise and succinct answers very clear, thank you very much.

MS. JANZEN: Thank you.
THE CHAIR: Now based on our questions, did you have any redirect that you wanted to provide, Ms. Janzen?
A. No, I do not.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. (WITNESS STANDS DOWN)

THE CHAIR:
So up next we have the Town of Coalhurst. So, Ms. Horvath, are you -- where are you here? There you are, perfect, I've got you on my screen.

MS. HORVATH:
Thank you.
THE CHAIR: We can have you sworn in or affirmed, yes, I remembered.
D. HORVATH (For the Town of Coalhurst), affirmed THE CHAIR: Thank you, and please proceed.
A. Thank you very much.

I'm just going to spend a little bit of time introducing myself and sort of my role.

I'm a senior planner with the Oldman River Regional Services Commission, and I've been a planner with the Commission for about 23 years. And my area assignments have included the Town of Coalhurst for the past about 16 years. So I was around when we did do the work on the Intermunicipal Development Plan. So hopefully if there's any questions on that, I'11 be able to provide some input to that.

As my colleague, Ms. Janzen, she's covered a lot of what $I$ had to include, so $I$ don't want to waste any time by repeating some of that. But $I$ maybe will speak to the one sort of outstanding item which is sort of new information to me as well is this idea that there would still be manure storage at that location that was proposed to be decommissioned.

So it is my understanding that the Van't Lands came to Town council in April of 2021. I was not at that meeting so, again, I'm working on information that I've received from the CAO, as well as the one remaining councillor. As everyone realizes we had an
election in October, and four of my five councillors that would have been included in that discussion are no longer on council. So we're kind of working on what was historic information from those meetings.

So it was my understanding that the idea that the decommissioning would include everything, that the entire operation would cease, including any manure storage or activity on the site. So if that is definitely not the case, I think that we would not be in support of that with, I guess, a permanent manure storage.

I think we would agree with the comments of Lethbridge County with regards that we understand there is temporary storage. As she said, we live in a very rural area. We understand those types of things and would have no objection to that part of a permit. If it was going to be there temporarily or moving on certain months of the year, that would be all right, but to have permanent storage, I think we would be less likely to support that.

So that's all $I$ really have to add to the hearing. So if there's any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

THE CHAIR:
Great. Thank you very much, Ms. Horvath.

Ms. Janzen, with the County, did you have any questions?

MS. JANZEN: No, I don't have any questions.
THE CHAIR: And neighbours, Ms. Schmid, Mr. and Mrs. Bedster, Mr. Clifton, do any of you have questions for Ms. Horvath?

MR. CLIFTON: No.
MR. BEDSTER
No.
MS. SCHMID:
No.
THE CHAIR:
Al1 right, hearing none.
Mr. Van't Land, do you have a question for Ms. Horvath?

MR. VAN'T LAND: I do not.
THE CHAIR:
And, Ms. Vance?
MS. VANCE: We do not have any questions either. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you.
Mr. Kennedy .
MR. KENNEDY QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. I have one question, and it's this, Ms. Horvath, is -and it's the same question that $I$ asked the County. And it is as a planning authority, do you have concerns that the NRCB might not be having regard for provision in an Intermunicipal Development Plan?
A. I would say yes, especially as an urban municipality
because, again, most of the time in our urban municipal development plans, we don't deal with livestock and confined feeding operations as policy areas. So we rely on our rural neighbours to ensure that our interests are protected.

I guess one thing that sort of, from what I've heard today as well is that the Municipal Development Plan, even on a rural, is a very high level document; it covers a lot of 1 and area. And so these Intermunicipal Development Plans are more site specific. While they're still general in nature, they are specific to each urban municipality and the unique situation that they may find themselves in with regards to existing development or long-term development.

So yeah, it is of great concern that the Intermunicipal Development Plan policies are not given a higher priority.
Q. Thank you. And the other piece is this, and this is an area that's been identified in the Intermunicipal Development Plan and with, you know, the potential for
know, this barn could well be current and operable for 50 years. Does that cause any concern, do you think, from the Town of Coaldale's (verbatim) support of that operation being put in place?
A. I think that's an excellent question because $I$ think that's -- if the proposal was on the existing site which was closer to Coalhurst and we knew that was going to be there for 50 years, that creates an incredible constraint to further development within that.

I guess the thought is, you know, as we go out in distance from the Town boundary, there's less likely to be development. So, again, the crop (phonetic) will come from the core and out. And as such, if that development is in its current location in the northeast quarter where Ms. Janzen indicated that both the municipalities had agreed that the Kipp Road, as it has been known, or 94 is a paved connection between Highway 3 and Highway 25 , we would anticipate that there would be development in that location, that this could be compatible to.

Or, again, as Mr. Van't Land mentioned, you know, sometimes these larger barns or buildings can be converted to something different, and as well would give them that opportunity.

So I think from a planning perspective, the current location was of support by the municipality because they felt that, yes, they understand these things. When people make investments, they're there for a long time. And to direct that investment to where it may make the most sense is really what planning is all about. And definitely from the Town's perspective, the further away from our boundary, the better it is.

Understanding that that's why in this particular one, the Town of Coalhurst, in discussions with the County, understood that there's investment and existing operators, and that's why we maybe took a less hard line on no expansions, no new ones. We said, okay, well, no new ones, we can understand that, but we have to understand that there are people that may need to expand, but how do we do that in a way that is beneficial to the municipality.
Q. Sure. Thank you. Those are my questions. I have some outstanding questions, but I think you've probably given me the best answer you can in terms of, you know, what the siting of the short-term manure storage facility, short-term manure storage on this site might mean.

And what I now hear is there's all kinds of lands
that are owned by the family along, you know, in the northwest quarter that may not be covered by the existing deemed permit. So any cancellation or any conditions associated with that may not apply to those other lands?

So we've got a lot of uncertainty related to what short-term manure storage might look like on a go-forward basis, and I think unfortunately we're not going to get -- we may not have all of the answers to that by the time this hearing closes.
A. I agree. I noticed that as well when Ms. Janzen was speaking that, yeah, there's six separate titles and whether or not -- what that first original grandfathered permit from 1998 looked like and what it actually entailed, $I$ guess, perhaps wasn't at the front of mind. When it was before Town council, it was the idea that that operation in that location was going to -- to no longer be, and that was sort of what was presented to them.

I don't think they understood that well, it could happen on one of the other titled parcels that really sort of, I guess, undermined what their thought process of what they were supporting I think.

So that does provide a little uncertainty for the Town.
Q. I see Mr. Van't Land making notes. Perhaps when he gets his rebuttal opportunity, he may speak to the question which may or may not -- may be helpful to the Panel and to the Town.

But, Ms. Horvath, thank you for your answers.
A. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Kennedy?
MR. KENNEDY:
Yes.
Thank you.
Ms. Roberts.
MS. ROBERTS QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. Yes, Ms. Horvath, AOPA's standards and administration regulations Section 5, and nobody has to go there, I'11 just comment on it. That section defines what operators are allowed to do and what they're not allowed to do for short-term solid manure storage. And there are a number of items listed there, but I think that the prime concern I'm hearing from the Town could be the location of those short-term storage sites.

And in that portion of the standards and admin regulation, one of the things that is stated is that those storage sites have to be not less than 150 metres from the nearest residence that isn't owned or under control of the owner or operator of the manure. And then they also define what actually is meant by "short
term," and it's meant to be no accumulative -- no more than seven months over a three-year time period.

So I would think that in this particular case, what that could mean, I'11 say worst-case scenario for the Town, could be that there could be a solid manure storage pile in one location for a seven-month time period, but then it couldn't be in that particular location until three more years had passed.

So you had commented that probably from the Town's perspective, temporary storage is okay. Having, I'11 say, those parameters around it, you know, what short term actually means, it could be seven months, but would have to be more than 150 metres from the nearest residence. Do you have anything, any additional thoughts on that? Do you believe that that could be acceptable to the Town?
A. I do. Given those parameters, I do believe that that would be acceptable. That particular part of our community only has one or two residents.

So, again, I think the more impacted residents would be actually County residents, so again, I think we would have no problem with that -- that scenario.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. ROBERTS:
That's all the questions for me, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIR:
Thanks, Ms. Roberts.
Ms. Stuart.
MS. STUART:
Thank you, Mr. Chair. My questions have been answered. Thanks, Ms. Horvath.

THE CHAIR:
And, Mr. Graham.
MR. GRAHAM:
Thank you. No, I have no questions at this time, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you. And I have no further questions either, Ms. Horvath. And like Ms. Janzen, thank you very much for very clear, concise answers. Thank you.

MS. HORVATH:
Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
And did you have -- based on the questions you had, did you have any redirect for the Pane1?

MS. HORVATH
I do not. Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
A11 right. Thank you very much.
(WITNESS STANDS DOWN)
THE CHAIR: So, Ms. Schmid, it's your opportunity to provide any direct evidence that you might have or if you wanted to explore or high1ight anything that's particularly significant to you, this is your opportunity.

Did you have something prepared or are you ready to present?

## M. SCHMID

1 MS. SCHMID:
2 THE CHAIR:
M. SCHMID (In their own stead), affirmed

THE CHAIR: Thank you.
A. So I guess basically for the letter I submitted, more of my concerns with this expansion were just around the health effects it could have for neighbours and communities, especially, you know, if you look at how things are going to expand in the next 50 years.

And I'm more concerned with, like, the air quality and how that impacts, like, the health -- like respiratory health stats. I don't think there was much done to address that, and I don't think that moving

## M. SCHMID

forward it's really going to be a consideration until it's actually a real problem.

But I also wonder, too, about the long-term ecological impacts on that natural drain when you add additional barns to it that are much bigger than what's already there and how that looks even just with effect of groundwater and runoff and drains and natural drains and things like that.

I don't know, I guess I have more concerns on like not having any compliance for air quality because I know it's a big concern.

THE CHAIR: Sorry, are you --
A. I'm not sure what else to add.

THE CHAIR: Oh, okay. So are you completed what you wanted to say? I mean, I know that you all had opportunities in terms of the questions previously to Double H, as an example, but this is an opportunity to do what you've done, but if there's nothing more to add, then we'11 move to see if there's any questions that others may have of you.
A. Sure. Yes, I'm done.

THE CHAIR:
You're good? Okay, thank you.
Ms. Janzen?
MS. JANZEN:
I have no questions.
THE CHAIR:
Ms. Horvath?

## M. SCHMID

Cross-examined by Mr. Van't Land

4 THE CHAIR:
5 MR. CLIFTON:
6 THE CHAIR:
7 MR. VAN'T LAND:
8 MR. VAN'T LAND CROSS-EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
MS. HORVATH:
THE CHAIR:
MR. BEDSTER:
Q. I just want to -- Ms. Schmid has brought up a lot of concerns about air quality, and I want to understand those concerns, that $I$-- if the air quality is bad, then that is definitely something $I$ want to be aware of and if there's a reasonable mitigation, I would definitely pursue it.

I guess my question would be in order to try to understand the problem if she's ever had the opportunity to document particular times when the air has been particularly of poor quality so that $I$ can find out how that would mesh with what I'm doing here.
A. Can I respond to that?

THE CHAIR: Please do.
A. I absolutely guarantee that moving forward, I will document every day, hour, and minute that there is an air quality concern.

Yes, the question is put to you.

## M. SCHMID

Q. MR. VAN'T LAND: I appreciate that because I mean -- we're neighbours, and if all goes well, I hope we're neighbours for a long time, and if there's something that $I$ 'm doing or can do to mitigate the concerns, then I want to do that, but I can't fix something that I'm not aware of either. So that's my comment there. And I'm done.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Van't Land.
Ms. Vance?
MS. VANCE:
I have no questions. Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you. Mr. Kennedy? On mute.
$\mathrm{Hi}, \mathrm{Mr}$. Kennedy. Did you have questions?
MR. KENNEDY:
I did have a question and I was halfway through it when I realized I was on mute.

THE CHAIR:
Oh, okay. No problem.
MR. KENNEDY:
I apologize.
THE CHAIR:
No problem. Thank you.
MR. KENNEDY:
Now, I'11 start over again.
MR. KENNEDY QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. Ms. Schmid, I'm looking at your written submission, and the only question $I$ have relates to a statement that you make near the end of that submission, and that statement reads: (as read)
"Real estate research shows depreciated
land values when commercial operations

> are developed in rural agricultural settings."

So the Board, you know, hears this concern, and, you know, it takes every opportunity to assess what information is available, what research information is available. So you've made a reference, but we don't have the specific research. Can you direct us as to where we would find what you're referring to.
A. So just a general Google search, but also my friend was formerly in real estate, so having discussions with him about how commercial confined feeding operations impact basically our resale value and what that would look like.
Q. Okay. But not -- I mean, our Board deals with technical research all the time. You're not referring to a technical research paper on the subject?
A. No.
Q. Thank you.

Ms. Schmid, thank you. That's the only question that I had. Your submission otherwise is very clear.

Thanks, Mr. Chair.
Ms. Schmid, thanks so much for presenting today, and I have no questions for you.

4 THE CHAIR: like.

Thank you. Ms. Roberts?
I have a question for Ms. Schmid.
MS. ROBERTS QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. You had commented that you had concerns about compliance regarding air quality, and the question that I have is, is there anything specific you had in mind that you believe the NRCB needs to do with regard to that or -- or consideration of it?
A. I think maybe where my concerns come from, and I'm not exactly sure how it would look moving forward, but like, environment is constantly monitoring the air quality, and where I'm concerned about is, like, the ammonia and the other elements that enter the air contaminate or pollute it, and I'm more concerned about at what point is that air quality coming out of those barns detrimental to a health exacerbation, but I'm not sure who would follow that or what that would look

But it's kind of sad to hear that, even through al1 of this, that was never considered because we are downwind, we do have a child that has respiratory issues and on days when the odour is bad, I mean she is
bad. So my question is, what about air quality? Should I have done more about that? Probably. I just didn't know.

So I just wanted to know how do you monitor that, how do you make that better because we're not the only people that's going to impact because 50 years from now, what's the population going to look like?
Q. Okay. So if I get this right, then, you don't have any specific parameters or anything like that that you're looking for. What you're looking for, really, is an explanation of how this is considered for CFOs. Would that be fair?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. ROBERTS:
That's al1, Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIR: And thank you, Ms. Roberts.

Thank you, Ms. Schmid. I have no further questions, but on behalf of the Pane1, I appreciate your participation at the hearing and you stepping up. So thank you very much.

Did you have -- based on the questions that you did get, though, did you have anything to redirect to the panel?
A. I don't know if it counts as a redirect, but moving forward for any other confined feeding operation, would

## A. BEDSTER

they consider air quality and how that impacts surrounding communities and neighbours.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you.
(WITNESS STANDS DOWN)
THE CHAIR: Mr. and Mrs. Bedster, did you have any direct evidence that you would like to contribute, and if so, we'11 have you sworn or affirmed.

MR. BEDSTER: We11, just one comment to make, though.

THE CHAIR:
Just before you do. If you're going to comment, you're more than welcome to. We're inviting you to do that, but let's have you either sworn in or affirmed first.
A. BEDSTER (In their own stead), affirmed

THE CHAIR: Mrs. Bedster, had you planned on --

MS. BEDSTER: No, that's fine, thanks. I'm just agreeing with what I'm hearing. Finding it very interesting.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you very much.
Mr. Bedster, please proceed.
A. Well, we've been there 42 years now where we live. We live down approximately 2 miles south of a dairy farm and there was never a time that -- there was 80 head of

## A. BEDSTER

Cross-examined by Mr. Van't Land
cattle they milked. So you've got a fair amount of manure, but where we're at now, over the last, I don't know for sure, I'm going to say 15 to 20 years there's some days, some nights you don't open your windows, you don't open your doors because if you open your windows and doors, it smells like manure.

So that's my -- along with what Mrs. Schmid said, it's quite pungent sometimes. Whether it's cattle, chickens, or horses or cows, it's definitely somewhat -- well, it is a problem out there.

I guess that's about all $I$ have to comment on. THE CHAIR: Okay. Well, thank you, Mr. Bedster.
A. You're welcome.

THE CHAIR: Are there any questions from Ms. Janzen?

MS. JANZEN:
No, I have no questions.
THE CHAIR:
Ms. Horvath?
MS. HORVATH:
I have no questions.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you. Ms. Schmid?
MS. SCHMID:
No questions.
THE CHAIR:
And Mr. Clifton?
MR. CLIFTON:
No questions.
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Van't Land.
MR. VAN'T LAND CROSS-EXAMINES THE WITNESS:

## A. BEDSTER

Cross-examined by Mr. Van't Land
Q. Again, just a clarification. I've been down wind of -a strong wind as well, and I'm also not a fan. But I was wondering if Mr. Bedster was able to take note. Normally when people are spreading manure, it's pretty obvious who's spreading where. And on the times when he found it particularly bad, if he noted where that smell was coming from?

Given where he's at, I'm willing to bet that it's probably feedlot manure, and I do know that Matt is pretty diligent about turning it in to deal with the odour.

But at any rate, just to clarify whether we're responsible for that smell or not, I was wondering if he has been able to document when he's noticed that it's particularly bad?
A. No, I have not documented, but you're partly right on that from the neighbour to the west of us. But there's also been times when there's a northwest wind, and it has been poultry. And it's definitely a different odour between cows and poultry.

So equal matters, equal things, they're both -they're both on the table.
Q. Okay. I was just looking to clarify that. I have no further questions.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Van't Land.

## B. CLIFTON

MS. ROBERTS:
THE CHAIR:
MR. GRAHAM : you.

THE CHAIR: appreciate your participation. I have no questions. Did you have anything to redirect?
A. No, not at this time.

THE CHAIR:
(WITNESS STANDS DOWN)
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Clifton, were you going to make a submission or provide any direct evidence today?

MR. CLIFTON:
THE CHAIR:

Yes.

Okay. Thank you. Ms. Vespa.
B. CLIFTON (In their own stead), affirmed

## B. CLIFTON

1 THE CHAIR:
And I do notice your voice is a bit softer. So if the mic is closer, if you could speak towards the camera if that's where the mic is, that would be great. Thanks.
A. A lot of the stuff that $I$ had we kind of touched on a little bit here with the swales and the drainage.

I do have that letter from -- or that email from Logan Huscroft saying that $I$ do have an open file with them concerning this matter. How that goes, I guess we'11 see and see what compliance we get.

The other concern with that is any manure that is spread on the 1 and and not incorporated can come with that runoff on wet years. So that's all contaminated and eventually goes to the 01d Man River which is only a mile and a half away.

Another thing we should touch on is the no-till farming. Being that we are in the rural urban fringe or the MDP, whatever you want to call it there, in consideration for the neighbours for the odour. I don't know why we can't incorporate this rule. He's stated that he has no intent to do it, so there is no regard for the neighbours. It's more, I guess, looking out for himself.

I've also touched on the reduced land value. I have a dry corner which would be in the southwest

## B. CLIFTON

corner of my property directly across the highway from these barns, a 5-1/2 acre dry corner that I can subdivide out. It has city water, it has gas, it has power, everything there. But how can I effectively market that when it's directly downwind from a 120,000 bird operation?

The quality of life is also down. The odour at times is so bad, you can't go out and enjoy a night in the hot tub. You can't have guests over on the deck. It's bad.

Chicken manure is probably right up there with pig manure. It's one of the most potent manures there are. It has its -- it's very high in ammonia. It's not a pleasant smell.

We don't have air conditioning in our house. We can't open our windows at night to cool off when it's 30 degrees in the summer. You open the windows, your house smells like manure. Your clothes smell like manure. There's really nothing you can do to get away from it.

The other thing I was going to ask too was what is the life expectancy of the barns; we've kind of touched on that already: 50 years approximately-ish. What's the development like or going to be like in our area in that time? Like are they wasting their money now

## B. CLIFTON

trying to build these barns just to have them be commissioned or have -- you know, be down this same road again? I don't know.

What -- what impacts to the directly affected neighbours are going to be reduced if this goes ahead? Like, there's already impacts from the existing operation. What's going to be done to the existing operation to bring it up to modern because it's already 30 years old or 25 years old or whatever it is. So what's going to be done to that to help these impacts? Is he going to be compliant with his manure spreading, his farming practices, everything, to help improve these impacts?

I've included some pictures; we've seen the swales there. But if you go, I don't know which one the submissions is there. Exhibit Number 20. If you can pull up the pictures on that, please.

THE CHAIR: Is this the correct picture, Mr. Clifton?
A. Yeah, that's the first picture. That is the area directly west of Double H's existing barns. So this was after a big rain, I believe 2011-ish; I'm not 100 percent sure on the year. This was prior to those swales being dug.

So now any manure spread on the 1 and all closed

## B. CLIFTON

into this water. So now that these swales drainage is dug, all flows basically towards us which would be heading north, this picture is taken from Kipp Road looking south, now that comes to their -- where the swale ends right at the county ditch and flows east towards Highway 25.

So if we scroll down to the next picture or the next three pictures, that is Highway 25 looking directly east towards my place. This shows the ditch full of water and it backing up onto my land.

The next picture kind of shows a bigger, broader angle of how full the ditch is and how much it backs up into me. These were all prior to the work that was done on Double H's land. So this is kind of what $I$ got already, but now that that whole quarter is being drained, it all comes to me.

Now I get even more. It hasn't happened yet, but it will. I don't know when, but how much is that going to affect me then?

I guess, you know, what comes with the water, what's in that manure? We don't know.

So I don't know -- like as medication that's in the manure or anything, whatever, cleaning agents that they use in the barn, $I$ don't know what's all there.

And then the third picture is kind of another

## B. CLIFTON

better angle kind of looking southwest. You can kind of see how it backs up there.

We've already touched on the letter from
Logan Huscroft that he has been out. He does see a compliance issue with it all, and it will be looked at.

Another thing I want to talk about was the manure storage that would be on the northwest which I think we've kind of covered that already.

I think -- I think that's it.
THE CHAIR: Well, thank you, Mr. Clifton.
Ms. Janzen, any questions?
MS. JANZEN:
No. I don't have any questions.

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Horvath?
MS. HORVATH:
I don't have any questions.
THE CHAIR:
Ms. Schmid?
MS. SCHMID: I don't have any questions.
THE CHAIR:
Or Mr. and Mrs. Bedster?
MR. BEDSTER: No questions.
THE CHAIR: Thank you.

## B. CLIFTON

THE CHAIR:
Thank you.
Mr. Kennedy?
MR. KENNEDY QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. Yeah, I have one, and it's going to sound like a strange question, Mr. Clifton. But those photos that you showed that are in your Exhibit, did you say they were from 2011?
A. I believe that is the year. The camera didn't have a date stamp, so I'm not a hundred percent sure on the year. That was one of the years that $I$ know we had the big rain and this happened, but $I$ can't be a hundred percent sure of the year.
Q. And you took those pictures to document what?
A. It was just a random just to show all the water.
Q. Oh, okay.
A. Because I've had issues kind of in the past with the flooding there, and it was just random luck that $I$ actually had this picture to show how much flooding he had on his 1 and.
Q. And so you talk about, you know, the swale construction and drainage construction that's taken place I think more recently. Is that fair?
A. The swales were dug within the last two to three years.
Q. I think we heard from Mr. Van't Land that it was a couple of years ago perhaps?
Q. But you had issues with the standing water or the accumulating water 11 years ago, and what were you attributing that to?
A. The natural drain where it goes through the southwest -- I don't know what the actual is, to the northeast of us, what was that location, the southwest 26 where he states that the water runs through, can't handle that much water at once.
Q. Right.
A. So that is the way it goes, but because it can't handle it, it backs up the county ditch and uses me kind of as a holding pond, $I$ guess, until it can eventually flow through.
Q. But none -- do I take it none of those photos were actually of your land?
A. The ones I submitted there?
Q. Yes.
A. The last three are of my land that shows how it backs up the ditch and then floods onto me.
Q. Thank you. Those are my questions.

I'm sorry, from your home, you don't own the 1 and north of the Kipp Highway?
A. No. I am -- I'm directly east of Double H.
Q. Right. Okay. Halfway through that quarter section?

MS. ROBERTS QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. In your verbal submission, Mr. Clifton, you mentioned reduced quality of life, and you specifically mentioned items that might -- that are concerns of yours that would fit under reduced quality of life, or is it primarily odour?
A. It's primarily the odour, yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. ROBERTS: That's all, Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you.
THE CHAIR QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. Mr. Clifton, just a couple of quick questions. You have been, from your submission, obviously in contact with Alberta Environment. So you are clear that it is, in terms of surface water flows and activity in terms of altering surface water on the land as opposed to just the CFO site itself, is the responsibility of Alberta Environment and Parks? Is that --
A. Yeah, I'm aware of that. But $I$ was also informed that any manure that could be on the 1 and that comes with that water is an NRCB issue.
Q. Exactly right. That was going to be my question if you were aware of that. Right, so thank you.
A. Yeah.
Q. So, thank you very much. Those are the questions that I have.

Did you have anything that you wanted to redirect

## B. CLIFTON

Questioned by The Chair

1 THE CHAIR:
We've got rebuttal evidence from Mr. Van't Land, and Mr. Van't Land, question to you, do you have rebuttal evidence and, if you do, how long do you think it would take you?

MR. VAN'T LAND: I have a number of points that I would like to clarify through. I can't see it taking longer than 10 or 15 minutes.

THE CHAIR: But then we do have -- also we have closing arguments, an opportunity for everyone to have closing arguments.

I'm just wondering -- I think we're going to be fine on time by the looks of things, so I really appreciate everybody being clear and succinct throughout the day, so thank you very much.

Well, let's just take a quick ten-minute break unti1 3:15 and return, and I think we're still going to be fine for time.

So if we could just break unti1 3:15 and come back and wrap it up. Thank you very much.
(ADJOURNMENT)
THE CHAIR:
Welcome back, everyone. The question is do we have everyone? We do. We're just waiting for Lethbridge boardroom, the neighbours. There we go. Perfect.

Everybody can hear me? We're good? Okay.

## Questioned by The Chair



Thank you.
Okay. Mr. Van't Land, just to remind you and confirm that you're still under oath. I think you were affirmed but you're still under oath, so with that understanding, let's proceed please.
S. VAN'T LAND (For Double H Feeders), previously affirmed
A. Okay. I wanted to take this opportunity just to go through some of the questions that have come up and perhaps some misunderstanding or, again, just clarifications.

Top of my list is the question regarding equipment modernization.

MS. FRIEND:
Excuse me, I'm sorry to interrupt but, Peter, Sandi just texted me and she lost her connection. So she's asking, Mak, if you're online, could you send Sandi another email invite to her home email, please.

THE CHAIR: Or just if you can -- I think you can just invite her as well, Mak, by the participants.

MR. ELHAKIM:
THE CHAIR:

Yes, I'm on it.
Thank you. Appreciate it.

Thanks, Laura.
A. Am I free to continue?

## Questioned by The Chair



## Questioned by The Chair

MR. ELHAKIM
Yes. 857 --
MS. FRIEND:
Yeah, exactly. We don't want to give it out, but...

MR. KENNEDY: I was going to suggest in a pinch, because there is a period of time before that it would -- Ms. Roberts would be asking questions, she could watch the YouTube channe1 and that feed and then come in later.

THE CHAIR:
I'11 1et her know that and when she comes in she comes in. Let's do that. Or, Laura, could you phone Sandi on her cell -- she's been answering -- and just let her know to maybe do that on the YouTube, and then she can catch up when she gets brought in so we can keep rolling.

MS. FRIEND: Yes.
THE CHAIR: Thank you.
Okay, Mr. Van't Land, sorry about that. First glitch of the day, wouldn't you know it. So please proceed.
A. If that's the worst thing that happens today, it's still a good day.

A number of questions came up throughout the conversations today that $I$ wanted to just clarify and maybe provide some light on. There was some concern over the equipment modernization versus bringing
equipment over from the old barns.
There's some aspects of a chicken barn that are night and day different from 20 years ago and some that haven't changed a bit. Computer systems that are running ventilation, and vents and fan design have improved greatly over the years.

If I buy a brand-new feed pan today, it is indistinguishable from the one that $I$ bought 20 years ago. So things like feed pans, drinkers, those types of things we're planning to bring over and repurpose where we can. Things like fans and vents and lighting, those things are all going to be selected -- selected new.

There's been a fair bit of comment about manure storage and operation decommission and specifically what that means. And sometimes I feel like -- I want to be clear that $I$ wasn't trying to deceive anybody when $I$ was talking to either the town or the county or anyone else for that matter.

In my mind, manure storage is a separate issue from where we're raising the birds. So I apologize if that was unclear. And I just wanted to make the point that, on northwest we have a fair number of neighbours in close proximity to our operation there, and we have stored the manure in different places over the years.

And in communication with those neighbours, and out of deference to them and their preferences, we have kind of stored the manure to where it seems to be the least nuisance to anybody in the neighbourhood.

We try to maintain good relations with our neighbours and we've been working with them, and there have been multiple times when we had selected a spot and they found that to be a nuisance so we selected a different spot, and we've done that a couple of times and we've landed where we are.

So it's not a case of trying to end-run around any kind of a rule; it's more a case of trying to be -- just try to be -- yeah, maintain good relations with our nearest neighbours who are close to that operation.

There was some concern about the level of ammonia that comes from the barns and that might be sifted downwind. Part of the permit that we have -- or permit is perhaps the wrong word -- the authorization we have from the Alberta Chicken Producers to be able to grow birds is we have to sustain an audit every year for the On-Farm Food Safety Assurance Program and Animal Care Program that works inside of that.

What goes alongside those two programs, one of the things we monitor in the barn is ammonia levels, and
one of the goals of the ventilation system is to keep that ammonia down to a healthy level for both the birds and the people that are in the barns.

So I just wanted to say that that is something that we monitor and keep down deliberately. It's mostly for the health of the birds, but the side effect of that is there is not large amounts of ammonia coming out of the barn.

I think back to Coalhurst. I don't know how good people's memories are, but $I$ can remember the chicken barns. There was a friend of my dad had chicken barns right across from the community centre and where the current gas station is. There used to be chicken barns there, and those are things that we keep in mind when we are looking at moving our existing -- our existing operation away from the town. We've been --

Since I've been involved with the farm, it's been coffee talk quite often as to how long it's going to take for Lethbridge or Coalhurst to get to us, and if the last 20 years is any indication that, in 50 years,
incentive. If it becomes a point where development is so dense that it's no longer a viable option to run a poultry operation, then typically land values would increase and we'd be, from that point on, better off to trade up to an area further away, expand our acres and perhaps take the opportunity to expand the operation. But in the short term, we try to build things as well as we can, and take care of them, and run with them accordingly.

Bryan had shown a number of pictures. If the document handlers could bring up Document Number 20. I think it was picture number -- on page 2 is the one that I'm particularly interested in.

That picture there shows -- he's exactly right, that's our field. You're standing on the Kipp Highway looking south, seeing the water accumulate, and what you see there is that the water is accumulating away from the road ditch. The prevailing 1 and there, the water -- the land doesn't flow into the ditch until there's a volume of water just because of the lay of the land, and we have not touched the level of the culvert or the final drain into the road ditch.

So we have run a swale down the middle of that piece, and it's precisely because of pictures like this where if we can take that pond that's several hundred
feet wide, and if we can get it down to a fraction of that size and essentially store the water until it dissipates naturally, that has been the goal from the start of this improvement.

So I just wanted to high1ight that.
That essentially covers the points that $I$ wanted to come around back to. So it's one of those days where I think I've said everything three times and I'm not sure if I've necessarily covered everything, but that is the end of my presentation for the moment.

So I submit the floor for the next step in the process.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Sorry, did -- I just missed the last couple of sentences there. Did everybody freeze or is it just my computer perhaps? Everybody froze?

Sorry, I think what I got, Mr. Van't Land, is you're completed, you're complete with your rebuttal evidence, you're good and you're ready for questions; do I have that right?
A. I think so, yeah. The last thing I said of note was talking about the picture that Bryan had submitted. So if that came through clear, then, yes, I'm ready to move on.

THE CHAIR: Okay.

## S. VAN'T LAND

Ms. Schmid cross-examined the witness

Ms. Friend, do we have an update on Ms. Roberts?
MS. FRIEND:
No. Sandi isn't connected yet. We're going to try another email address, so it will still be another few minutes.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. So we'11 start with -- I mean, there's a list ahead of --

MS. FRIEND: She's watching on YouTube.

THE CHAIR: Okay. And if necessary, she texted a question -- it's a little awkward, but if she has a question, she can text that in if we need to, just to make this work, so. Okay, thank you.

So, Ms. Janzen, do you have any follow-up questions for Mr . Van't Land based on his rebuttal?

MS. JANZEN: No, I don't have any other questions.

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Horvath?
MS. HORVATH:
No, I don't have any questions.
THE CHAIR:
I'm not sure whose -- I don't think that's my computer, but it's coming through somewhere. Is everybody hearing that dinging happening? Okay, thanks.

Ms. Schmid?
MS. SCHMID: a minute.

THE CHAIR:
Hello. Yes, and I don't even need

Okay, perfect. Go ahead.

MS. SCHMID CROSS-EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
Q. Okay. So my questions are just for some clarification for Scott when he had mentioned about the odour and his surrounding neighbours and how they just didn't have any concerns about it, and if they did, he was willing to work with them. And I just wanted to know if those neighbours are downwind from the storage and what that -- maybe why there's not so much concern about it?
A. I would comment that those neighbours are -- they're bordering our field very closely, and if they have concerns, we work with them.

And it -- to be honest, you've never raised a concern with me, so I've never had a chance to address it. So that's the other side of it.
Q. I just wanted to know, though, if they were downwind from the storage?
A. Some are, yes.
Q. My next point that $I$ would like clarification on. When you talk about animal welfare and ammonia levels in the barn, you have to keep that at a certain level. And I can appreciate that. But by keeping that ammonia level down, does that increase what's being put out through the fans into the environment and then going back to the air quality?
A. Not really because, in keeping the ammonia level down,
the reality is that what we're actually managing is the moisture level, and it's the interaction of the moisture and the manure and the microbes that generates the ammonia.

And in keeping the density of the ammonia down in the barn, the air coming out of the barn is obviously not going to be any more of a -- of a concentration of ammonia than what's in the barn.

So as that goes out and dissipates into the general environment, then -- the further downwind you get, the less of a concentration there is also.
Q. Thank you. Those are my questions.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Schmid.
Mr. and Mrs. Bedster?
MR. BEDSTER: I guess not. I just -- we talked about the ammonia. Al1 I can tell you is I know people that worked in barns for years on a colony, especially on pigs, and they kept the ammonia down there, but the gentleman damn near died.

They had to be taken out of the barns and, you

THE CHAIR:
Okay. So there was not really a question for --

MR. BEDSTER: No.

THE CHAIR:
-- Mr. Van't Land. Okay, thank you.

Mr. Clifton.
MR. CLIFTON CROSS-EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
Q. I just wanted to touch on that picture that he brought up there with the -- west of his barns. That was taken before the swales were down.

THE CHAIR:
Did you want that posted? Oh, here we go. Okay, thank you.
Q. MR. CLIFTON: Yeah. So he said that the swales were there, there's a gravel dispersion pit by the road.

So now how big is that gravel dispersion pit? Like, will it handle all this water to disperse it out, or is it just going to go up and over that and down the county ditch? Because this picture was taken prior to al1 that being dug. So now that's just all extra water now?
A. There is a point where, if there's so much water, it really doesn't matter what you do; it's going to flow.

The nature of the dispersion pit is, because it's below the level of the culvert, the idea is that it
decreases the surface area where the water come in and the tile can engage the surrounding ground and slowly seep into the ground and away through groundwater mitigation, the way it does now, the way this water disappeared. Because I can tell you that pond was there a long time, and it didn't run anywhere. It goes down. And yeah, once the water goes down, I'm not an expert to tell you what happens to it after that.

But $I$ can say too, and I don't know if it's relevant to some of the memories you're maybe having is the culvert underneath my driveway where this water or anything over a certain level would run, when they improved the Kipp Highway, it could be 40 years ago, when they ran the new irrigation or the new telephone line, they plowed through that culvert. And that was a point of concern for us for many, many years. We could never quite figure out why that water would never move because we'd have a pond on one side and be dry on the other.

And the County did replace that culvert, I'm trying to think, we couldn't come up with a date, and it could have been around 15 years ago. It would have probably been before this. But if the perception of water flow has changed since then, then that might be the case why that might be. And that is something
that -- replacing that culvert with a proper culvert, functioning culvert was something that essentially restored the natural water flow instead of altering it.

All these swales and work that we've done hasn't changed direction of water or the volume of water that moves; it simply tries to manage the amount of cross-section of field that it damages before it -- before it moves.
Q. So what you're saying is that, in this picture, for instance, this water here, wouldn't go down the county ditch if there was a swale dug?
A. No, because we never touched the height of the culvert.
Q. The culvert is level with the ground at the county ditch, though, so the swale being dug brings this water --
A. I spent a lot of time with a laser out there two years ago, and our low spot adjacent to that is probably about six inches below that culvert.
Q. No further questions.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you, Mr. C1ifton.
Ms. Vance?

MS. VANCE:
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Kennedy.
MR. KENNEDY:
questions.

## MR. KENNEDY QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:

Q. And, again, Mr. Van't Land, it's to deal with the northwest quarter and manure storage on that.

So you mentioned, you know, your relationship with neighbours and your accommodating their concerns when you're storing manure. I assume that's with the temporary manure storage that you're storing there?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And I assume that when you're having those discussions with neighbours, it's because they -- they are troubled from time to time. Is that fair?
A. Troubled, it -- we cross paths from time to time, and they -- you express a concern. And we do our best to work with them on that.
Q. Okay. And we've had this discussion elsewhere, and you know, it's the potential for an approval, and NRCB approvals under $A O P A$ have no time limit.

So whatever's -- if you should get an approval, there is no time limit. It may not be limited to 50 years; it's potentially forever.

And I think it's probably a reasonable forecast to say what's around that northwest quarter will look a great deal different as each decade progresses. Is that a reasonable assumption?
A. Your guess is as good as mine.

It -- I would characterize that area as there's a lot of acreages, so a lot of it hinges on whether people choose to maintain them as acreages or pursue further development. It -- that's just the character of the area around that particular barn.
Q. But facing the same choices that you said at sometime you might face on the northeast quarter, the 1 and values may dictate more densification?
A. That is entirely possible.
Q. Yeah. Okay. And you're saying that you have a desire to continue temporary storage on the northwest quarter. AOPA says you can do temporary storage and you get seven months, but only for every three years.

How many months over a three-year period do you want to be able to store manure on the northwest quarter throughout anywhere on the northwest quarter?
A. Our preference is during the summer months, before and after there's a crop on the field, we spread it straight out of the barn when we can. We haul it when we can.

It -- to be honest, every year is different. It -- that's -- that's not a simple question to answer.
Q. Well, you know, with the Board looking at a situation where, you know, if they say "approved
notwithstanding," it's a now and forever decision, if they were to include a condition that would go at least in part to assessing future land conflicts, land use conflicts and say, "Yes, you can continue to use this as a temporary storage on the northeast quarter," but in total you might only be able to do that for only seven months for each three-year period, does that work for you?
A. We can make it work.
Q. Okay. Mr. Van't Land, I appreciate those answers. different screen, so I did see you. And are you stil1 there?

MS. ROBERTS: I stil1 am here, yay.
THE CHAIR:
Okay, awesome, thanks. Please, do you have any questions?

MS. ROBERTS: No, I don't. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Ms. Stuart.
MS. STUART:
Thanks, Mr. Chair. Just have one.
MS. STUART QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. I don't think we have to bring up the exhibit, but it is Exhibit 17, which is the IDP that Mr. Kennedy previously referred to, page 78 , Section 4.1.5, which,
if the Board were to consider the IDP, talks about that, you know, the core of that particular issue, that permit holders may be allowed to expand operations if it is to upgrade and modernize demonstrating changes that will reduce negative impacts (odours) to the rural and urban residents.

So Mr. Van't Land, my question to you is could you take this opportunity to clarify exactly for us what upgrading and modernizing steps you would take were the Board to overturn the approval officer's decision in terms of upgrading and modernizing and addressing odour concerns in the consolidation of your operation?
A. I think the primary consideration we have as far as the modernization would be a case of taking the existing double-decker barns and rebuilding them as a more appropriate model that is used primarily in broiler production today.

The primary concern we have there is the proximity to the town of Coalhurst and the number of neighbours that we have in close proximity to those barns. And a significant portion of our rationale for wanting to pursue this project is to take that production and move it away from the residential development that has gone on there, and depending what happens in the future, may continue to encroach upon that location.

I made reference to at least two sets of chicken barns that $I$ remember being what's now in the middle of Coalhurst, and those were in the neighbourhood of 40 years ago. And that's why we're looking to move outside before that becomes a reality and to make sure that that production is in a place where it makes sense to produce chickens.

It -- being on a quarter section, having sat down and counted, I think there's ten subdivisions out of that quarter section which indicates in the future, I mean there's the opportunity to have all kinds of different development there that have nothing to do with agriculture. Whereas on the adjacent quarter, it's a whole quarter surrounded by more or less whole quarters, and that's a more appropriate place to have that kind of development.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thanks, Ms. Stuart.
Mr. Graham.
MR. GRAHAM: No questions at this time. Thank

THE CHAIR: Mr. Van't Land, just a follow-up to Ms. Stuart's question.

THE CHAIR QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. I think this is fair, but if not, you know, you can let
me know.
In terms of the IDP, in terms of modernizing, and you had it in parenthesis, as Ms. Stuart points out, you know, things like mitigating negative effects like odour. And that's -- we've heard that today; that's a big one. What would be your sense in terms of source of odour from storage versus spreading versus the continuous operation of the barn, in terms of severity, where would you rank those?
A. I would say the least severe is storage. You take that manure and pile it. As long as you don't disturb it, then it -- the perimeter of that pile dissipates fairly quickly.

An ongoing concern is the barn, so $I$ would say that is probably -- probably I guess the second level of nuisance would be the spreading of the manure because obviously you're taking that pile, disturbing it, spreading it over a wide area. We've never gotten a nuisance complaint over spreading.

So I characterize -- I mean we have run a hog operation and a cattle operation in the past, and when I compare the three manures, broiler manure is by far the least nuisance factor to it compared to the other two types of manure.

And then the ongoing operation of the chicken
barns, as I characterize it, the barns we have that we're looking to take down, we have neighbours that drive within 500 feet of those barns almost on daily basis, and they're -- to be honest, they're surprised that they're active.

So the nuisance factor of a running chicken barn, I would characterize that as low.
Q. And you're spreading manure currently I mean to meet AOPA guidelines presumably but on the northwest quarter?
A. There's some that gets spread on the northwest quarter. There's -- I think there's about 40 acres of the northwest quarter that has cropland that we -- that we currently operate on. And then there's the 160 -- probably about 150 acres by the time you take the yard out on the northeast quarter.
Q. Are there other lands that you own closer to Coaldale [verbatim] that would be spread or stored?
A. You mean Coalhurst but --
Q. What did I say, sorry? Coalhurst, I'm sorry.
A. You're not the first one to make that mistake.

This is -- this is the closest land we have to Coalhurst. We have two more parcels of land: There's one that's about three quarters of a mile north from us from my northeast quarter on Highway 25, and then
there's another half section of land that's, I don't know exactly, about 60 miles away kind of in the northwest direction.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you. Those are al1 my questions. Thank you very much.

Did you have any -- you had quite a few questions on your rebutta1. Did you have any redirect based on those questions or...
A. No.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you very much, and
(WITNESS STANDS DOWN)
THE CHAIR: We do have an opportunity for everyone to provide a closing argument, and we'11 have you, Mr. Van't Land start. And then we'11 have Field Services, and I'11 go through the order after that. But you'11 start, and then you do have an opportunity for a reply at the end of it.

So take it away for now, and you'11 -- as I say you'11 have an opportunity for a reply.

MR. VAN'T LAND: Okay. I just want to take the opportunity to thank you and the rest of the Board for hearing this rebuttal.

My family has been running this farm here. My grandfather bought the northwest quarter in 1954, so
we've seen a lot of development here over the years. We've had this parcel where I'm sitting on right now, the northeast quarter, for at least the last 50 years, and we're in it for the long haul.

My grandfather started it, then my dad, and now I'm here, and my son and my nephew are very much becoming involved in the farm. So we're looking at this with a long horizon in mind.

With that, we're looking at being sustainable, we're looking at being responsible, and we want to do things in such a way that we maintain good relationships with the County, with the Town, with our neighbours. We don't want to be a nuisance or to be that neighbour that people wish wasn't there.

When we look at our northwest location, it's at a point where we have to spend a bunch of money on something, as far as how that operation runs. And when we look at our options, we thought that it would be very advantageous. It seems to suit the intent as we see it of the IDP, as far as future development, that the broiler operation be moved further away from the town of Coalhurst.

The northeast quarter is listed as primarily agriculture. That semicircle of light industry potential development, it seems obvious that there's
not an intent to have further residential development in this area but rather to go to more of an industrial side which we feel having a feedlot-type operation, intensive livestock operation is going to be more appropriate in this area.

Knowing that -- yeah, obviously I'm biased, but I mean I've run a hog farm, I've run a cattle farm, and I've run a chicken farm, and of the three, the nuisance factor of a broiler farm is far, far lower than the rest. And that is something that we take into consideration when we're planning.

I would encourage our neighbours that have concerns, when something ruffles them, like for crying out loud, let me know. It -- there's nothing I can do about a problem I don't see. And my perception at this point has been that there has not been a nuisance factor.

So if, in the future, when there is one, by all means let me know. And if there's something that we can do to mitigate that, we've done it for other neighbours, and we will definitely do it for you. We know that your families have been there a long time too, and we don't want to -- to -- to ruffle that relationship.

Again, we're looking to be responsible owners.

We're looking to be -- obviously we're business owners, this farm has to make sense at the same time, so logistics always figure in.

Our children are becoming involved; it's the fourth generation of our family that has farmed this farm, and we're excited about that. And your guess is as good as mine as to what the future holds.

But that pretty much summarizes why we want to do what we want to do. We've talked a lot about the details of what's going to happen here, depending on what the Board's decision is at this moment.

But I thank everybody for taking the time. There's been a lot of documentation for everybody to go through, and I can't imagine the hours that the Board puts in looking to review it and become familiar with it and I thank you for that. And with that I will close my arguments.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Van't Land. Thank you very much.

Ms. Vance, do you have any closing arguments?
MS. VANCE :
I do, Mr. Chair. I hadn't anticipated it, but I that think the discussion between Mr. Cumming and Mr. Kennedy in particular suggests that it might be appropriate to do so.

And I do want to begin by thanking some of the
other parties for their patience on what may appear to be somewhat of an academic point, but to our approval officers, and I suspect to municipalities, it is very much an everyday working thing that is very important.

Ultimately, you know, our submission is as it stands in Exhibit 16. NRCB Field Services does seek guidance from the Board. We are grateful that the Board might take this opportunity to provide such guidance to Field Services. And as I mentioned, guidance $I$ think would be valuable to all sorts of parties going forward.

The Chair of the Panel did speak about statutory interpretation, and that is a great deal of what is going on in this academic-sounding issue.

I wonder if document managers could just bring up Section 20(1)(a) of AOPA. There is no exhibit number because it's not an exhibit, but I believe that the document managers have that. It's on page 19 of mine; I don't know if it will be 19 of this one. Almost there.

Perfect. Thank you very much.
And I'11 be focusing on (1)(a) because that is the provision under which Ms. Weisbach made her decision, but of course there is a (b) part as well to keep in mind.

So statutory interpretation in a nutshell consists of looking at text, context, and purpose. And if the Board Panel is interested in wondering where I've come up with that formula, it is from a case called Rizzo \& Rizzo Shoes out of Supreme Court [1998] 1 SCR 27. It's a well-known leading case in statutory interpretation, and I'm happy to provide that case as well.

But, basically, you look at the ordinary sense, the grammatical sense, the context, the purpose, the objectives of the legislation. So it's a holistic exercise, not just a plain text reading which I appreciate.

However, part of it is text, and I -- it sounds as if the Board might go down a path of considering guidance in the form of IDP provisions prevailing over MDP provisions to the extent that it would affect how we read 20(1)(a). 20(1)(a) talks about inconsistency with the MDP land use provisions must deny. It is difficult to interpret your way out of that, to be frank. I'm not saying it cannot be done, however.

If the Board considers this, I would suggest that you include some hypotheticals as you work your way through this, and the hypotheticals I'm going to give you are in their very basic form. We're not exploring how you decide if something is inconsistent because
that is a whole other question.
But, essentially, there's four that I can see:
Scenario A is if the MDP says yes to the application and the IDP says yes; Scenario B is if the MDP says yes and the IDP says no; Scenario $C$, if the MDP says no and the IDP says no; and finally Scenario $D$ is if the MDP says no and the IDP says yes. And I would submit that Scenarios $B$ and $D$ are the ones, of course, that will make us scratch our head.

If the Board interprets IDP paramountcy as applying to somewhat change Section $20(1)$, I would just suggest as a possibility this theory: The theory would be that one could read in the concept of validity, so it would be a valid land use provision. And I suppose by operation of law, if one thing prevails over another, that other may not be valid. There may be a better term than "valid," but that's -- I'm thinking that that's one way to do it is to kind of read that in.

And I suppose the next question I would ask, and this relates in part to Mr . Kennedy's question concerning our paragraph 23 where I confessed I'm not sure the "and" was scrutinized as much as maybe it could have been, although I think it still stands. And part (b) is this idea of a policy or framework under
which an approval officer would look at the extent to which an MDP refers, cross-references, incorporates land use provisions of an IDP or just the IDP itself. And I would just ask the question, if the IDP provision is going to prevail in the face of an MDP provision that is inconsistent, do we need to even have that concept, that trigger of cross-referencing in that kind of a framework.

Those are my submissions. I'm certainly welcome to take any questions that you might have.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Kennedy?
MR. KENNEDY: Sorry, I'm having trouble hitting the unmute button.

I have no questions. I think the submission is very clear and very helpful and appreciated.

THE CHAIR: I would agree. Pane1 members, any questions?

Hearing none. Thanks, Ms. Vance.
MS. VANCE: Thank you.
THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.

MS. JANZEN: Board .

THE CHAIR: your participation.

Ms. Horvath?
MS. HORVATH:
Great. No, I don't have anything else. And, again, thank you very much for inviting us into the process today.

THE CHAIR:
And just a quick comment, the Board in the past has had times where County or Town has been reluctant and perhaps even failed to show up at the hearing on request, and I must say it's been delightful to have you. You've added to the process, and, you know, your ability to come and provide direct but also -- evidence but also answer questions from the Panel and from other participants is very useful, very helpful. So thank you both.

Ms. Schmid, sorry, do you have any questions -- or not any questions, do you have any closing argument?

MS. SCHMID: Yes, I do.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, please proceed, thank you.
MS. SCHMID: So my closing argument is just around -- well, first of all, thank you guys for hearing us. I know it's been a long day, but this is near and dear to our hearts, so I do thank you for your time. I know it can be spent in other places.

So going through this hearing today has been intimidating and exhausting, so sorry if I repeat myself. But in hearing some of the responses from

Mr. Van't Land and also like the discrepancies that were in the documentation that has been submitted, like I just have noted, like non-compliance with NRCB policies already in place, making a remark of not willing to work within those policies and requirements, also with doing unauthorized work with the Environment to create those swales and how that impacts the drainage.

I also don't think that there was fair representation for the negative effects so what adding two more barns to what's already in place would look like if it was approved.

I also feel like concerns for potential contaminated runoff water, whether it's medication that's in the feed for the chickens and how that stays in the barn the whole time and then when they clean the barn and it's stored outside or they spread it and it's close to the environment and the elements and eventually turns into runoff and what that looks like. It's not just the short-term, it's the long-term
sufficient evidence that supports how modernization and expansion are going to make those negative impacts less if that makes sense.

And I think that pretty much sums up my concerns and my closing statements.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Schmid.
Mr. and Mrs. Bedster?
MR. BEDSTER: What has been said is impacted because some things, what $I$ have said are really just kind of pushed aside, that it can't happen or whatever, and that really is not the way it is. If it happened once, it's happened quite a few times, I would say.

So it's just my word against their word or compliance, however you want to say this, but if it goes through, and it happens again, then what? What does the NRCB do then? Come in and slap a hand, or what takes place?

I guess that's everything.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you, Mr. and
Mrs. Bedster.

MR. CLIFTON:
I guess I'd like to thank everybody for their time and to allow us to express our concerns.

At the end of the day, it's still within the I
call it the rural/urban fringe area, which is labelled under the County Bylaw Act as prohibited.

As for the expansion, it's kind of a grey area as what they described. If it does go through, I would like to see that condition on the existing permit carried forward, for the 48 -hour manure incorporation to help reduce the odour. And I guess a little more compliance and consideration for neighbours. That's a11.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Clifton.
Mr. Van't Land, you have an opportunity to reply. You've heard comments from all parties in closing. Did you have any reply to those?

MR. VAN'T LAND: I just want to again one more time to take the opportunity to thank everybody involved. This has opened my eyes to a number of perspectives that I had not considered previously. Concerns have been brought up that are ones that I was not aware of and now I am, and I appreciate that and those will definitely be part of our consideration going forward.

Obviously, it is my desire to move forward with this project, but I want to make -- have good relations with the neighbours at the same time. So with the best of the both worlds, we're going to find a way to do both of those things, but at this point, it's the

Board's decision as to how they want to move forward.
And, again, I appreciate the opportunity to make the submission. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Van't Land. Thank you very much.

Well, this is a time to close, but just a couple of closing remarks.

On behalf of the Panel, I'd like to thank everyone for your participation in the process, and interesting, you know my notes, I used the words "intimidating" -that these proceedings can be intimidating and, Ms. Schmid, I think that's the exact word that you used and we recognize that. It is a difficult process, in particular for folks that, you know, it's not your everyday thing to participate in hearings, we get that. But we also get the fact that you stepped up, you came, you participated, you asked questions, you delivered direct evidence, and we really appreciate that from all participants. So thank you very much on behalf of the Pane1.

A couple of administrative thank yous. Ms. Kaminski and Ms. Taylor from the NRCB, they were our document managers. Once again, just a stellar job. Those documents came up in a hurry, right to the right page numbers. And often before we even had the number,
they were up, so thank you very much. It was a job really well done.

And, Ms. Vespa, court reporter, awesome. And, as usual, you catch me when $I$ forget to get people sworn in, so I appreciate that as well. But you folks do a really good job on the transcripts for us, so thank you very much on a very difficult job.

And our Zoom host from MNP, Mr. Elhakim. Thank you very much, Mak. You did a great job including when we had a glitch with Sandi. You got her back on track and included with Ms. Roberts. But thank you very much for spending the entire day with us and making sure our Zoom ran smoothly.

So we've received a ton of very helpful information today. We're going to consider all of this information, including all the submissions made to date, and we'll provide a decision to all the parties at the same time in written format.

Our longstanding performance target for the Board is to issue a decision within 30 working days, so roughly six weeks, the close of the hearing. And I don't see any reason why we won't meet that target here as well. So within six weeks, you should be seeing a decision from the Board.

So thank you once again, everyone, including

Ms. Friend who is behind the scenes and sometimes in front of the scenes, done a great job getting everybody organized and making sure that everything ran smooth1y. So thank you very much, Ms. Friend, and also Mr. Kennedy for the support you give to the Pane1.

So with that, I now adjourn and the hearing is now closed. So safe travels everyone that is travelling and have a good evening. Thank you very much.
(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 4:10 P.M.)
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| \$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20(1) .1[1]-57: 10 \\ & 20(1.1[1]-56: 18 \\ & 200[1]-92: 3 \\ & 200-\text { acre }[1]-135: 18 \\ & 2006[1]-4: 18 \\ & 2010[1]-4: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4.1.5[11]-24:22; } \\ & \text { 26:20; 27:11, 16; } \\ & \text { 29:22; 55:7,13; } 60: 7 ; \\ & 90: 20 ; 149: 10 ; 209: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$50,000 [2] - 137:21 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 9[3]-8: 16 ; 13: 24 ; \\ & 34: 23 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | 4.5.1 [2] - 113:4, 9 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { acres [4]-92:3; } \\ 199: 5 ; 213: 12,15 \\ \text { act [5] - 18:7; 70:22; } \\ 71: 22 ; 127: 16 ; 144: 20 \end{gathered}$ $\text { Act }[16]-27: 23 ;$ |
|  |  | 112:16; 134:3; <br> 205:13. 211.3. 213:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 9-22[1]-38: 21 \\ & 9-4[2]-87: 9 ; 136: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 37:16; 39:14; 43:17; |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1[7]-57: 11 ; 109: 10 \\ & 13 ; 156: 2 ; 219: 5 ; \\ & 229: 4 \\ & \text { 1)(a } \mathbf{[ 1 ]}-218: 22 \\ & 1.1[3]-58: 18 ; 59: 3 \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2011 \text { [1] - 188:7 } \\ & \text { 2011-ish [1] - 185:22 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 50:4, 10, 12, 20; 51:1; |
|  |  |  | $94[1]-166: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 10,13 ; 71: 25 ; \\ & 72: 20 ; 148: 23,25 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 2017 \text { [2] - 4:19; 50:10 } \\ & 2021[4]-8: 13 ; 9: 1, \end{aligned}$ | 403-620-8294 [2] | 98-189 [1] - 35:1 |  |
|  |  | 5:9, 11 | 9:04 [1]-2:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 20 ; 148: 23,25 ; \\ & 225: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 2021[4]-8: 13 ; 9: 1 \\ & 3 ; 162: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 42 [2]-94:9; 179:23 |  |  |
|  | 2022 [6]-2:4; 9:6,$15 ; 122: 1 ; 229: 9$ | 43 [1] - 94:9 | A |  |
| 1.5 [1] - 82:6 |  | 48 [2] - 36:17; 46:7 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 126: 22 \\ & \text { activity }[2]-163: 8 ; \end{aligned}$ |
| 1.7 [2] - 81:19; 94:2 | 2022-01 [1] -9:7 | 48-hour [3] - 46:6; | a) [2] - 61:15; $63: 2$ <br> A.M ${ }_{[1]}-2: 23$ |  |
| 1.8 [1]-82:4 | 2025 [1] - 128:17 | 134:7; 225:6 |  | 191:8 |
| 1.85 [1]-82:4 | 21 [1] - 108:7 | 4:00 [4]-13:24; 14:2, | AAMDC [1] - 4:13 abandoned [1] - | actual [4]-41:5; |
| 1.95 [1] - 81:15 | 216-5 [1]-70:15 |  |  | 95:16; 99:12; 189:6 |
| $10[5]-2: 4 ; 73: 15$ | 22 [16]-8:16; 32:25 | 4:10 [1] - 228:9 | $146: 3$ | add [6]-74:4; 84:15; |
| 122:1; 192:7; 229:9 100 | 33:3; 60:18; 61:3, 5 , | 4:30 [5] - 14:23; 15:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ability [4]-6:5; } \\ & \text { 159:10; 222:10; 229:7 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 163:21; 173:4, 13, } 19 \\ & \text { added }[2]-17: 19 ; \end{aligned}$ |
| 100 [2] - 104:9; | 8, 13; 62:5; 99:17; |  |  |  |
| 10th [1] - 117 | 137:15; 138:8; |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { able [13]-3:8; 8:1; } \\ & \text { 14:22; 29:8; } 94: 12 ; \\ & 97: 21 ; 141: 10 ; \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 222: 9 \\ & \text { adding }[3]-74: 5 ; \end{aligned}$ |
| 11 [4]-57:4; 79:1 | 22-09-22 [1] - 143:2 | 5 |  | 141:21; 223:10 additional [5] - |
| 23; 189:3 | 22-9-22 [4]-38:10, |  | 162:13; 181:3, 14; <br> 197:20. 208:16. 209 .6 |  |
| 11-day [1] - 6:15 | 20; 102:23; 156:2 | 5 [9] - 14:15; 44:1 |  | 12:25; 74:2; 160:13; |
| 11:20 [1] - 80:8 | 226,000 [1] - 83:18 | 50:3; 83:19; 84:7; | $\begin{gathered} \text { 197:20; 208:16; 209:6 } \\ \text { absolute }[1]-31: 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 170:14; 173:5 } \\ & \text { Additional }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 12 [4]-16:24; 50:3; | 229 [1]-229:4 | 98:1; 125:2; 156:3 | absolutely [4] - |  |
| 109:3 | 23 [9] - 17:21; 49:22; | 169:13 | 52:14; 67:6; 140:25; | ```30:11 address[18] - 11:15;``` |
| 120,000 [7] - 8:22; | 61:4, 9, 21; 119:4; | 5-1/2 [1] - 184:2 | 174:23 |  |
| 35:18, 25; 83:21; | 162:8; 220:22 | 50 [11] - 101:21 | absurd [2]-69:5; $\quad$ 18;65:21; 67:20; |  |
| 138:1, 7; 184:5 | 23(a [1] - 51:25 | 112:16; 134:3; 166:2, |  |  |  |
| 12:26 [1] - 121:11 | 238,000 [1] - 83:18 | 8; 172:21; 178:6; | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 70:23 } \\ & \text { absurdities [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 68: 5 ; 76: 16 ; 79: 2 \\ & 117: 16 ; 140: 1 ; 150: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 12:30 [1] - 119:16 | 23rd [1]-9:3 | 184:23; 198:20; |  |  |
| 15 [5] - 89:7; 108:15; | 24 [2]-17:22; 112:16 | 207:20; 215:3 | 69:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 117: 16 ; 140: 1 ; 150: 3 ; \\ & 153: 25 ; 172: 25 ; \end{aligned}$ |
| 180:3; 192:7; 205:22 | 25 [26]-72:22; | 50,000 [9] - 32:20 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 201:3; 202:13 } \\ & \text { addressed [11] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 150 [3] - 169:22; | 73:15; 87:20; 88:15; | 33:2, 6; 35:20; 93:10; | $\begin{gathered} \text { academic }[2] \text { - } \\ \text { 218:2,14 } \\ \text { academic- } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 170:13; 213:15 | 91:19; 93:18; 94:11; | 95:1; 137:15, 22; |  | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 13 ; 54: 24 ; 64: 18 \\ & 67: 23 ; 96: 17,19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 16 [10] - 9:1; 49:18, | 104:13; 105:17; | 138:5 |  |  |
| 20; 60:18; 61:10; | 106:22; 111:6; 112:2; | 50-pound [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sounding }[1]-218: 14 \\ & \text { accept }[1]-129: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 108: 15 ; 142: 12 ; \\ & 147: 14 ; 154: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| 102:25; 115:1; 145:5; | 119:1; 133:17; | $\begin{aligned} & 113: 20 \\ & 500[1]-213: 3 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 162:10; 218:6 | 136:15; 142:3; |  | acceptable [5] - | addressing [2] - |
| 160 [1]-213:15 | 160:16; 166:19; | 541 [1] - 25:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 44: 14 ; 45: 3 ; 108: 21 ; \\ & 170: 16,18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65:3; 210:11 } \\ & \text { adequate } 1]-88: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| 17 [3] - 85:16; 145:5; | 185:9; 186:6, 8; | 55,000 [2]-32:18 |  |  |
| 209:24 | 190:5; 213:25 | 33:2 | access [2] - 136:10, |  |
| 18 [6] - 70:12; 81:4; | 25th [1] - 8:13 | 58,000 [3]-32:24; | $16$accessing [1] - |  |
| 115:8; 138:17; 142:9 | 26 [2]-119:2; 189:8 | 33:2; 93:8 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150:2 } \\ & \text { adhere [2] - 36:11; } \\ & 37: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| 18.2 [1] - 70:13 | 26-9-22 [3] - 38:12;86:4; 104:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 00[3]-14: 5,7,18 \\ & 5 \text { th [1] }-9: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 136:11 } \\ & \text { accommodate [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 18.2(b [1] - 69:24 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 37:17 } \\ & \text { adjacent }[8] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 19[6]-24:7, 18, 21; | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27 [1] - 219:5 } \\ & \text { 27-SE [1] }-159: 21 \\ & \text { 27th [1] }-9: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $6$ | ```94:6 accommodating [1]``` | 138:20; 145:17; |
| 25:11; 218:18 |  |  |  | 155:11, 16, 19; |
| 1954 [1]-214:25 |  |  | - 207:6 | 156:13; 206:17; |
| 1978 [1] - 133:23 |  | $\begin{gathered} 6[4]-26: 3 ; 33: 14 ; \\ 38: 5 ; 110: 16 \\ 60[1]-214: 2 \\ 65,000[1]-8: 22 \end{gathered}$ |  | $211: 13$ |
| 1993 [1] - 58:9 | 3 |  | 144:19 | adjourn [1] - 228:6 |
| 1998[2]-168:14; |  |  | according [2] - | ADJOURNED [3] - |
| 219:5 | 3 [16] - 19:1; 33:14; |  | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 25 ; 84: 25 \\ & \text { accordingly [1] - } \\ & 199: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $121: 11,13 ; 228: 9$ <br> ADJOURNMENT [2] |
| 1:20[5]-121:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 5 ; 40: 16,23 ; 41: 5 \\ & 100: 23 ; 109: 10 ; \end{aligned}$ | 7 |  |  |
| 10, 13 |  |  |  | - 80:10; 192:20 |
| 1:23 [1] - 122:4 | 110:20; 142:9; 149:18; 156:2; $166: 19$ |  | $123: 13 ; 124: 7$ | adjust [1] - 98:24 <br> admin [2]-44:16; |
| 2 | 149:18; 156:2; 166:19 3.4.6 [1] - 158:20 |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 30 \text { [10] - } 5: 2 ; 91: 8 ; \\ 93: 19 ; 94: 3 ; 112: 16 ; \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:21; 50:21; 56:22; } \\ & 60: 18 ; 61: 3,11 ; \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { accumulate }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 199:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 169:20 } \\ & \text { administration [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 2 [20]-19:1; 26:2; |  | 158:19 | accumulated [3] - | 169:12 |
| 33:13; 34:24; 35:12, | 133:17; 184:17; | $\begin{aligned} & 75[1]-89: 24 \\ & 78 \\ & \text { [6] - 24:4-6; 25:18; } \end{aligned}$ | $35: 25 ; 103: 25 ; 105: 25$ accumulates [1] - | ${ }_{226: 21}^{\text {administrative [1] - }}$ |
| 20; 93:24; 100:23; | 185:9; 227:20 |  |  |  |
| 109:10, 15; 138:18; | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30-year-long [1] - } \\ & 5: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78 \text { [6] - 24:4-6; 25:18; } \\ & 56: 21 ; 209: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { accumulates [1] - } \\ & \text { 118:2 } \end{aligned}$ | adopt $[3]-17: 9,18$, |
| 143:15; 149:19; |  | $780-720-2317 \text { [1] - }$ | accumulating [2] - | 25 (1) |
| 156:2; 159:20; | $31[1]-94: 3$31 st [1] - 142:14 | 8:1179$71]-25: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 189:3; 199:17 } \\ & \text { accumulation [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | advance [1] - 65:16 advantage [1] - |
| 179:24; 199:12 |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3 [1]-81:17 | 31st [1] - 142:14 $32[1]-38: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79[1]-25: 19 \\ & \text { 7th }[1]-9: 7 \end{aligned}$ | ```116:4 accumulative [1] - 170:1 accurate [1] - 229:4 achieve [1] - 93:17 acknowledgement``` | $110: 1$ <br> advantageous [1] - |
| 20 [17] - 5:7; 42:10; | $\begin{aligned} & 37[1]-143: 15 \\ & 38[2]-83: 1 ; 93: 25 \\ & 3: 15[2]-192: 16,18 \end{aligned}$ | 8 |  |  |
| 50:24; 73:9; 79:23; |  |  |  | ```215:19 adverse [1] - 100:11 advice [2]-21:13; 22:9``` |
| 82:15; 91:8; 95:24; |  |  |  |  |
| 99:17; 108:1, 16; |  | $\begin{gathered} 8[1]-40: 21 \\ 80[2]-124: 15 ; \\ 179: 25 \\ 800-\text { head }[1]- \\ 124: 14 \\ 857[1]-195: 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| 180:3; 185:16; 196:3, | 4 |  |  |  |
| 8; 198:20; 199:11 |  |  | ```[3] - 51:5; 58:21; 59:23 acknowledges [1] - 62:13 acre [1] - 184:2 acreages [3] - 85:3; 208:3``` | 117:10 |
| 20(1 [2] - 50:4; | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4[10]-26: 20 ; 37: 14 ; \\ 72: 22 ; 102: 24 ; \\ \text { 109:10, 12; 110:20; } \\ \text { 112:17; 125:1; 156:3 } \\ \text { 4-inch }[1]-105: 13 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 800-head [1] - } \\ & 124: 14 \\ & 857[1]-195: 1 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 220:11 |  |  |  | advisor [2]-89:7; |
| 20(1)(a [2]-218:16; |  |  |  | 113:18 |
| 219:17 |  |  |  | advisory [1] - 71:17 |
| 20(1)(a) [1] - 219:17 |  |  |  | aerial [3]-117:12; |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { awkward [7] - 30:4; } \\ & 67: 18,25 ; 68: 2,7 ; \\ & 77: 11 ; 201: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { became [1]-82:20 } \\ & \text { become [2]-77:11; } \\ & \text { 217:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 204:16; 212:6 } \\ & \text { bigger [2]-173:5; } \\ & \text { 186:11 } \end{aligned}$ | bracketed [1] - 59:2 brackets [1]-27:13 brand [1] - 196:7 | C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | 159:1; 199:1; $211: 5$ | $5: 2 ; 24: 17 ; 25$ | $196$ | camera [2] - 183:3; |
|  |  |  | break [7] - 79:19, 23, | 88.8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { b) } \\ & 66: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $215:$ | $\text { bird }[14]-81: 2$ $93: 24 ; 94: 2$ | $\text { 25; 80:8; } 1$ $192: 15,18$ | canal [2] - 112: $142: 1$ |
| background [3] - | BEDSTER [20] - | 95:12; 100:9; 101:21; | breaks [2] - 13:16 | cancellation [1] - |
| 3:11, 13; 4:19 | 21:3, 5; 102:20; | 108:24; 129:8, $25 ;$ |  | 168:3 |
| backing [1] - 186:10 | 110:6, 10, 12, 17 | 137:22; 138:1; 184:6 | br | cancelled [1] - 131:7 |
| backpack [1] - | 111:1; 112:21, 24 | birds [40]-8:23; | 35:8; 120:14; 148:16; | cancer [2] - 106:4; |
| 103:22 | 164:8; 174:3; 179:8, | 35:19; 36:1; 81:10 | $150: 16$ | 223:23 |
| backs [6] - 1 | 15, 18; 187:19; | 13, 22; 82:3; 83:18 | briefly [5] | nnot |
| 186:12; 187:2; | 203:15; 204:3; 224:8 | 23; 93:8, 10, 22; 94:3, | 5:13; 18:7; 35:2 | 56:11; 62:23; 219:20 |
| 189:12, 19 | Bedster [33] - 2:19; | 7, 9-10; 95:1, 8, 16; | 56:21 | canola [2]-98:10, |
| backwards [1] - | 9:4; 16:10, 12; 21:2; | 97:20; 100:10, 12; | bring [20]-18:17 | 12 |
| 126:25 | 34:20; 38:13, 19, 21; | 107:18; 125:3, 5 ; | 40:17; 42:3; 53:8; | canvassed [1] - |
| bacterial [1] - 113:23 | 86:6; 87:23; 102:19; | 128:25; 129:23; | 59:20, 23; 72:20; | 153:19 |
| bacteriological [1] - | 110:8, 23; 112:23; | 130:2, 5, 24; 137:7, 9, | 75:6; 81:4; 86:16 | CAO [1] - 162:24 |
| 90:5 | 141:13; 151:7; | 15, 24; 138:7; 196:21; | 97:5; 110:15; 147:12 | capacity [6] - 32:19; |
| bad [9] - 100:17; | 153:11; 164:5; 174:2; | 197:21; 198:2, 6 | 154:7; 157:7; 185:8; | 70:7, 14; 137:15, 17; |
| 105:21; 174:11; | 179:5, 16, 22; 180:13; | birds' [1] - 107:15 | 196:10; 199:11; | 154:21 |
| 177:25; 178:1; 181:6, | 181:3; 182:14; | bit [34]-3:14; 13:17; | 209:23; 218:15 | captured [1] - 124:22 |
| 15; 184:8, 10 | 187:18; 203:14 | 14:4; 29:1, 20; 32:8; | bringing [2] - | carbon [2]-90:9; |
| balance [2]-93:25; | 223:22; 224:7, 20 | 39:8; 41:2, 9; 42:17; | 152:25; 195:25 | 157:9 |
| 125:17 | Bedster's [1] - 86:5 | 54:5; 56:24; 67:18; | brings [2] - 122:10 | Care [1] - 197:22 |
| ball [2] - 76:21; 86:11 | beef [1] - 4:17 | 83:8; 86:16; 90:20; | 206:14 | care [5] - 35:18; |
| ballpark [1] - 111:22 | begin [2]-11:1 | 103:6; 105:11; | broadcast [1] - 121:9 | 44:5; 107:2; 133:20; |
| barely [1]-121:5 barn [36]-39:1; | $\begin{gathered} 217: 25 \\ \text { beginr } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 111: 12 ; 134: 6,19 \\ & 142: 12,19 ; 145: 23 \end{aligned}$ | broader [1] - 186:11 <br> broiler [15] - 8:22; | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 199:8 } \\ & \text { careful }[3]-55: 15 \text {; } \end{aligned}$ |
| 82:19; 83:3; 94:7; | 5; 106:20; 117:13; | 147:3, 9; 157:12; | 35:19; 45:23; 81:1 | 71:11; 109:25 |
| 100:22; 101:19, | 140:4 | 162:4; 172:7; 183:2, | 91:3; 100:7; 102:2; | carefully [1] - 107:19 |
| 22-23; 103:13, 20, 24 ; | behalf [3]-178:18; | 6; 196:4, 14 | 108:18; 109:4; | Carina [7] - 2:12; |
| 104:7; 108:3, 24; | 226:8, 19 | bite [1] - 120:5 | 114:24; 129:20; | 5:18; 8:14; 27:16; |
| 109:19; 123:10; | behind [2] - 87:13; | blow [2] - 103:23; | 210:16; 212:22; | 131:23 |
| 129:4; 131:21; | 228:1 | 114:12 | 215:21; 216:9 | Carol [2] - 2:19; |
| 133:22; 153:1; 166:1; | beige [1] - 3:12 | blowers [1] - 103:23 | broilers [4]-32:8, | 16:12 |
| 186:24; 196:2; | belief [1] - 111:7 | blowout [1] - 97:15 | 24; 33:3; 107:20 | Carolyn [4]-2:10; |
| 197:25; 198:8; | believer [1] - 145:6 | blue [1] - 38:8 | broke [1] - 80:1 | 6:7, 16 |
| 202:20; 203:6, 8; | believes [1] - 11:18 | Board [53]-2:1; 3:5; | brother [2] - 124:4; | carried [11] - 23:7, |
| 208:6, 20; 212:8, 14; | bell [1] - 70:9 | 5:2, 6-7; 9:14, 20; | 133:23 | 14; 34:25; 36:4 |
| 213:6; 223:16 | below [2] - 204:25; | 11:18; 12:16; 18:12; | brought [11] - 84:8; | 18-19; 37:12; 44:20; |
| barns [93] - 8:21; | 206:18 | 19:10; 20:16; 23:20; | 96:11, 14; 115:2; | $46: 4,15 ; 225: 6$ |
| 27:4; 33:25; 34:5; | beneficial [2] - | 30:24; 35:3, 6; 43:5; | 118:11; 126:11; | carry [10] - 23:10, 16; |
| 38:10; 39:5; 59:8; | 11:19; 167:18 | 46:20; 47:14; 51:13; | 142:24; 174:9; | 35:11; 37:1; 46:5; |
| 82:18; 84:22; 87:3; | benefit [2] - 114:23; | 68:3, 7, 21; 72:23; | 195:14; 204:8; 225:18 | 48:8; 55:3; 63:5; 78:4 |
| 91:1, 3, 7; 94:1, 16; | 152:13 | 73:5; 78:3, 8; 131:9; | brown [1] - 111:17 | carrying [2] - 28:2; |
| 97:1-4, 8-9, 18, 22; | benefits [1] - 114:1 | 137:13; 138:4, 6; | Bryan [3] - 2:18; | 34:21 |
| 99:6, 12, 14-16; | best [23]-10:3, 25; | 146:5; 149:5, 18, 23; | 199:10; 200:22 | Carstairs [1] - 4:6 |
| 100:3, 8; 101:5, 11, | 14:14, 17; 15:1; 22:6; | 155:3; 176:3, 14; | buckle [1] - 125:20 | case [26] - 15:2; |
| 14, 18; 102:6, 8, 16; | 48:2; 78:18; 84:6; | 208:24; 210:1, 10 ; | build [5] - 66:23; | 40:19; 44:2; 47:18; |
| 103:11, 16-17, 19, 21; | 98:13; 110:2; 113:21; | 214:22; 217:14; | 128:6, 19; 185:1; | 53:1; 62:14; 69:9; |
| 104:8; 108:2; 123:7, | 114:13, 25; 134:23; | 218:7; 219:3, 14, 21; | 199:7 | 78:7; 82:13; 83:5; |
| 16; 127:14; 128:21; | 144:2, 8; 152:4; | 220:10; 221:23; | builder [1] - 128:4 | 89:10; 112:19; |
| 129:1, 14, 23-25; | 167:21; 207:14; | 222:6; 227:19, 24 | building [3] - 91:6; | 118:12, 17; 145:24; |
| 130:17; 132:3, 10-11; | 225:23; 229:6 | board [6]-4:14; | 146:17 | 156:18; 163:9; 170:3; |
| 133:21, 25; 136:10; | bet [1] - 181:8 | 18:18; 49:14; 120:15; | buildings [2] - | 197:11; 205:25; |
| 143:20; 144:3; | better [22]-43:8; | 122:22; 135:5 | 132:18; 166:23 | 210:14; 219:4, 6 |
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| 35:3, 13, 21; 36:11, <br> 24; 58:2, 11-12; <br> 69:25; 75:11; 81:21; <br> 82:15; 83:16; 91:24; <br> 92:2, 12, 18; 93:10; <br> 94:15; 95:1, 3, 22; <br> 96:3; 113:11; 128:1; <br> 129:2; 131:2, 4, 6, <br> 10-11; 132:9; 134:9, <br> 13, 15, 25; 135:7; <br> 140:1; 143:18; 144:7; <br> 154:18, 20; 163:16; <br> 168:3, 14; 197:18; <br> 210:3; 225:5 <br> permits [13]-23:2, <br> 11-13; 36:10; 47:23; <br> 48:7; 63:13; 83:11; <br> 94:8; 137:11 <br> permitted [7] - 25:1; <br> 27:19; 93:12; 95:8; <br> 133:16; 137:7, 25 <br> permitting [1] - <br> 136:22 <br> perpendicular [1] 87:1 <br> perpetual [2] - <br> 127:19; 131:1 <br> person [1] - 146:11 <br> perspective [5] - <br> 46:20; 156:23; 167:1, <br> 8; 170:10 <br> perspectives [1] 225:16 <br> persuade [1] - 78:3 <br> pertain [1] - 138:16 <br> pertinent [1] - 93:4 <br> Peter [4]-2:5; 3:3; <br> 4:16; 193:15 <br> Phase [1] - 109:15 <br> phased [1]-109:15 <br> phone [3]-5:9; <br> 143:11; 195:11 <br> phoned [1] - 104:22 <br> phonetic [2]-37:5; <br> 166:13 <br> phonetic) [1] - 16:3 <br> photos [5] - 104:21; <br> 117:12; 143:3; 188:5; <br> 189:15 <br> physical [1]-94:12 <br> pick [1] - 198:23 <br> picture [24] - 45:13; <br> 87:23; 88:7; 110:7, <br> 17; 111:4, 9-10, 13 , <br> 16; 185:18, 20; 186:3, <br> 7, 11, 25; 188:18; <br> 199:12, 14; 200:22; <br> 204:8, 19; 206:9 <br> pictures [16] - 110:4; <br> 117:10; 118:10, 14 , <br> 16; 119:11; 140:21, <br> 24; 142:23; 143:6; <br> 185:14, 17; 186:8; <br> 188:13; 199:10, 24 <br> picturing [1] - <br> 146:22 <br> piece [12]-54:6; <br> 70:2, 6, 21; 73:2; <br> 78:5; 111:23, 25; <br> 125:15; 135:19; <br> 165:18; 199:24 <br> pieces [4]-63:21, <br> 25; 71:23 <br> pig [1] - 184:11 <br> pigs [1] - 203:18 <br> pile [7]-82:11; <br> 125:11; 141:14; <br> 170:6; 212:11, 17 <br> piling [1] - 125:11 pinch $[1]-195: 4$ | ```pink [1] - 85:8 pipe [1] - 110:21 pipeline [1] - 107:11 pit [8] - 105:16; 115:11, 13; 116:3, 9; 204:14, 16, 24 place [27]-25:10; 71:19; 83:23; 88:16; 92:4; 93:10; 98:11; 101:3; 105:15; 106:15; 112:10; 118:8, 21; 120:2; 130:18; 137:24; 141:14, 16; 166:4; 186:9; 188:21; 211:6, 15; 223:4, 11; 224:17 placed [1] - 129:13 places [6] - 69:8; 140:23, 25; 144:25; 196:25; 222:22 placing [2] - 130:17 plain [1]-219:11 Plan [26]-24:5, 10, 14; 39:20; 52:11, 13; 55:8; 57:12, 15; 72:14, 18, 25; 73:8; 84:4, 11; 143:24; 148:25; 149:1, 9 ; 150:1; 152:1; 162:11; 164:24; 165:8, 16, 20 plan [33]-34:4; 35:17; 39:19; 41:12, 17, 19; 43:10, 14, 21, 24; 44:4, 7; 50:8, 17-18; 52:3; 53:1; 66:8; 67:1, 13; 81:6; 84:6; 89:5; 126:9; 131:21; 135:2; 143:23; 144:2; 154:17; 159:14, 21 planned [1] - 179:16 planner [3]-155:13; 162:6 planning [25] - 29:22; 30:7, 9; 39:24; 41:15; 56:10; 84:14; 101:10; 132:25; 148:21; 152:5; 156:8, 13; 157:1; 159:14, 20 ; 160:12; 164:22; 165:23; 167:1, 7 ; 196:10; 216:11 Plans [8] - 19:9; 39:13; 41:22; 74:6; 150:13; 156:14; 165:10 plans [13] - 39:15; 41:1; 49:13; 50:13; 52:1, 12; 62:3; 73:17; 74:7; 133:7; 148:24; 150:3; 165:2 plant [1] - 84:21 plastic [1] - 134:2 pleasant [1] - 184:14 plowed [1] - 205:15 plus [2]-101:6; 103:11 point [41] - 11:12; 15:8; 16:23; 17:1; 20:9; 23:5, 15; 33:7; 39:25; 50:2; 51:15, 17-18; 53:19; 64:24; 65:4, 14; 66:12; 67:8; 78:7; 82:16; 83:25; 97:8; 98:17; 102:5; 133:13; 142:1; 143:1; 147:10; 149:24; 177:18; 196:22; 199:1, 4; 202:18; 204:22; 205:16;``` |  | ```181:19; 199:3 power [2] - 73:5; 184:4 powers [1] - 144:1 practice [3]-46:9; 47:2, 16 practices [1] - 185:12 Practices [2]-27:23; 50:4 pre [1] - 108:7 pre-starters [1] - 108:7 precisely [1] - 199:24 predated [1] - 58:4 preface [1] - 51:4 preference [1] - 208:18 preferences [1] - 197:2 prefers [1] - 137:22 preliminary [2] - 11:15; 16:18 prepare [1] - 94:1 prepared [7]-19:1; 43:24; 44:8; 76:12; 126:5; 132:8; 171:24 preparing [3] - 81:3; 104:1; 129:23 prescriptive [2] - 69:13; 70:2 present [6] - 11:20; 77:8; 78:7; 80:15; 120:11; 171:25 presentation [3] - 10:4; 120:19; 200:10 presented [5] - 12:14, 19; 71:1; 149:2; 168:19 presenting [5] - 10:16; 77:2; 120:9; 148:2; 177:2 pressure [1]-104:2 presumably [3] - 46:16; 57:25; 213:9 presumed [1] - 150:8 presumption [2] - 72:4; 81:21 pretty [12]-26:17; 56:12; 75:19; 89:3; 105:21; 118:24; 131:23; 181:4, 10; 194:10; 217:8; 224:4 prevail [6] - 31:2; 62:14, 25; 96:7; 157:25; 221:5 prevailed [1] - 150:9 prevailing [2]- 199:18; 219:15 prevails [7] - 65:17; 66:9; 67:3; 148:25; 150:4; 157:4; 220:15 prevent [2] - 14:3; 114:19 previous [6] - 85:24; 88:9; 91:25; 95:14; 103:3; 127:5 previously [8] - 34:20; 50:13; 122:6, 13; 173:16; 193:7; 209:25; 225:17 prices [2] - 89:12; 198:25 primarily [10] - 85:8; 109:11; 138:16; 158:22; 159:5; 160:1; 190:24; 210:16; 215:23 primary [3] - 28:8;``` | ```210:13, 18 prime [1] - 169:18 priority [3]-61:14; 68:8; 165:17 proactive [1] - 108:10 problem [13]-7:5; 66:4; 87:14; 102:11; 151:13; 170:22; 173:2; 174:16; 175:15, 17; 180:10; 216:15 procedural [1] - 16:23 procedure [3] - 47:22; 79:1; 92:17 procedures [1] - 48:15 proceed [9] - 19:15; 27:18; 49:8; 80:18; 162:2; 179:22; 193:5; 195:19; 222:17 proceeding [3] - 10:13; 13:7 PROCEEDINGS [6] - 2:23; 121:11, 13 ; 122:4; 228:9, 11 Proceedings [1] - 2:1 proceedings [5] - 7:23; 16:23; 75:25; 226:11; 229:5 process [32] - 8:7; 10:12, 20; 11:2, 5 , 7-8, 13; 13:14; 20:5; 43:13; 49:23; 73:11; 75:24; 79:8; 81:25; 83:9; 90:5; 103:20; 109:14, 18; 134:21; 136:23, 25; 140:20; 160:12; 168:22; 200:12; 222:4, 9 ; 226:9, 13 processing [1] - 160:21 produce [4] - 95:13, 23; 108:6; 211:7 produced [3] - 35:22; 93:15; 98:1 producer [2] - 130:14 Producers [2] - 81:24; 197:20 produces [2] - 101:22; 108:25 product [2] - 89:10; 114:23 production [17]- 44:6; 84:16; 85:7; 89:18; 91:4, 19; 94:15; 95:17; 108:14, 17-18, 21; 143:25; 146:25; 210:17, 22; 211:6 productively [1] - 89:14 professional [2] - 43:25; 44:9 professor [1] - 106:11 Program [2] - 197:22 programs [1] - 197:24 progresses [1] - 207:24 prohibited [1] - 225:2 project [8] - 90:24; 99:1; 103:4; 128:7, 20; 210:22; 225:22``` |
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|  | ```57:18; 168:6 relates [4] - 61:13; 62:2; 175:21; 220:21 relation [1] - 122:24 relations [3] - 197:5, 13; 225:22 relationship [3] - 83:15; 207:5; 216:24 relationships [1] - 215:12 relative [3] - 39:15; 40:4; 101:21 relatively [4] - 7:15; 45:20; 102:4; 194:7 relaxed [2]-60:11; 157:22 released [1] - 80:2 relevance [1] - 109:9 relevant [11] - 10:6; 53:2; 55:19; 58:17; 63:22; 82:7, 11, 16; 109:8; 142:23; 205:10 reluctant [1] - 222:7 rely [2] - 156:16; 165:4 remain [2] - 119:21; 146:25 remaining [1] - 162:25 remark [1] - 223:4 remarks [2] - 148:1; 226:7 remember [7] - 106:10; 107:9; 108:15; 113:6; 121:9; 198:10; 211:2 remembered [2] - 148:8; 161:24 remind [2]-44:24; 193:2 remiss [1] - 91:24 remove [2] - 92:12; 108:20 removed [1] - 142:2 removing [2] - 92:18; 116:14 renovating [1] - 143:19 repeat [1] - 222:24 repeating [1] - 162:16 replace [3] - 58:23; 133:21; 205:20 replaced [3] - 37:9, 12; 59:20 replacement [1] - 45:21 replacing [2] - 58:9; 206:1 replies [1] - 42:5 reply [4]-214:18, 20; 225:11,13 report [2]-9:9; 26:8 REPORTER [4] - 7:8; 14:10; 80:22; 172:10 Reporter [4] - 19:16, 20; 229:14, }1 reporter [3]-7:16; 12:4; 227:3 Reporters [1] - 2:20 reporters [3]-7:6, 10,19 representation [1] - 223:10 represents [1] - 83:18 repurpose [1] - 196:10 request [11] - 8:24; 10:3; 12:6; 28:12;``` |  | reversed [1]-139:11 reversing [1] - 63:2 review [8]-3:5; 8:12, 24; 9:10; 12:8; 49:14; 72:23; 217:15 $\qquad$ reviews [2] - 5:5 revised [1] - 157:7 revisiting $[1]-73: 16$ rezone [1] - 160:10 RFR [3] - 8:25; 9:7 right-hand [1] 85:22 rightly [1] - 70:4 ring [1] - 70:9 rise [1] - $88: 7$ rising [1] - 88:11 risk [5] - 64:10, 12, 14, 17; 65:3 <br> river [2]-116:19; 141:18 <br> River [2] - 162:6; <br> 183:14 <br> rivers [1] - 87:25 <br> Rizzo [2] - 219:4 <br> RMA [1] - $4: 13$ <br> road [11] - 77:17; <br> 110:22; 112:5; 118:3; <br> 119:6; 144:5; 185:3; <br> 199:18, 22; 204:15 <br> Road [5] - 87:9; <br> 136:12; 166:17; 186:3 roadway [1] - 105:15 roadways [1] - <br> 155:10 <br> ROBERTS [19] - <br> 32:4, 6; 36:6; 37:21; <br> 74:19; 78:24; 137:5; <br> 158:10; 169:11; <br> 170:24; 177:5; <br> 178:15; 182:10; <br> 190:16, 18; 191:2; <br> 209:15, 18 <br> Roberts [20]-2:6; <br> 4:2; 32:2; 37:23; <br> 38:13; 74:18; 137:4; <br> 138:11; 158:9, 12; <br> 169:10; 171:1; 177:4; <br> 178:16; 182:9; <br> 190:15; 195:6; 201:1; <br> 209:12; 227:11 <br> Roberts' [1] - 38:3 robustly [1] - 40:4 role [1] - 162:5 rolling [1] - 195:14 roof [4]-34:2; <br> 103:11, 16 rope [1] - 106:13 rotation [4]-98:9, <br> 12; 131:24 <br> roughly [4]-81:6; <br> 83:19; 94:3; 227:21 <br> rounding [1] - 98:4 roundtable [1] - 3:24 routinely [1] - 94:9 RPR [2] - 2:20; <br> 229:13 <br> ruffle [1] - 216:23 <br> ruffles [1]-216:13 <br> rule [4] - 75:17; 76:9; <br> 183:20; 197:12 <br> rules [5] - 68:25; <br> 71:3, 10; 76:6 <br> run [38] - 54:25; <br> 86:25; 87:1, 6; 88:5, <br> 13, 17; 101:19, 22; <br> 103:16; 104:10; <br> 106:15; 107:6; 112:2, <br> 15; 114:14, 20; <br> 115:17; 116:2, 5, 17; |  |
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| ```138:1; 218:6; 220:24 stank [1] - 99:19 start [17]-17:20, 22; 18:3; 49:2; 54:10, 23 ; 61:15, 22; 77:12; 79:4; 92:14; 150:24; 175:18; 200:4; 201:5; 214:15, 17 started [9]-3:3; 16:19; 54:3; 81:13; 82:3; 108:14; 113:18; 140:19; 215:5 starters [3]-108:7; 126:25 starting [3] - 61:24; 65:4; 81:9 starts [2] - 100:22; 111:3 state [2]-32:13; 133:22 statement [7] - 61:15; 62:5; 66:10; 77:22; 142:16; 175:21, 23 Statements [1] - 48:16 statements [1] - 224:5 states [3] - 36:10; 69:24; 189:8 static [1] - 83:3 stating [1] - 113:13 station [1] - 198:13 stats [1] - 172:24 status [2] - 98:21; 144:8 statute [3]-67:9; 73:2 statutory [23] - 49:13; 51:25; 52:3, 12; 53:1; 62:3; 66:6, 8; 67:1, 13; 68:24; 71:1, 9; 73:16; 74:7; 148:24; 150:11; 156:24; 218:12; 219:1, 6 stays [1] - 223:15 stead [5] - 2:17; 172:15; 179:15; 182:25 stellar [1] - 226:23 stench [1] - 100:6 step [5] - 52:24; 104:1; 114:13; 154:2; 200:11 stepped [1] - 226:16 stepping [1] - 178:19 steps [2]-71:19; 210:9 still [23]-15:4; 50:19; 56:10; 90:4; 105:22; 119:23; 126:13; 132:9; 135:3; 145:3; 154:25; 162:19; 165:11; 192:16; 193:3; 195:21; 198:21; 201:4; 209:13, 15; 220:24; 224:25 stocked [1] - 93:24 stocking [4] - 82:19; 83:2; 93:19; 94:5 stockpiled [1] - 39:4 stockpiling [3] - 126:1; 155:8, 17 stood [1] - 143:2 stop [1] - 157:21 stopped [3] - 109:13; 115:25; 145:4 storage [65] - 34:8;``` |  |  | ```129:2; 132:9; 154:19 surrendered [1] - 154:19 surrendering [1] - 131:6 surrounded [2] - 34:1; 211:14 surrounding [4] - 139:23; 179:2; 202:4; 205:2 suspect [1] - 218:3 sustain [1] - 197:21 sustainability [1] - 3:23 sustainable [2] - 95:20; 215:9 SW [2] - 38:12; 104:14 swale [16] - 87:7, 10; 102:24; 103:10, 14 ; 104:11, 15; 105:25; 106:18-20; 186:5; 188:20; 199:23; 206:11, 14 swales [10] - 115:2; 183:6; 185:14, 24; 186:1; 188:23; 204:10, 13; 206:4; 223:7 swap [1] - 65:18 swear [1] - 172:11 sweep [1] - 103:25 sweeping [1] - 97:15 switched [2] - 134:16; 139:4 sworn [11] - 12:2-4; 80:23; 119:21, 23; 148:5; 161:23; 179:7, 13; 227:4 Sylvia [4]-2:9; 6:7, 16 system [2] - 101:16; 198:1 systems [1] - 196:4```  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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