

Cindy Hoerger and Sons,  
Box [REDACTED],  
Carseland, AB  
[REDACTED]

April 14, 2022

**RE:**

Notice of Filed Request for Board Review and Rebuttal Opportunity **Decision Summary LA21053** John Schooten and Sons Custom Feedyards Ltd.

Dear Laura Friend;

Thank you for sending the statement of option for rebuttal.

Although every resident in this area, has concerns for their quality of life and future, and value for their homes/property, it appears that those rights to acceptable water levels, water quality, air quality, and environmental enjoyment, has been ignored in the initial application. Despite our government having multiple 'Acts ' in place for the very purpose of protecting each of these fragile eco systems. (listed below)

Rebuttal to continue to **Determine deemed capacity of the grandfathered portion of the feedlot, from 41,500 head to 75,000 head (I resided here when the previous request to expand had been made to County – and was never completed –therefore it is expired, not transferred to a new operator 20 years later).**

The requirements of detailed statistics to reflect the impact on quality of life, and to measure the dust, and stench, and road damage, 'nuisance' as coined in the many acts relating to disruption of family farms, and enjoyment of any outdoor activities that we want to engage in – quality of life (a large factor for families choosing to live rurally) is like asking for the number of people who will have accidents from changing traffic flow in a specific section of a city. – It is future orientated and until it happens difficult if to place a statistic to. Unfortunately by the time a specific number can be assigned – it is too late.

In the case of the almost doubling of the intensity of the confined feed lot, however we can extrapolate that the current 'nuisances' being experienced by the long list of families stated as having submitted concerns to this proposed expansion, - where may be 'tolerable, bearable' at the current state, will actually become increasingly inimical by increasing risk to animal and human health, quality of life, let alone environmentally draining.

One has to ask why the efforts have been put into these several Provincial Acts – (and these are not exhaustive), if an industry can come along and ignore the majority of what is set out in them to protect.

Would it not be of greater benefit to consider the evidence that exists on the cost/benefit balance of major intense operations like these, (where efficiency in numbers and environmental balance is closer to 25,000 ?- not triple) and put in some parameters to numbers that can be considered in one location that will not wreck havoc on all the surrounding living ecosystem and can thus save volumes of time with applications.?

Agriculture Operations Practice Act:

“The purpose of the Act is to ensure that the province’s livestock industry can grow to meet the opportunities presented by local and world markets in an **environmentally sustainable manner**. Part one of the Act defines how nuisance issues such as odour, dust, noise and smoke resulting from agricultural activities are addressed.

Rebuttal – How does a drain of 525,000 gallons of water PER DAY –out of our already depleting river flow/ irrigation system, water aquifers, speak to ‘environmental sustainability.?’

Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act:

Alberta Water ACT:

The Act is the primary act in **Alberta through which regulatory requirements for air, water, land, and biodiversity are managed**. The Act **supports and promotes the protection, enhancement and wise use of the environment** by designating proposed activities for which an approval or registration is required.

Rebuttal – considering every element of our environment is harmfully impacted by the volume of intensity – how do we proceed to ‘Approve?’

**Alberta Land Stewardship Act**

The Act enables government to provide direction and leadership in identifying current and future land-use objectives of the Province, including economic, environmental and social objectives, **while respecting private property rights**. The Act provides for the coordination of decisions concerning land, species, human settlement, natural resources and the environment while taking into account cumulative effects of human endeavours and other events.

Rebuttal – again as mentioned above- obviously non of the 15 families including two major populated settlements with concerns and experience living amidst the 41,500 volume are given any consideration with the approval to doubling the issues currently coped with.

I recognize this may not be the exact formatting or form anticipated for a formal rebuttal. It is a statement of definite continued concern of an impending doubling up of intense operations, and request for full review of the decision to ‘approve’ **Decision Summary LA21053** John Schooten and Sons Custom Feedyards Ltd.

Sincerely,

Cindy Hoerger & Sons

