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(PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 9:00 A.M.)
THE CHAIR: Good morning to everyone. My name is Peter Woloshyn. I'11 be chairing the Pane1 today for the NRCB to hear the review of approval officer's Decision LA21037 for A\&D Cattle. We really do appreciate you all accommodating the Board's request to hold a hearing today.

Before we begin the formal part of the hearing, I would like to pay tribute to and have an Indigenous land acknowledgement. I want to take a moment to respectfully acknowledge that we are coming together online from the traditional lands of Treaties 6, 7, and 8. I recognize the many First Nations, Métis and Inuit whose footsteps have marked these lands for centuries and share a deep history with this land. And we are spread across today, I think, all three treaties, if I have it right, so all treaty areas.

To help you identify the Panel, we have Zoom backgrounds with a mountain scene, as you see on my screen, for the three Panel members who I'll introduce briefly. And our staff have -- the Board staff also have backgrounds that have an NRCB logo on them. So it will be relatively easy to identify us folks I hope.

I'd like to briefly introduce my Panel members today.

Sandi Roberts. Can Sandi -- hi, Sandi. Ms. Roberts is an agricultural engineer, and she was an approval officer with the NRCB until 2010, and has been a municipal councillor for the Town of Carstairs, and was an instructor a number of times with Olds College.

Mr. Ceroici. Everyone can see Mr. Ceroici. Perfect.

Walter has extensive experience in the development of environmental risk management tools and groundwater assessment policies to support sustainable livestock and industry development, and he acquired that through his past work at Alberta Environment and Parks and during his tenure as lead of NRCB Science and Technology division. So Walter's an acting Board member and was on staff for a number of years with the NRCB and since retired.

Again, my name is Peter Woloshyn. I grew up on a forage and beef farm near Devon, close to Edmonton. I was appointed CEO of the NRCB in May of 2006 and up until my appointment as Chair in December of 2017. I have a background in resource economics, crop insurance, policy development, and have led research divisions with Alberta Agriculture in crops and livestock area.

We also have assisting the Panel, Mr. Kennedy. So

Mr. Kennedy -- I think his screen is off right now. There he is. Hello, Mr. Kennedy, good morning.

General counsel for the Board, and a little shout out to Bill. He's now in his 30th year with the NRCB. So we've been just delighted and it's been a privilege having Bill with us.

Ms. Friend, also a longtime Board staff member, manager of review. So you've all met her with all of the dealings to get this hearing up and running. And thanks to you, Laura, for that. And Laura's been with the NRCB for 20 years now.

So if you have any difficulties during the hearing, we'd ask you to phone or text Laura -Ms. Friend -- and you can do that at -- if you don't have the number already, maybe take this down just in case -- that number is 403-620-8294, and she can he1p you and that may involve getting MNP involved.

But depending on the issue, we may have to pause the hearing until everybody gets fully connected again. It seems to be working now, so we'11 cross our fingers on the technology.

For Field Services today, we have Joe Sonnenberg, the approval officer who handled the application. Good morning, Mr. Sonnenberg. Ms. Fiona Vance, chief legal officer for Field Services, who will be representing
the approval officer. And Mr. Andy Cumming who is director of Field Services on the application side. Good morning, Mr. Cumming.

And we have two staff that I think are coming on now -- yes, I see them there -- who are doing our virtual onscreen document management, and they are our rock stars for document management. They are Ms. Taylor and Ms. Kaminski. So Sylvia Kaminski and Carolyn Taylor, good morning.

So when you want a document on screen when you're -- if you're giving direct evidence as an example, and you'd like a document up, you can please let us know what the document number is by exhibit, and we'11 do that in a minute, but by the exhibit number and then the pdf page number. And it really helps if we have the actual pdf page number.

So some documents that we've had submitted have multiple pages, multiple attachments. So if it's attachment -- in an attachment with a page Number 60, it's going to be pretty tough for us to find. That entire document should have a 1 through, say, 900 pdf numbers on it and just tell us it's pdf Number 122 if that's the number, as an example. It really helps our document managers get to that document and page number quickly. And if you give them that information, I can
assure you they will have it up quickly. They are very good at this.

And our MNP Zoom host for the hearing, Mr. Mak Elhakim, with Meyers Norris Penny, and MNP provide the NRCB with our IT support, and he'11 be overseeing the technical matters for the virtual hearing today and has already done that this morning. So welcome, Mr. Elhakim, and thank you.

Our court reporters for today from Amicus Reporting will be providing a transcript for the hearing, which is very useful. Welcome back, Ms. Vespa. We're thrilled to have you back with us. She's old hand with the NRCB now on a number of our hearings.

And welcome to, I think, a first time for NRCB hearings, Ms. Symonds, But she'11 begin this afternoon. I suppose we can introduce her later -- or are you going to be handling the whole day, Ms. Vespa?

Oh, you are. Okay. Perfect. Well, thank you, and welcome back.

During the hearing --
(DISCUSSION OFF THE RECORD)
THE CHAIR: I think we're back and ready to go.

So I just need to get my screen organized here.

Just give me one second.
THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Chair, the last we heard was "During the hearing."

THE CHAIR:
Yeah, I just have to find it on my screen. A11 right. Thank you.

So where I was going with that is we do need you to identify yourself when you're speaking so the court reporters can record who is speaking, and if you could do that very clearly. And when you're speaking, if you could speak, you know, fairly slowly and clearly so that it gives the court reporters a chance to get the transcript right, we'd really appreciate it.

Ms. Vespa, as usual, don't hesitate to interrupt us if you are having trouble either hearing or keeping up with someone if someone is speaking too quickly.

The NRCB has provided a YouTube link as well on its website for members of the public to observe. The link is on NRCB's main web page. And, also, the meeting is being recorded and will be saved on NRCB's YouTube channe1. So if you have someone that you were
is any members of the media that would like to do any interviews or have any questions, she can be reached by email at janet.harvey@nrcb.ca. Alternatively, her cell number is 780-720-2317. If you can't get ahold of her, you could also text Laura and she'11 help you out.

So the purpose of the hearing is to review Decision LA21037 that was dated Apri1 1 of this year, 2022, and that was issued by approval officer Joe Sonnenberg.

The confined feeding operation, or CFO, is located
09:10 at NE 27-8-26, West of the 4th Meridian, in the Municipal District of Willow Creek, and it's roughly 2 1/2 kilometres from the Town of Fort Macleod.

The approval officer denied the application to construct a new 2,000 head beef finisher CFO, and he ruled that the application was inconsistent with the intermunicipal development plan that was in place as of March 9, 2022.

We received three requests for review and they were received by the filing deadline of Apri1 26. Those were from the MD of Willow Creek; from the operator, A\&D Cattle; and from directly affected party neighbour, Mr. Dwain Lewis.

Portions of the public record maintained by the approval officer were provided on April 29th of 2022,
and rebuttals were received within the filing deadline of May 3, 2022, from directly affected parties Wade and Kaitlyn Conner, and the Town of Fort Macleod. Al1 submissions for the hearing and replies were received by the filing deadlines.

So your participation at the hearing is important to the Panel. We look forward to the information that you'11 be providing, and recognize that our decision will have a significant impact on your community. We take this responsibility very seriously.

The process that we follow is inherently formal. It is a quasi-judicial proceeding, so a certain level of formality is appropriate, in our view. However, we recognize that some parties are not used to the process. And to minimize the formality to the extent possible, we want to have participants comfortable in presenting the information to the Panel and able to ask questions when they need to.

We do have two external parties represented by legal counsel who are undoubtedly familiar with tribunal processes. Several other parties are not represented by legal counsel.

You know, you may be unsure at times about the process, but the Board encourages you to ask questions at any time if you're not sure about where we're at in
the process or when you're allowed to interject, and do that at any point. I'll do my best to answer your question, or we can get Mr. Kennedy to help you out, and if necessary -- Mr. Kennedy has done this many times before -- we can have a short break and he can just kind of get you up to speed a bit and it's not an issue at all. We want to make sure that you're comfortable so that we get the information we need to make the best decision we can.

So in terms of the brief overview for the hearing -- and you may have hopefully read some of the background information that we have for our hearings, but we will register all the parties, and then each participant will have an opportunity to address any preliminary matters that you have, if any.

Once that's done, we'11 begin with the evidentiary or direct evidence portion of the hearing. And in this hearing, the Board believes it's beneficial for NRCB's Field Services to present their direct evidence first, followed by A\&D Cattle, then the MD of Willow Creek, the Town of Fort Macleod, and then directly affected neighbours.

When it's your turn to provide evidence, you'11 be sworn in or affirmed -- it's your choice -- by the court reporter. And once you're sworn in or affirmed,
any new written evidence that you want us to consider may be entered into the record on request. We then give you a chance to highlight and expand upon any points in your submission that you feel are particularly significant.

You don't need to reread your submissions, we've all read the submissions, but there is undoubtedly some pieces of that submission that you would like to highlight for the Board or clarify further.

After you've presented that evidence, you'11 be
you provide rebuttal evidence, other parties will be given opportunity to ask some questions on that.

And then, lastly, everybody will have opportunity for final argument. These are not obligations, they're not requirements, but they're opportunities if you wish to take advantage of them.

So just before we get into the next piece, based on the process for the hearing, is everyone familiar with the process and do you have -- or do you have any questions that you'd like to ask at this point?

And, Ms. Vespa, that works for you as well? Good. I see you nodding. Yeah. Thank you.

And Mr. Elhakim with MNP?
MR. ELHAKIM:
Yes, no problem.
So if we lose those two, we're in trouble, so we have no virtual. So I wanted to confirm. Okay. Thank you very much.

So document managers, if you could flip to, on the screen, the participant registration. Those are the parties that $I$ believe are online now, and those are the parties that we have registered so far. I would ask if there any errors, mistakes, to let us know now, and I think we can forward this document also to Ms. Vespa so she has spellings of all the parties.

So we have representatives and the people providing evidence for the approval officer, A\&D Cattle, Willow Creek, Town of Fort Macleod, and then the neighbours, affected parties, Mr. and Mrs. Conner and Mr. and Mrs. Lewis.

If I have any errors there, please let me know now, or if $I$ missed anybody that is participating today that should be on this list.

MS. VANCE:
Mr. Chair, this is Fiona Vance, counsel for Field Services. Mr. Andy Cumming will be briefly giving some evidence, so he should be added to
this list.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you. So, Ms. Vespa, can we add Mr. Andy Cumming? Thank you.

Any others? Hearing none. Perfect. We have that. Thank you, document managers.

So before we get started on the evidentiary portion, are there any preliminary matters that anyone would like to address, procedural, legal, or others?

Hearing none.
We'11 adopt an exhibit list. So Ms. Friend prepared an exhibit list and posted it on the website with exhibit numbers. Document managers, if you could bring up that list, that would be great. There we go.

So we have 26 exhibits so far, at least, and what I'd like to do is just through approval or at least no objection adopt this exhibit list as our exhibit list for the hearing.

Are there any objections to adopting this list as the exhibit list, which is also available on the website.

I see none and I hear no objections, so that makes it easy, and we'11 be referring to those throughout the day.

Okay. So we can take that down. Thank you, document managers.

Okay. Perfect. So we'11 get started with the evidentiary portion of the hearing, and as I mentioned earlier, we would start with Field Services and approval officers.

So, Ms. Vance, I'11 pass the mic over to you, and you can proceed.

MS. VANCE:
Thank you so much. So my name is Fiona Vance. I'm legal counsel for Field Services and the approval officer and --

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Vance, sorry, I should have asked. I figured you might, but we should probably either now or you can ask for swearing in for Mr. Sonnenberg.

MS. VANCE:
Yes, I will get there.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Perfect. Thank you.
MS. VANCE:
Thank you. I may need reminding.
THE CHAIR: Well, I usually do, so that's why.

MS. VANCE:
Ms. Vespa is also very good at reminding.

THE CHAIR:
Yeah, okay.
MS. VANCE:
Thank you for the opportunity to present some evidence today.

Just for clarity to couch some context around the evidence you will hear, the approval officer and NRCB Field Services are not taking a position on what $I$

## J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING

Examined by Ms. Vance
would consider to be the main issues today.
So we're not taking a position on whether the policy of using the MDP or IDP in place at the time of decision should remain. We are also taking no position on whether the Board should uphold, vary, or overturn the approval officer's decision.

However, there has been some suggestion about possible delay on the part of the approval officer in issuing his decision. That is Issue 3 as identified by the Board in Exhibit 17, which is the RFR decision. It touches on procedural fairness, and we are entitled to respond to that.

And so to that end, I will be calling Mr. Joe Sonnenberg, the approval officer. And to provide context and also to answer any questions that parties or the panel may have, $I$ will also call Andy Cumming to give some evidence.

So, at this point, Ms. Vespa, I wonder if we could have those two witnesses affirmed or sworn in.

## J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING (For NRCB Field Services),

 affirmed
## MS. VANCE EXAMINES THE PANEL:

Q. So I'm going to start with Mr. Sonnenberg.

And, again, for a bit of context and to understand

## J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING

Examined by Ms. Vance
where these questions are coming from, I am not planning to review the life of this file day by day. In my view, the Board has lots of factual information about this, which we will refer to. Several exhibits have this in, and I feel an oral testimony of day-by-day rehashing would not be particularly helpful to the Board and maybe not an efficient use of hearing time. So I will ask Mr. Sonnenberg to point out some clarifications, and then, of course, he will be available to answer questions.

So, Mr. Sonnenberg, I wonder -- we'11 start with some easy questions for you. What is your position at the NRCB?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: So I'm an approval officer out of the Lethbridge office.
Q. And how long have you been in that position?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Just over five years.
Q. So I'd like to ask you some general questions about processing application files, and my purpose in asking these is to assist the Board in understanding the life of a given application file. So setting amendments aside, what types of permits do you see applied for?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: So in general, we see a mixture of approvals, registrations, and authorizations, which are essentially just varying from bigger applications where

## J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING

Examined by Ms. Vance
animals are being added to small applications where maybe it's just an addition to a barn or something like that at an existing site.
Q. And if you're able to answer this question, could you give a ballpark estimate of how many files you see in a given year?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: So, yeah, it would generally be around 20 per year with a range of about 15 to 35 .
Q. And, again, if you can answer this, what portion of those applications are approval applications?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: It varies a little bit, but for me, I would say around 75 percent.
Q. Okay. Thank you. So the file in question was an approval, so let's just focus on those for a moment. And I do recognize there is no such thing as a typical application, but in general, could you, please, tell the Board the steps that you go through in processing an application?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah. So in general, we start out following, well, what AOPA lays out, so it's a two-part application process. So what gets the ball rolling is we would receive a Part 1 early in the process. So that's -- the applicant submits it and gives us an idea of what they're looking to build, the size of the CFO.

At that point, we provide information to the

## J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING <br> Examined by Ms. Vance

applicant. They need to proceed. So maybe the application forms include things like measurements of MDS; we do our land-base requirements; if they have questions, we try to answer them to the best of our ability at that point; setbacks, other requirements.

So once they have the application paperwork, it's kind of up to them to get it submitted and filled out, come up with a plan and get all the information in to us.

And when we have it, we kind of try to determine if it's all there. It's not an intensive investigation at this point, but, you know, we try to make sure it looks like there's enough manure lands, it looks like it meets AOPA.

And then once we've kind of determined that, we proceed to the deem and complete stage when it will -courtesy letters are sent to neighbours, it appears in the local newspaper.

And then 20 business days to get our responses back, give it a few days for coming in by mail, make sure we provide all those responses for their -- for the applicant's review and possible response.

And then we kind of get to the point where we start processing these things and do a more in-depth assessment, so...
Q. And eventually issuing a decision?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah. And then I guess our objective, as laid out, is we try to issue a decision -- whether, you know, approved or denied -within 65 business days. And, yeah, obviously that varies a little bit seasonally between files, so...
Q. And, Mr. Sonnenberg, just to be clear, filing a Part 2 application is different from a file being deemed complete; is that fair to say?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, for sure, because when it comes in, we need to set aside some time to review it for sure, make sure all the papers there, go through.

And so, yeah, the date can vary. You know, best case scenario, sometimes it's within a couple of days, but often it might take a week, week and a half before we have time to review.
Q. And, in general, from your five years of experience, is processing an application for a new CFO any different from processing an application to expand an existing CFO?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah. So, again, it's variable for sure. Each is different, but in general a new CFO is a little more in depth. We don't have the background information. Most likely, you know, we've never done risk screening for the site. We just don't

## J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING

Examined by Ms. Vance
have background documents. So, in general, a new site will be a little bit more time consuming than an existing site.
Q. Thank you. I will now move to ask you what could be considered blunt questions, but $I$ think we all would like the answers to those.

So, the first question, in processing application LA21037, did you at any time intentionally delay the release of your decision?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: No, there was no intentional delays.
Q. And did you know when the Board's Double H decision was going to be released?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: No. It wasn't something I was tracking at the time.
Q. Do you recal1 when you found out about the MD of Willow Creek passing third reading on the IDP?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah. So I had processed most of this application. We were in the internal review process, which spans about four to five business days. And in that time, I was notified that the IDP had likely been implemented.
Q. And who notified you of that?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: The manager of approvals during the review process, so...

## J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING

Examined by Ms. Vance
Q. Mr. Cumming?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, Andy.
Q. So some time, obviously, has flowed under the bridge since you issued this decision. So in preparing for your testimony today, what did you do to prepare?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: So I tried to review all the documents that $I$ have here, just went through any notes I have on call logs. And it's been eight months, but I refreshed everything to the best of my ability and, yeah, so I think I've reviewed everything that I could here.
Q. Thank you.

MS. VANCE:
Document manager, could you kindly bring up Exhibit 21. Exhibit 21 is the NRCB's submission in this review, and I am -- when we get there, I'm looking for pdf page 4.

Thank you.
Q. Have you had an opportunity to review this submission?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yes, I have.
Q. And specifically the chronology section.

MS. VANCE:
If you could just scroll down a little bit. There it goes.
Q. So it goes from paragraph 4 through 23. You reviewed this as well?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yes.

## J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING

Examined by Ms. Vance
Q. So at the time this submission was made, which was May 26, were you available at the NRCB offices to review this before it went out?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: No, I was not.
Q. And what was the reason for that?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I was away on a leave.
Q. Okay. So I'd like you to take some time and tell the Board, is there anything in this chronology section that, to the best of your knowledge, is inaccurate?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: So if we could -- document manager, if we could, please, scroll down to Bullet 17.

In general, $I$ think everything is -- seems to be in place, but on 17, it indicated the applicant contacted me and advised there was an issue where he drew the well.

And that's not true. I contacted the applicant with questions about the well.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Aside from that, I think everything looks feasible.
Q. Okay. If anything occurs to you later, we can always bring this document back up.

MS. VANCE:
Thank you, document manager.
Could we kindly have Exhibit 22, now?
Exhibit 22 is the first submission from A\&D Cattle

## J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING

Examined by Ms. Vance
in this review dated May 26, and I am looking for pdf page 6 through 8.
Q. Mr. Sonnenberg, have you had an opportunity to review the information on these pages?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yes, I did.
Q. So this appears to be a summary of events over the time period. Is there -- as you've reviewed this, is there anything in here that you feel is not accurate?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Most -- most of it seems to follow my memory as well. I just have, like, some clarifications on a couple of the points.

If we could scroll down to the November 24 th date. Yeah, there we are.

So I don't have a great recollection of -- of this call. Sorry, I'm just taking a look here. Just making sure $I$ remember it as $I$ read it the other day.

Yeah, so $I$ do not remember at least the portion of saying where there's more statements of concern during December, or as a result of doing notice then.

So maybe I wasn't super clear on how I would normally understand it, but normally when I kind of explain this, it's more about just the public notice and making sure everyone has a fair chance to be able to comment on it.

So maybe not incorrect; it could just be the way
J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING

Examined by Ms. Vance

I -- a misunderstanding or maybe I didn't explain things clearly, but that's one thing.
Q. Are there any others?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: And then if we scroll down to January 5th. So it states the first statement of concern. And this isn't fully accurate, but this kind of is an internal thing $I$ thought $I$ could explain, is I did send the Alberta Environment and Parks' response to the applicant right away, and this was more as a
courtesy than anything because $I$ know the process for getting water can be quite time consuming.

So I just kind of wanted to give them the benefit of the doubt and get that ball rolling. So everything else I didn't send till the end because I didn't quite see the same timeframe for follow-up.

And also just -- yeah, yeah. So I mean that's the basic thing. So the rest of it was sent later on, but. So it wasn't a statement of concern; it was a referral response.
Q. For January the 5th?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah.
Q. Okay. Are there any other items you wish to clarify?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I think I got everything from that section. If we could scroll down to March 21st.

So the conversation -- you know, it's been a long

## J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING <br> Examined by Ms. Vance

time since March here, but I'm pretty sure I would not have said I'd be able to get his permit accepted.

So I'm just saying I might have explained the Board process, and maybe some stuff was lost in translation. But I mean, I would have said the route to getting accepted would be through requesting a Board review and that the rest of my decision, IDP was kind of out of my control, so...I think that about sums up that section.
Q. Thank you. Are there any other items in this -- these three pages that you wanted to clarify?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Not at this point. I think that's al1 that comes to mind immediately, so...
Q. Okay. Thank you. And just briefly to clear it up, the pdf pages 9 and 10 , if we could just move to those. So these appear to be reproduction of text from emails on November 16, March 14, and then further down the page March 16. And I just wanted to, you know, ask, is there anything in here -- does this kind of square with what you have against your own file?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah. They look like the same emails that were sent. I didn't notice anything that was different.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MS. VANCE:

J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING<br>Examined by Ms. Vance

Exhibit 26. And so this is the second submission from A\&D Cattle. It would be their reply submission and the review, starting, when we get there, at pages -- pdf page 1. Perfect.
Q. And so there's two pages of sort of chronology -- at 1east a response to chronology. Have you had a chance to review this chronology?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yes, I have.
Q. And I'm going to ask you the same thing. Is there anything in these pages that you think is inaccurate or needs clarifying?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: In terms of these pages, most of it is kind of fairly accurate, I would say, but -- I would say there's some misleading text in terms of the dates and just the time that had passed between us receiving things and deeming complete and issuing decision.

So, as an example, on the first page, Bullet Number 1 in Approval Officer Chronology where we have February 2nd as the dead1ine and then jumping to the

## J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING

Examined by Ms. Vance
think, is a little bit of a misnomer. It's not like I'm working on one file here, so...
Q. Okay. Are there any other points?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: And just some of the dates that I guess if we get into -- sorry, flipping my page here -- down to Bullet 3 in kind of the second half of the first Bullet (a). The 2 there threw me off, but.
Q. Okay.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Is that where I was?

Yeah. So just saying the application was completed December 3rd also would be -- again, that's when I received application paperwork for some changes to the application. It doesn't mean it would have been, like, deemed complete, just to be clear.

Based on that date and newspaper cutoffs, like, best case scenario, if $I$ would have had a lot of time on my hands, public notice could have been done December 15th if we had no other guidance and we weren't worried about doing notice over the Christmas holidays and that sort of a thing.

So just to clarify, deemed complete is a little different from when an application is completed.

And, yeah, I think that was the majority of it aside from maybe some discussion about the Christmas
J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING
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closure dates. But I mean that's something I would not be able to provide a lot of feedback on at this point, SO...

MS. VANCE: Okay. If we could just move down to pdf page 4.
Q. Sorry. I should just -- that's it for clarifications of that section?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, I believe, so...
Q. Okay, thank you. So pdf page 4. So in this, A\&D is suggesting that you could have delivered your decision as early as February 22nd.

And I believe in the submission from the MD of Willow Creek, they suggest March 4th. So I'm just -you know, looking back, do you think that would have been possible for you?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: And at that time, neither of those dates would have been remotely possible.
Q. Okay. Why is that?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Basically I was still waiting for information. There was a lot of other files on my desk I was reviewing, kind of in the order as I received information.

I believe I had around a dozen different applications $I$ was working on at that one point in time in different stages of completeness. There's no way,
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like even if $I$ had time getting it out on that timeframe, just the time you write these documents, do all the technical review on one -- especially one that has statements of concern and neighbours bring up some things that we have to consider, it's just not feasible.
Q. So when they suggest that there were unwarranted delays, how do you respond to that?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I respond there definitely was no delay, definitely nothing intentional.

And in terms of timing, if anything, I'd actually say this one probably got out a little quicker than it could because we were -- I think most of our organization was working full hands on deck trying to get caught up at this point, so...
Q. Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. VANCE: If we could -- document manager, you can close that and maybe just bring up Exhibit 1, briefly, pdf page 1. Exhibit 1, I am hoping, is the decision summary of the approval officer. There it is. And, yeah, we even have it on the screen.
Q. So the fourth full paragraph that starts the "Part 2 application was submitted." I'm just going to give you a moment to re-read this paragraph.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah.
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Q. So is there anything you wanted to add in terms of the holiday closure? Or is this paragraph representative of why there was no public notice over that time?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I guess the thing I could be more -- a little more clear on in it is, yeah, the Part 2 came in on December 3rd. That doesn't mean I could have ran public notice on December 3rd. Just looking back at my calendar, even it appeared that though I had a block of time around December 9th, I actually wouldn't have had any time at all to start looking at this.

So as I kind of mentioned before, best-case scenario for deemed complete in terms of how we define that in AOPA would have been December 15th.

And then, otherwise, yeah, the holiday closure text, I -- I put in as I do think it's unfortunate the way the dates worked up if I was looking at this from Mr. van Huigenbos's point of view.

And I wanted to just to be totally open with partially why this happens and that I really have no control on some of the dates.

But, yeah, just trying not to hide anything on our process here, so...
Q. Yeah, thank you very much.

And I think we've spoken a little bit about -- you
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can take Document Exhibit 1 down, thank you.
We have spoken a little -- you have spoken a little bit about what $I$ would call the alleged December delay period, and thank you for your testimony on that.

The second period that sort of has been questioned is the January 5th through April 1st period. And you've spoken a little bit about being busy and having files on your desk. Is there anything else you would wish the Board to know about that time?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I think just in that time period, I was around the office -- yeah, I was around the office. I mean, we were working full out.

If anything, I would say I was probably out of the office less than normal, you know, as that goes when you're in the busy season. But -- but, yeah, and if anything, I did have some outside help from other approval officers and stuff on this file even. So we -- we were trying to get it out in a very timely fashion, so...
Q. Okay. That's the last question I have for you.

Is there anything else that I have not asked you that you would want the Board to know?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Not that I can think of at this time.
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Q. Okay. Thank you very much.

My plan was to have Mr. Sonnenberg questioned by the other parties at this time. However, I'm also happy to have Mr. Cumming move forward with his direct. I'm in the Panel's hands on that?

THE CHAIR: Why don't we move forward with Mr. Cumming? I'm guessing it's not going to be a long question period anyway; right?

MS. VANCE:
That --
THE CHAIR: So let's do that.

MS. VANCE:
-- should be nice and brief.
THE CHAIR: Thank you.
Q. MS. VANCE: Okay. Mr. Cumming, thank you for attending. You already have been affirmed so that was good.

Again, nice soft questions for you. What is your position at the NRCB?
A. MR. CUMMING: I am the director of Field Services applications with the NRCB.
Q. And how long have you held that position?
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't know exactly, but it's been quite a number of years.
Q. Like, 20 years?
A. MR. CUMMING: No. My title has changed over the 20-plus years that I've been with the NRCB, but my
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title of director of Field Services applications, I think, I've had since around about 2017, but I'm not a hundred percent certain on that.
Q. Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

So you've been director for a while and you have certainly been with the NRCB for a while and you've processed some applications yourself as an approval officer. And you heard Mr. Sonnenberg give some testimony about his understanding of the steps on an average file, if there is even such a thing.

And I was wondering if you wanted to speak maybe to some of the parts of those steps that are within or without the control of the approval officer.
A. MR. CUMMING: Certainly, I can -- I can try to elaborate a little bit on that.

Our application process consists of a two-part application form. The Part 1 form essentially declares the intent of the applicant to do something.

There is an allowance of six months which can be extended up to a full year for the applicant to then provide a Part 2 application. The Part 2 application would contain the -- excuse me -- the technical information to support how what is being proposed can meet the AOPA requirements. That timeframe is totally outside of the control of the approval officer, and
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that's obviously within the -- the applicant's control.
So the number of applications that an approval officer receives at any one particular time or the NRCB as a whole is totally outside of the control of any approval officer.

So we have historically seen a little bit of seasonality when -- with the number of applications that we receive with more coming sort of over the winter months when farming activities are a little slower and generally slightly fewer coming during the summer months.

However, as always, there are exceptions to that.
What we've also seen is that the complexity of the applications is outside of the approval officer's control, and it depends on whether the applicant is proposing to construct the confined feeding operation of -- for various facilities.

My screen is jumping around, so I'm not sure who's doing that.

So the information that gets provided to the approval officer generally when -- when the application is deemed complete, our approval officers will do a -- a quick overview of the information in the application to see that there's sufficient information there so that they can start to process that
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application. And then that will go out to the public notice, assuming it's a registration or an approval application.

There may be things that -- that come up either through responses that are received relating to that application or when the approval officer is going through the information that would require additional information to be supplied by the applicant to support what is being proposed.

This could be, you know, the inclusion of additional lands for manure application, it could be to provide additional details related to some sort of a liner or naturally occurring particle layer (phonetic), things like that.

The other thing that is somewhat out of the control of the approval officer -- I sort of touched on it -- is -- is the number of applications that -- that come in at any particular time.

Certainly, our objective and our performance measurement is to try and issue our decisions -85 percent of the decisions within 65 working days of deeming the applications complete. So our approval officers do their best to account for that and to process the applications within that timeframe.

Sometimes we are delayed by getting responses from
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referral agencies and municipalities. It's not often, but sometimes we do get delayed by them. So those are also outside the control of our approval officers.

So, generally, whilst they do have some control, there are many factors in the day-to-day working and processing of applications that are outside of their control.

I hope that paints a little bit of an overall picture of how applications are processed.
Q. Yeah, thank you very much for that.

I'm going to ask you a similar set of questions to Mr. Sonnenberg, but I think an abbreviated version, because this was not your file. You were not the approval officer. But I wanted to talk a little bit about clarification of the chronology.

So this is Exhibit 26, which we saw a few minutes ago. This is the second submission from A\&D Cattle starting on pdf page 1 and 2. Yes. So, again, moving down a little bit, the chronology here, have you had an opportunity to review this version of the chronology?
A. MR. CUMMING: I have.
Q. And is there anything you would like to clarify?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes. If we can go to the next page, please, Item Number 4 and there's (a) and (b). This section here talks more about the office closure
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and makes several statements that aren't correct.
The office closure in December, at the end of last year, the Christmas closure took place and the office was closed effectively December 24th through January the 3rd inclusive and not as set out in that chronology there.

December the 24th was the Christmas floater. The 27 th is the date in lieu of the Christmas day, the 28th was the date in lieu of Boxing Day, the 29 th to the 31st is the Christmas closure, and January the 3rd is the day in lieu of New Year's Day.
Q. And why do we close for December 29 th through 31 st?
A. MR. CUMMING: That is a Government of Alberta decision to have a Christmas closure at that period. There is a Government of Alberta policy relating to that.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

I think those are all the questions $I$ had on chronology.

If we could -- I think this might be my last question. Exhibit 21, this is the -- there it is before, I can even tell you what it is. It is the submission of the NRCB Field Services. Could we, please, go to pdf page 104.

So this is part of an excerpt of the 2020, 2021
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annual report from the NRCB and on the top right paragraph there, it talks about the: (As read)
"...goal of issuing 85 percent of the decisions within 65 working days of the date at which the application is deemed to be complete."

So my question to you is where did this 65 working days come from?
A. MR. CUMMING: The performance target which you've just read out there was developed in the early 2000s, and it's a performance target that takes into account the different types of applications that we deal with -- namely authorizations, registrations, and approvals -- and tries to come up with a target whereby we can measure quite easily from performance side, and that is that we are going to issue 85 percent of those decisions within that 65 working day timeframe from the date the application is deemed to be complete.

The 85 percent takes into account that some applications may get delayed either by request of the applicant or through some other matter and may take longer than that.
Q. Thank you very much. Those are all my questions for you, Mr. Cumming.

Mr. Sonnenberg and Mr. Cumming, I would ask you to
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respond to the questions posed by other parties, Board counsel and the Board.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Vance,
Mr. Sonnenberg, Mr. Cumming.
So we'11 begin with questions from MD Willow Creek. Ms. Finlay, do you have any questions?
MS. FINLAY:
I have a few questions, but on my order -- okay. Then A\&D Cattle near the end. Okay. That's fine.

## MS. FINLAY CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:

Q. So I have one or two questions. I don't have a lot of questions. I want to first ask a question about the Christmas break.

If I could ask for Exhibit 1 to be put up. Pdf page 1 of Exhibit 1.

Mr. Sonnenberg, this decision summary is intended to inform the parties, to whom it is provided, your process for processing and making a decision; is that correct?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yes. Yeah.
Q. Okay. And it's intended to provide an explanation to those parties of how you processed the application and then what your ultimate decision is; is that correct?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: That is the intent, yes.
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Q. Okay. And, sir, if I could just get you to turn your attention to the fourth paragraph on that page that begins with the "Part 2 application was submitted on December 3rd"?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah.
Q. And you reviewed this with Ms. Friend (verbatim).

In that second sentence and in the subsequent sentence, so the next two sentences, you talk about the de1ay between December 3rd and January 5th. You see that there?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah.
Q. Okay. And would you agree with me that the only reason you give for that delay in timing is the accommodation of the NRCB's holiday closure; is that right?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, that's the only aspect of it I included in here that kind of just doesn't occur on every other file. It's unique to this file for me, so...
Q. Okay. Okay. And the holiday closure, we've heard and we've reviewed, that was to -- that was from the 24 th of December to January 2nd; is that right? Did I hear that right?
A. MR. CUMMING: Perhaps I can answer that question for you.
Q. Sure.
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A. MR. CUMMING: The first -- first day the office was closed is December the 24 th, and the closure continues through and includes January the 3rd.
Q. Okay. And is there a policy or anything that provides guidance to you with respect to processing in December that goes beyond those holiday closure dates?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Indirectly, I suppose, the way we do the public notice, we select the most -- how would you put it -- the most effective local newspaper we can.

So, indirectly, that would impact when we do the dates due to their cutoff times for getting the notices in and -- for what date that paper is published on.
Q. Okay. But there's nothing that says to you, if it's in December, then just wait until January? There's nothing that provides you with that type of guidance; correct?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: No, we've been giving that guidance internally as direction for management in the past and with the justification being it's not fair to neighbours for us not to be in the office when the files out to public notice.
Q. Right. And that has to do with being in the office between December 24th and January 3rd; correct?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah.
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Q. Yeah. Okay. So you want to make sure that you time it so that that public notice goes out at a time when you will be in the office?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, I believe that's the intention.
Q. Okay. And so maybe I can ask you this next question. The Part 2 application, you said there was additional information that you received after December 3rd that related to the completeness of the application. Did I hear that right?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: No. This is a -- I don't remember a hundred percent. I do know, though, that the paper was submitted on December 3rd, but that doesn't mean I'd, like, reviewed the paperwork and determined it was all there on December 3rd. That was just the day it was submitted -- or the last information, I should say.
Q. Okay. And did you need to get any additional information from the applicant prior to January 5th to determine that the application was complete?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I do not believe so, but I can't remember for certain.
Q. Okay. Okay. Thank you very much. I'm finished with that exhibit.

I just want to ask you one or two questions about the technical document. And we don't need to bring it

## J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING

Cross-examined by Ms. Finlay
up yet, but I just wanted to better understand the purpose of that technical document.

That's the document that reflects the work that you've done to review an application; is that correct?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Well, it reflects the -- at least the part we want to be publicly available and publicly clear just to give our kind of decision-making process a good amount -- what do you -- how do I put it?
Q. Transparency?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, that's what I'm looking for. We just try to have the information in there. There's lots, you know, often that's done behind. You know, we don't include absolutely every air photo we look at and thing we review.

But in general, we try to provide that minimum amount of information so anyone who looks at the application can understand why we made the decision we did.
Q. Okay. And that technical document provides commentary and then the dates of that commentary; correct?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I'm not sure what you mean on "the dates of that commentary."
Q. Okay. I want to be fair to you. So let's take you to an exhibit.

$$
\text { If we could pull up Exhibit } 20 \text {, and if we could }
$$
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pull up -- if we could start with page 9 of the pdf.
So in this technical document -- and maybe I could just get us to -- you'11 see that there are sort of these little comment boxes here.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Okay.
Q. Do you see those?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah.
Q. Are you familiar with those?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I'd seen this document, I guess submitted, yeah.
Q. Okay. So if we could just maybe scroll down to the next page. Okay. That's great.

So this, then, is the summary of comments that appear on the full page photo. Do you understand that?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Oh yeah, yeah. That makes sense.
Q. Okay. And then next to that, we are provided with, it looks like, the dates that those comments are made.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Okay.
Q. Have you seen this type of a thing before?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I have seen it maybe in a
Q. Right.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: -- this way.
Q. Okay. Okay. So do you have any information that would
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suggest that those dates for those comments are incorrect?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: That's something I couldn't -could not collaborate back to that timeframe, but I would imagine they would be.
Q. Okay. So you'd agree with me that this document provides us with some information of the chronology for your review of this application?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah. Yeah, I think we could infer that.
Q. Okay. If I can just take a minute, I think those are all my questions. I just want to take a minute to confirm that.

THE CHAIR:
That's fine.
MS. FINLAY: Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Finlay.
And just to be clear, I may not have outlined this in the start, but if I did, this repetition may be worth it.

So in terms of the order of questioning, we'11 go MD Willow Creek, Town of Fort Macleod, Mr. and Mrs. Conner, Mr. and Mrs. Lewis, A\&D Cattle, Board staff, then Panel. So, clearly, when you're up, you wouldn't be questioning, but other than that, this will
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be the order we'11 go through.
So next up will be Town of Fort Macleod, Ms. Agrios.

MS. AGRIOS: I have no questions.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you.
Mr. and Mrs. Conner?
MR. CONNER: We have no questions.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you.
Mr. and Mrs. Lewis?
MR. LEWIS: No questions.
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Methera1, A\&D Cattle? Hello.
You're not coming up on screen there. We've got just a blank. Is your video on?

MR. METHERAL: We're getting an alert that suggests we can't post our video because the host has stopped it.

THE CHAIR:
Oh. Okay.
MR. METHERAL:
Thank you, Mr. Chair.
We were curious if we could have a quick pause for a bio break here.

THE CHAIR:
We11, I mean, I guess I don't want to have an accident while we're talking. It's a bit early, but $I$ certainly don't want to have an accident.

I mean, what is your length of questioning that you expect for Field Services?
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MR. METHERAL: Six pages.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. So let's -- Ms. Vance, are you -- yes, Ms. Vance?

MS. VANCE: Yeah, if we're going to take the break, I just wanted to remind Mr. Sonnenberg and Mr. Cumming that they should not talk to each other or to me or to anybody else about your evidence until you're done being questioned.

THE CHAIR:
MS. VANCE:
THE CHAIR: heard Ms. Vance?

Perfect. Okay. Great.
So it's 5 after 10 on my watch, so 10 after 10 , we'11 return. Thanks.

MR. METHERAL:
(ADJOURNMENT)
THE CHAIR:
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Citizen Ecosmart solar watch is behind a bit. That's probably not because of the sun; it's probably because I had it set a little off.

So I'11 use my cell phone for time for the rest of the day. So thanks for that reminder, Ms. Friend.

So, obviously, if you're using your cell phones, I was probably a little tight on the five minutes. So I've got 10:13 on my cell now, and I hope everyone else's cell or watches say $10: 13$. So I'11 use my cell from now on for timing, especially for quick breaks, because it makes it a bit short. So thanks for accommodating.

Mr. Metheral, you can begin, please. Thank you.
MR. METHERAL CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We would direct our first round of questions to Mr. Sonnenberg, and then perhaps move on to Mr. Cumming.

I appreciate your update, Mr. Sonnenberg, talking to us a little bit about your experience with the NRCB.

Just to clarify, do you review your perhaps deliverables or statistics with your manager on this 65-day process?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I'm not a hundred percent sure what you're getting at, but this -- this permit was
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issued within the 65 days, if that's what you're interested in.
Q. Yeah, in general, the idea that you're achieving your 65-day timeframe on your applications, is that reviewed with your manager annually or over time?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I think so. I -- I don't know if I've had too many that have went over it, so...
Q. Okay. And you would suggest that this spring was a busy year for you when it comes to applications, approvals, and authorizations?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah. Last fall and this spring were definitely busy time of year, yeah.
Q. Abnormally busy?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: We11, I mean, based on five years, it's busy.
Q. Okay. Can you maybe describe a little bit how you supported the producer through the approval process, perhaps starting in as early as July, August?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I don't remember a ton specifically. I'm sure $I$ would have tried to answer
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communications?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I can't say that far back what our initial contact would have been.
Q. I'm just trying to understand how -- I -- it's understood that you provided some of the NRCB application forms, the Part 1, Part 2, some of the technical documents, waivers and calculations. I'm just curious when those were delivered to the producer?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, and I think you had just said he submitted Part 1 in July, so I would imagine around that timeframe. I'm sure $I$ would have taken forms out again in November if he didn't already have them. I just can't recall.
Q. That's fine. Just to understand that you were supporting his application and that some of this material was delivered as early as July? Do you agree with that?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: It's possible. Yeah, I can't remember for sure, but $I$ would have provided material whenever it was requested.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

When we look at the submissions that were submitted on behalf of the NRCB, perhaps on behalf of yourself, did you -- do you feel comfortable that the information is your position in those submissions?
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A. MR. SONNENBERG: For the most part, details, obviously, I mean, I'm not saying I remember everything a hundred percent, but it looked plausible aside from that one bullet I clarified earlier where I know I had contacted Mr. van Huigenbos there. So I know there was an error there, and that one stuck out to me, but.
Q. Okay. And I believe Ms. Vance identified a document. It was a submission from the Board or from the Field staff, but you were away on leave, so you didn't actually review that document?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Not at the time, no.
Q. I see. Just to clarify, you have in the past, permitted facilities for 2,000 head beef feedlots -for, we'll say, beef feedlot?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I've permitted a lot of feedlots. I'm sure some of them have been 2,000 head.
Q. Do you have any idea what the largest CFO that you've permitted, what size that could be, or could maybe illustrate what you think would be the largest CFO you've ever permitted?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Probably, I don't know, somewhere in the 20 to 25,000 head range. I can't say for certain, but.
Q. Okay. And whose responsibility is it to review the MDP or IDP as these applications come in? Do you believe
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it's the onus of the producer or yourself.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: To some extent, I mean if a producer is looking at a piece of land or something like that, $I$ would suggest they look at zoning and stuff. But I mean, if otherwise I've just received an application, $I$ do it in the application, like at the time we're processing it.
Q. Right. Okay. If we can just switch gears here to the application review process. So it's understood that you received an engineering report and waivers and all of the technical documents that you needed to make your decision?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Like, when I -- sorry, you're going to have to clarify what you mean there. Sorry, I didn't quite catch what we're looking for.
Q. The question was related to the technical information. Did you receive all of the technical information you needed to make your decision?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yes. In the end I did, yeah.
Q. Was there anything that exceeded the six-month timeline in AOPA to submit the information to complete the Part 2? Did that timeline get exceeded?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: To the best of my knowledge, it did not.
Q. Okay. And maybe help us better understand when the
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documents -- when the documents were submitted to you in November, did you review the documents in their entirety but not necessarily review them for AOPA content? Does that make sense?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: If you mean like when we look at it when it first comes in, we try our best to just check if the information is there. It's not an intensive comb-through, but if there's something blatantly missing, we try to identify it so there's not delays later in the process, or we don't have to redo public notice later on.
Q. Right. Okay. Do you recall when you completed the actual review of this application? Can you recall the timeframe where you're actually comparing the submitted documents to the AOPA requirements?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: It would have been into late February into March, I believe. I would have started earlier as I had time, just as the way I work through things. But the bulk of it was done in that timeframe.
Q. Okay. We see a submission, an email submission from you that suggests that you needed more information about the location of the water wells and the manure land spreading. That email came in March 14th. Do you recall that email?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: When I was reviewing here I saw
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it, yeah.
Q. When it comes to the public notice process, would you have reviewed the MDP prior to submitting this document for public notice -- submitting the application for public notice?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: No. No, not necessarily, unless it was in an area where I maybe knew there was some exclusion zones or something.

In general, $I$ mean, we skim it but nothing in depth.
Q. And then when it comes to the internal review of your decisions, who helped you with your review of this application?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: It would have been two other approval officers, manager of applications, Andy there, and I think Fiona, I'm sure, like, our legal counsel that had a look at it.
Q. Okay. Then the permit was issued and posted on the NRCB website on April 1st?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yes.
Q. Okay. When you deem an application complete, is it related to the public notice process? Are they interlinked?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: For an approval application, they are, because they do go in the newspaper, so in
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circulation in the community.
Q. Is that an NRCB policy that the deeming complete date is reflected in the public notice date?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: It's how we phrase it. So I mean "deemed complete" is when we put the public notice in. That's when we start the 20 -day countdown for public and municipal feedback and all that stuff.
Q. Okay. Can an application be deemed complete without going to public notice?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah. Yeah, an application could be. Not for an approval, though. But for, you know, an authorization could.
Q. Okay. An authorization could. An approval can't be deemed complete without going to public notice? They can't be separated?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I'd say the terminology goes along with the public notice.
Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the Board decision regarding Double H Feeders?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Familiar, but not well versed in it.
Q. Okay. It's understood that that virtual hearing was held on February 10th, 2020, and it talks -- gives the approval officer some guidance on how IDPs and MDPs should be considered.
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How did that decision have an impact on your review of this application?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: We don't necessarily use past Board decisions as precedents 100 percent, but it gave us just direction that we should be looking at all applicable planning documents that are in effect, so...
Q. Okay. So that document came into -- or we saw the results from the Board hearing on March 17 th? Would you agree with that date?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: It sounds about right. I can't remember exactly but somewhere in there.
Q. Okay. So prior to March 17 th or perhaps around the adoption when the municipalities adopted the IDP, which document were you looking at when you were reviewing A\&D Cattle's application?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I would have just been looking at the MDP that was in effect at the time for the Municipal District of Willow Creek there, so...
Q. Can we try and clarify what those dates are exactly?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Which dates are you interested in?
Q. So on March 19th - and I'd love to hear from others if I'm wrong -- it's understood that the municipality adopted the IDP.

MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: March 9th.
Q. MR. METHERAL:

Sorry, on March 9th, it's
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understood the municipality adopted the IDP, and on March 17th, we heard from the Board.

So just to clarify, prior to March 9th, you would have been looking at the MDP for guidance?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I would have been interpreting it, like we do on every AOPA application.
Q. Okay. If we can talk a little bit about the application and the review of the application. When did you start the review of the application?

Perhaps I already asked this question, but when do you believe was the first day that you actually started -- when you actually compared the AOPA technical requirements to the application?

MS. VANCE: I'm going to object because I do believe you have asked that question.

MR. METHERAL:
Yes. My challenge with this, these timeline questions, is we are -- the timelines of this discussion are crucial to this application. So please be patient as I try to work through these timelines.

But I believe I can move on from that. I believe you answered, later in February.

File manager, if you can pull up Exhibit 21, page 5 for me, please. I'd like to ask Mr. Sonnenberg about his visit with the MDP of Willow Creek.
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Page 5.
Q. Bullet 13 suggests that on January 5 th and 6 th, you visited with the manager of Willow Creek. Can you maybe --
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Well -- sorry.
Q. Can you describe that -- can you better describe that interaction for us?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I believe we exchanged phone calls, which is pretty standard on most applications, and I don't remember when we discussed each thing, but I do know the municipality had some earlier feedback on some kind of unique road allowances and property line sort of information on this one. I don't remember if that was the exact timing, but it was -- yeah, just kind of discussing general project information, so...
Q. Okay. Do you know what occurred on January 5th, which would have been different than January 6th?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I think we just would have had ongoing discussions, and I think there was some -- just
Q. Okay. So it was a phone conversation; it wasn't a visit at the municipal office?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: No.
Q. Okay. And you were reviewing some of the County's
J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING

Cross-examined by Mr. Methera1
requirements, the land use documents?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: We -- at that point in time, we request any applicable feedback, essentially. So, I mean we try to uphold things like property line setbacks, easements. You know, if the County has good planning concerns, we try to have that back and forth early on, so we have all the information we can to try to make the best decision.
Q. Okay. And that - those requirements, they're found in the MDP? These are the MDP requirements or land use planning provisions?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: The main thing we do consider under AOPA is the municipal development plan, but other considerations are given to things -- land use, bylaw related, and even land ownership. Sort of, like, everything that you may consider a normal development permit can come up on AOPA applications.
Q. Okay. Did the County give any indication that this application met their municipal development plan at that time?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I can't recall at that point in time.
Q. Okay. And then, of course, you reviewed the IDP at the end of Apri1 -- or, sorry, at the -- no, the IDP was available for you at the end of April when it was
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provided to you from the municipality.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I believe you mean in March.
Q. March? Oh, sorry, of course. End of March.

MR. METHERAL:
Okay. File manager, I'd just like to ask some questions about the NRCB's internal review policy. If we can open Exhibit 22, page 9 just to clarify a few points.
Q. Yes. At the bottom of the page. Yes, so the bottom of the page, we see a submission from Mr. van Huigenbos that is a cut and paste of some emails that were sent back and forth to you guys. Are you familiar - I guess you confirmed you're familiar with these emails?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah.
Q. Okay. If we look at March 16th email, Adrian is asking to you how long does the decision normally take, and your response was "Typically 3 months or so" and then specifically that you're hopeful to have it out in the next three weeks or so, but no promises, as it's contingent on internal review and a few other factors.

Can you maybe describe what point in the process
you were at? This appears to suggest that your document had been -- was in internal review at this time.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, I won't be able to remember specific what date $I$ sent it to review, but it would
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have been right in that timeframe where I would have been just completing the final touches and getting it out for a look-through. So a few factors, just to give you some clarification. It could just be staff availability when other people have time to look through it, when your field office admins have time to and print and finalize stuff.

So it's not exactly just, you know, I can decide I'm going to issue a permit and have it all ready to go in a half hour, so...
Q. No, certainly. But do you send that decision to your team as one email? The whole document is for their review?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, typically it's three documents: decision summary, a permit, and a technical document. So, in this case, I would have sent out, you know, the technical document and the decision summary.
Q. Okay. But one email?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I'm not sure what you mean by "one emai1." Like...
Q. Would those documents have been included in one email?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Oh, no, it's just we have them on an internal database, so it's just you give people directions to where they are, so...
Q. Okay. Thanks for clarifying that.
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Do you know the date that you provided or asked your team members to look at those documents?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: No, I do not.
Q. Is that something that we could get our hands on? Would there be a correspondence where you provided direction?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, I'm sure we could with some time go back and find it but, $I$ would suggest it's not going to have any bearing on what you're getting at here, so...
Q. The decision summary itself, if you were to have sent that out -- and we're talking in March -- would you have been looking at the municipal development plan at that time?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, yeah, I would have already looked at the municipal development pl an on the date I would have been doing that section.

MR. METHERAL:
Okay. File manager, can we jump to Exhibit 1, page 3.
Q. This is from the decision summary, down to, yes, your
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Q. Okay. And if we were to look at the AOPA requirements below, the document does meet all the technical requirements under AOPA?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yes, it did with all the supplemental information provided.
Q. Okay. So then the document that you sent to your colleagues or asked your colleagues to review, that would have been an approval?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, the application would have been approved.
Q. Okay. Therein lies a request from A\&D. We would like to know exactly the date that you reviewed the application, the MDP, and when you approved it for review. So we would like that date to be clarified.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Well, for that date, as far as the AOPA is concerned, it would be the date the permit was issued, so April 1st, but that's maybe not what you're looking for there.
Q. Not exactly. I'd like to now move on to some of the NRCB office closure and some of the delays that A\&D Cattle believe occurred. This has been reviewed by you guys. Just to confirm --

THE CHAIR: Just to interrupt, there's been a request for an undertaking, I think. I think that's what I'm hearing. Ms. Vance, is there an objection to
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the undertaking? Because it's, I think, left in nowhere land right now.

MS. VANCE: Yeah, I was wondering where that might go. I am not clear on what the undertaking is asking, to be honest.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Metheral?
MS. VANCE: And whether Mr. Sonnenberg maybe answered it with his answer. I'm not sure.

MR. METHERAL:
Okay. We would like clarification on this point. Can we provide the Board with some written direction on what that undertaking is to make it formal?

THE CHAIR: Well - -
MS. VANCE: I would like to know what it is now so that $I$ can get going on it.

THE CHAIR: Yeah, I mean, and you know, depending on what it is, there may be an objection, so the quicker the better.

What I think I heard was what date was the then an approval circulated for review to the other staff -- do I have that -- did I hear that right?

MR. METHERAL:
THE CHAIR:
Yes.
Okay. And whether that's able to be tracked down, I don't know.

Ms. Vance, are you agreeable to at least
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attempting to track that date down, or is that something that you feel is -- or are you objecting, actually?

MS. VANCE:
I'm not objecting. I imagine that would be pretty quick to track down. I could probably doe that during a break.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you very much.
UNDERTAKING - TO ADVISE THE DATE THAT
MR. SONNENBERG REVIEWED THE
APPLICATION, THE MDP, AND WHEN HE APPROVED IT FOR REVIEW (UNDERTAKING FULFILLED AT PAGE 94)

THE CHAIR:
MR. METHERAL:
A11 right, Mr. Metheral, continue.
Thank you.
Q. If we were to look at the office closure, just to clarify, Joe, do you recall that the office closure was from December 24th to January 3rd?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I think that's what we've decided on. I couldn't remember for sure, but $I$ think that's what the expert said.
Q. Right. Okay. And you were provided direction about the office closure through NRCB, perhaps, email that those would be closure dates?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I don't remember in particular how we would have been made aware of it this year. It's
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generally just something we keep an eye on, and we try to get things out for public notice around that time. So I don't remember specific dates or how we were -- came to that conclusion, but...
Q. Okay. And did you discuss the office closure dates with your manager?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I can't recall, but it's something we would often discuss internally, so I'd say it's likely.
Q. Okay. And did you discuss the reason why you delayed the public notice because of those closures with your manager?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: We've -- we've discussed that in the past, yes.
Q. Do you know when you would have discussed that reason for delay?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I don't know what delay you would be referring to, but in terms of why we don't do public notice over Christmas, it's -- I think we may have even touched on this earlier, but, you know, you want to have someone in the office so if a neighbour has concerns or wants to call in, at least we can answer questions on the application and give them a fair shake at providing feedback.
Q. Okay. I just would ask the file manager -- sorry,
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quick pause here. This is information $I$ just would like Joe to respond to, and it's new to me.
THE CHAIR: Sorry, new information? Is there new information that we're --

MR. METHERAL: It's a new exhibit. I'm just trying to pull up the exhibit. It is Exhibit...

THE CHAIR:
I'm just trying to understand. We're still dealing with Exhibits 1 to 26 , which are not new; is that correct?

MR. METHERAL: No, it's not new, it's just a new piece that $I$ would like to look at. Exhibit 22 , page -- page 9 .
Q. Okay. So your decision summary states that on December 3rd, there was a decision made to delay the public notice until January 7th, and I believe earlier in your testimony --

MS. VANCE:
I'm just going to object to that.
I want to make sure that the context that you're providing is factually accurate. I do not believe that is actually what the decision summary says.
MR. METHERAL:
Okay. Let's pul1 up Exhibit 1, page 1 to refresh our memory, down to Part 2. A little up. There we go.
Q. So, again, this is the public notice delay. So it's understood that the document was submitted
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on -- documents were submitted on December 3rd and that the reason there was a delay was to accommodate NRCB's holiday closure and that the public notice occurred on January 7th -- sorry, January 5th. Are we in agreement January 5th is the date?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: It was officially deemed complete January 5th, yeah.
Q. Okay. Early in your testimony, you suggested that you wouldn't have been able to do public notice until perhaps December 15 th or 16 th by your count, by your -- after reviewing, you suggested that January (verbatim) 15th or 16th would have been as early as you could have completed public notice.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, that would have been whatever day the newspaper would have ran.

MR. METHERAL:
Okay. Now can we go back to
Exhibit 22, page 9. Okay.
Q. And it would be the second submission here, November 16th. Are you familiar with this email?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah.
Q. And it looks like you sent Adrian two emails because of perhaps some computer issues, but specifically, if we look at the second email.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah.
Q. There's a correspondence here where you are talking
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about -- you're asking for additional information like the engineering report.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, correct.
Q. You're a bit short on perhaps manure spreading lands. You indicated he was short on manure spreading lands, and it would be helpful if additional lands were made available, and that you included a template.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Okay.
Q. Okay. If we were to read the last sentence, it says: (as read)
"I have started preparing the public notice and is very close to ready to go."
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah.
Q. Why do you believe back in as early as November 16th, that you were ready for the public notice process at that time?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Because if I would have got all the documents within like a day or two of November 16th, I still could have managed to get the public notice in that -- like for last year, but I didn't get all of the details within enough days.

But $I$ was trying to move it along as quick as we could, just cognitive of the upcoming Christmas closure dates.

## J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING

Cross-examined by Mr. Methera1
Q. The details were provided to you -- the missing details were provided to you as early as November 29th and a minor change was done on the 30 th. You weren't prepared to issue public notice in November at all?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: As you remember, we discussed when I got the details, like, even November 29th, or whatever you suggest it is, it's not -- you can't publish public notice that week; it needs to get into the newspaper. Their deadline I believe for that one is on a Friday at some point, and then it wouldn't even appear until the following week.
Q. Did you express those requirements for public notice to the applicant?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I can't recall.
Q. So --
A. MR. SONNENBERG: But we process applications as they come in, and $I$ can tell you, it's not like $I$ have one application coming in at the time. I have had many, many on my desk and you just work on them as people submit stuff.
Q. And do you need a completed application, then, before you deem the application complete?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yes.
Q. And you didn't feel like it was completed by November 30th?
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A. MR. SONNENBERG: I don't remember the exact dates, but, yeah, there were details missing we needed in order to call it "deemed complete."
Q. And how often is the paper -- the public notice for Willow Creek -- the Fort Macleod Gazette, how often is that published?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I believe it's weekly.
Q. So considering you had the application in part in November, mid November, and you received the rest of the application, including the technical requirements from the engineer by the end of November, is it still your position that December 16th was the earliest that you can --
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, I would not have had time to review the information. I looked back at my calendar and it just would not have been even remotely possible, because everyone was trying -- everyone's trying to beat the rush that time of year. I mean, that's -it's a lot of paperwork we're going through.
Q. You just testified that the Gazette publishes weekly?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I said to the best of my knowledge. I don't even remember the exact dates, but I know you can't just get it in that date. There's a lead-up. And I do believe it was weekly and I believe the cutoff was a Friday, but could be off on what days
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are which.
MR. METHERAL:
Okay. File manager, could we open
Exhibit 1, page 1?
Q. Again, to justify the closure -- the NRCB's office closure and why the delay, it was intended to allow the public to complete -- the public notice to be completed in a time when neighbouring residents and landowners would be allowed to see the notice.

Okay. And then there's a second part to that, to when the NRCB offices would be open to take enquiries.

Does the NRCB use any other means to display public notice aside from the local papers?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: It's also shown on our website. But AOPA does direct the newspaper advertisement.
Q. Okay. The second part of this piece suggests that the NRCB offices would be open to take enquiries.

Due to the COVID restrictions, it's understood that the NRCB field offices were and continue to be closed to the public in 2020 -- since 2020. Was the NRCB field office open to the public in December of 2021?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I don't believe it was, but for clarification, maybe the wording of that sentence isn't absolutely perfect, but I mean, NRCB offices were running remotely. And if we were in business hours and
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you phoned our office phones, we received all those phone calls, and we -- that's how we requested new enquiries.
Q. Okay. So field staff were working from home? Can you describe how you were communicating with the public through -- remotely?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Like, generally, phone calls, site visits, emails, occasional Zoom calls. Whatever they were comfortable with for the most part.
Q. Okay. Do you believe you had all the tools that were required to communicate with the public regarding public notice?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: When I would have my work cellphone on, they could get ahold of me. So yeah.
Q. Okay. So the requirement for the office to be open is a bit misleading?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I'd say not because, I mean, would you be happy if someone's building next to you, you tried to phone and you can't get ahold of them, right? Because office open is -- you know, people have to be working to answer a phone.
Q. The question is more related to your -- you have the ability to answer public notice, but the NRCB field office does not have to be open to do that?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: That is accurate.
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Q. Okay. Were you working from December 3rd -- were you working remotely from December 3rd to December 24th?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, I believe so. I might have been off the odd day here and there, kind of like a normal thing, but, yeah, we were operating.
Q. Okay. So the December 3rd to the December 24th timeframe is approximately 16 work days. Would you agree, then, that the delay of the public notice delayed the process by 16 days?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Absolutely not. As discussed about four times already, December 15 th would have been the best case scenario for public notice. And for clarification, that time of year, $I$ do recall $I$ would not have had any time to work on it, any significance anyway because we were -- there was a lot of files in before. So -- so there was no -- there might be a perceived delay, but there was no actual delay.
Q. The actual delay is very important to A\&D Cattle.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, and I understand the unfortunate timing of how these things correlated, but there was no actual delay.

MR. METHERAL:
File manager, can we pull up Exhibit 22, page 7. If we were to look at the comments from Mr. van Huigenbos, he states that: (as read) "Joe said it was NRCB policy to have
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office closure and implied that the NRCB has seen more statements of concern when public notice happens during December."

That's from the first paragraph.
Would you agree that those two statements from your decision summary and Mr. van Huigenbos's appear to contradict each other?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Well, I would say he is saying I -- what is the exact wording you just used there -"implied," and, you know, I didn't imply that intentionally at all; that would have been his interpretation. And, you know, I take responsibility if maybe $I$ could have communicated things clearer. It's sometimes tough to get things across, but.
Q. Do you remember making the comment about why it would be -- why December might not be a good month for public notice?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: In general, and I've been asked that -- I would respond that we're just not available to answer the phone, the office isn't open. And maybe as far as, like, it's just -- yeah, that's about all I can recall. I don't have anything more than that.
Q. Okay. I'd like to move on to Exhibit 22 , page 1, some of the details about the application.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Methera1, how much longer do
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you expect for Mr. Sonnenberg and/or Mr. Cumming?
MR. METHERAL:
I'm on page 4 of 6.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Great. You know what, to the extent possible, if you can have your questions succinct and pointed, that would be great, but please proceed.

MR. METHERAL: Okay.

If we were to -- sorry, 20 -- sorry, is this Exhibit 22, page 1? Can we scroll down the page? Sorry, this must be Exhibit 26 , page 1.
Q. Yes, here we go. Sorry, "Approval Officer Chronology," Item Number 1.

Earlier, you had -- in your testimony, you had referred to this document that was submitted that discusses approval officer chronology, and you had kind of clarified some of the timelines. The statements of concern deadline was February 2nd. Would you agree with that?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah.
Q. Okay. And then you had indicated in your decision summary that you had, a couple of days later, sent the statements to the applicant. So that would have been February 7th.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, that sounds about right.
Q. But you don't agree that this should be considered a
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delay?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: No, it's typical process to see if anything else comes in by mail. And also, I think it's just we need time to compile when public notice is over.

Again, we have many applications ongoing at the same time and we try to send these things in as we can. But three to five days, $I$ would say, is pretty typical.
Q. On that note, and with that prompt, did you reach out to Mr. van Huigenbos to initiate this exchange of statements of concern?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: No. No. He had phoned me. I think he was just trying to keep the process moving like a lot of applicants do, so...
Q. So in his opinion, perhaps this was -- he was checking in on the status of this review and was wondering why this material wasn't available for him to comment on?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah. And if we would have discussed, I think there's a decent chance I would have explained we wait for things to come in, but $I$ can't
Q. Okay. On page 3-- if we can scroll down on page 3, to page 3.

March 10th. Let me just confirm where I'm at here. So there was some communication about missing
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information, and that email correspondence started on March 10th, and it specifically asks about the location -- sorry, phone call on March 10th. It specifically asked about the location of the water wells.

Were you on site in November?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yes, I was.
Q. Did you look for or verify the location of the water wells at that time?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I did not, and I guess I could add clarification that it was maybe my misunderstanding at the time when $I$ first took the documents that both wells were to be decommissioned.

And, yeah, later on, I -- yeah, I kind of -- I
will admit that was missed. But also at the time, it's just the one well -- yeah, yeah.

No, it's basically, that was my bad.
Q. Okay. And the producer had submitted some drawings that illustrated the location of the water wells?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, in that case too, I just had a little bit of tough time with the -- when I got back a few months later being able to tell which dot. So it was just providing clarification just -- just the size of some of the font and their photo quality.
Q. Okay.
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A. MR. SONNENBERG: And the other factors, just the pens that were added December 3rd that changed the site significantly, and that's something I obviously wasn't aware of on November 3rd, and it just did not occur to me until later on when I was reviewing the information, so...
Q. Okay. I'd like to move on to some comments about cultivated land. If we could look at Exhibit 2, page 9. Oh, that can't be right. Exhibit 22, page 9. Down to the March 16th email.

The second bullet suggests that you were looking for lands that were not cultivated. Sorry, the March 16th suggests non-farmed areas removed, and the March 14th email looks for -- to compensate for areas that were not cultivated. Why was the farming practice important to you for this application?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Well, in this case, I did have some internal assistance.

Like I said, we were trying to get these applications processed as quick as we could at the time. But when I have since reviewed it, there's definitely -- you know, so maybe non-farmed isn't fully accurate, but there is setbacks, there's wetland areas, there's areas with slopes that wouldn't necessarily be suitable for manure spread. So those are all removed
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when you tally up what is available for every application.
Q. Wouldn't you agree, though, that AOPA talks about soil classification for land base?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah, for sure.
Q. Okay. Did you provide Mr. van Huigenbos with the 1and-base calculations?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I'm sure I would have. I don't recall exactly what $I$ would have provided, but we generally set that along with the Part 2.
Q. Okay. And did he meet your requirements? You asked for a certain amount of acres.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: At a quick glance, just some of the landowners give a little bit of optimistic view of what was available for manure spreading.
Q. So you provided that calculation first, but you didn't consider the setbacks at that time?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I would suggest -- I mean, we -we provided the applicant -- we say, you know, it needs to be spreading land. It's kind of up to an applicant to make sure they provide lands that are suitable for manure. So we kind of just take their word for it.

And then in the Part 2, I mean, we look at it much more closely. And in this case, where we deemed he was a little short. Some of it wasn't suitable. We had
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the opportunity to provide us more.
Q. Okay. But you've indicated that it's not suitable because of the farming practices.
A. MR. SONNENBERG: You could interpret it that way.
Q. Is it possible that he provided you enough land base that this calculation could have proceeded based on soil classification?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: In a hypothetical world where maybe you remove wetlands and slopes and setbacks to neighbours and waterbodies, but in reality, it's very rare where every acre on a quarter section is available for spreading.
Q. And you did that detailed calculation?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: That was done internally. I ended up having some assistance with it. But, yes, those detailed calculations were done using aerial photographs and measurements.
Q. You delineated riparian area using air photos?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: In genera1, yes, that's how we would do it. We also drive by some of the fields, but,
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home quarter there.
Q. And so you were confident you could delineate riparian areas from a drive-by setting and Google Earth review?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I'd say in that case, there's definitely some areas that you can delineate as not suitable for spreading based on an air photo.
Q. Okay. Well, in this case, this action, the request for more information to determine water well location and to question the farming practices resulted in a six-day delay from March 10th to 16 th.

Had these details been collected earlier, do you think this delay could have been avoided?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: I'd say if those details were collected earlier, it just would delay me getting out for notice on the other end, because, I mean, you only have so much time when we look at these. So there is a perceived delay, but there was no actual delay.
Q. Again, these actual days are important to the app1icant.

Just a quick question. Were you away on holidays
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Christmas closure is discussed earlier.
Q. Okay. How about during the public review process from January until April?
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A. MR. SONNENBERG: I may have had a couple of days off, but it would have been less than -- I was actually working, if anything, way more than we normally would.
Q. Okay. And did you include the Town of Fort Macleod as a directed (verbatim) affected party?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Initially, I did not.
Q. Why is that?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: So we request addresses and who lives within the prescribed radius, so directly affected radius from the farm. And at the time, it didn't fall into that radius, and there was no planning documents that would have brought them into the fold, so -- prior to March 9th.
Q. So when would you have exactly determined affected party status?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Well, it depends. If you live within the prescribed distance of a CFO, you're automatically presumed, you know, to be directly affected. Other -- other people can make a case, though.

So, you know, if Town of Fort Macleod would have wanted to, let's say, respond to the public notice, maybe they would have made a case, and you find them directly affected. Or in other cases, people who draw water downstream of a site. There's a lot of other
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factors.
So it's kind of a -- during the same review process when we're looking at MDP, we're looking at the technical documents. That's when we make those decisions.
Q. Okay. Thank you, Joe -- or thank you, Mr. Sonnenberg, for your time. That would conclude my questions for you.

I would ask to speak to Mr. Cumming for -- to clarify a few points.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Cumming is ready.
Q. MR. METHERAL: Yes, hi.

I'd like some -- just some clarification on NRCB 65-day delivery policy. Just to confirm, that's an internal NRCB policy?
A. MR. CUMMING: Are you talking about the performance measure that I provided evidence on earlier? It is an NRCB performance measure.
Q. Okay. And perhaps I missed this, but the 65 days, how did you arrive at the 65-day number?
A. MR. CUMMING: Back in the early 2000s, I did some calculations based on the information that we had at the time to develop and propose that to our management group, and the management group accepted it and adopted it as a performance measure for the NRCB.
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Q. Okay. It appears like, though, that the approval officer can delay the start of the countdown. Is that accurate?
A. MR. CUMMING: The performance measure is from the date that the application is deemed complete, so I -- I don't know what you mean by "delay the start of the countdown."
Q. Well, it's A\&D's position that this application was complete in November and would like the countdown to have started when the submission was finished. But the NRCB chose to delay the start date until the deemed complete day, until January 5th.

Can you explain why that countdown is relevant, if the approval officer can simply delay the start date?
A. MR. CUMMING: Perhaps a better way to respond to this is to look at the approvals policy that we have. And I must apologize, because I don't know what the exhibit number is, but $I$ do have the section number and, again, we'd have to look at that.

But it's Section 7 (11)(3), which essentially
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approval officer has deemed an application for an approval or registration to be complete. Approval officers will consider the date the public notice appears in the local paper as the official date the application is deemed to be complete. This approach ensures that all parties have the full 20 working days to respond after being notified of the application."

MS. VANCE:
I might just step in to assist. I believe that that portion of the approvals policy is contained within Exhibit 11.
A. MR. CUMMING: Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Unless other parties need it, I think from the Board's perspective, we're good.
Q. MR. METHERAL:

Okay. So to confirm,
Mr. Sonnenberg has said that the earliest that public notice could be maintained, in his opinion, was perhaps December 16th -- 15th, 16th. Do you recall that date?
A. MR. CUMMING: I recall that Mr. Sonnenberg mentioned that. I believe that the Macleod Gazette gets published on a Wednesday, so $I$ believe that date would be the 15th.
Q. The 15th. Okay. So it's an internal NRCB policy that
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requires that these notifications go out according to publication dates for local newspapers. So in essence, then, we can argue that this application was delayed based on an NRCB policy.
A. MR. CUMMING: I -- I disagree with that. We have an internal practice that has been a long-standing practice since the early 2000s, again, where notice is not provided if it's -- not provided if it will fall over the Christmas break.

And that -- that internal practice came about after getting a lot of feedback from parties when we originally started AOPA and we did provide notice over that break.

So the decision was made that it would be the -- we would delay decision until as soon as possible after the Christmas break if notice was going to fall over that Christmas break.
Q. I'd like to speak to the Christmas break timeframe in a bit. Specifically now, I'm focusing on the NRCB's decision to wait for public notice until it reflected on the Gazette submission date. Would you agree the NRCB delayed this application until it reflected on the publication date?
A. MR. CUMMING: No, I wouldn't agree that we delayed the decision. I think that the -- the policy
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is quite clear that 7 (11)(3) as that the date the application would be deemed complete would be the date that the notice was published in the paper.
Q. The notice could not be published until it reflected on the Gazette submission timelines; is that accurate?
A. MR. CUMMING: The public notices -- as I've mentioned a little earlier, and I think I've already answered this question, when the notice is published in the newspaper, that would be the date that the application would be deemed complete.
Q. And the NRCB waits to reflect publication dates, yes or no?
A. MR. CUMMING: I -- I don't know what your question is. I think I've already answered it several times.
Q. Joe indicated that he could have published on the 16th. Did he delay publishing this application until at least the 16th?
A. MR. CUMMING: No, I believe what Mr. Sonnenberg said is that if -- if he had received this decision or
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However, because of our practice not to have notice cover that Christmas break, the notice was actually placed on January the 5th in the Macleod Gazette.
Q. I'm not looking for the justification. I'm looking to better understand if NRCB policy delayed this application to reflect the Gazette timeframe.

MS. VANCE:
I'm just going to object --
THE CHAIR: Ms. Vance, please --

MS. VANCE: I believe the question has been answered and asked a number of times, and I was going to jump in on the previous question, but $I$ waited. And some of these questions are more appropriate for Mr . Sonnenberg, who you've already questioned. So just bear that in mind, please.

THE CHAIR: Ms. Vance, thank you. I would agree, and I was going to ask Mr. Metheral as wel1, you know, from the Board's perspective from terms of information we need, I believe we have heard the question and answer a number of times.

So if you could please move on to your next question, it would be appreciated.

MR. METHERAL:
Okay.
Q. The next question is about the timeframe for NRCB office closure from -- I understand you corrected it to
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be December 24th until January 3rd.
A. MR. CUMMING: That's included, yes. Both of those dates are included.
Q. Is December 24 th a statutory holiday?
A. MR. CUMMING: The way that the Province does it, it's -- December 24th is the floater day for the Christmas day.
Q. A floater day for Christmas day? What about --

THE CHAIR: Excuse me, Mr. Metheral. I believe the -- if I have it right, Mr. Cumming answered the Christmas closure days, including the statutory days, the days in lieu, and the floaters in a previous answer. So if there's a new question, maybe we could have that.

MR. METHERAL: Yes.
Q. I'm trying to determine if the closure period delayed my applicant's review. Does January -- does December 29th, 30 th, and 31 st -- how would you describe those days? They're not statutory holidays. How does the Government view those days?

MS. VANCE
I believe that has also been answered. And in terms of do you think this delayed, I think that's a piece for argument rather than evidence. We're trying to -- anyway.

MR. METHERAL:
Okay. Perhaps I'11 move on. But
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for the Board's position, $I$ am trying to determine if NRCB and Government practice delayed my client's application.
Q. Mr. Cumming, can you confirm the location of the NRCB field office in Lethbridge?
A. MR. CUMMING: It's at the Agriculture Centre off of 1st Avenue south. It's actually in the county.
Q. Is that a provincial building or a federal building?
A. MR. CUMMING: We are located in the provincial wing of the federal building.
Q. Is the NRCB field office open to the public?
A. MR. CUMMING: I'm not sure. Are you talking about specific dates? Are you talking about right now, or are you talking about when?
Q. Is the NRCB field office open to the public today?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes.
Q. Was the NRCB field office open to the public in December of 2021?
A. MR. CUMMING: I don't believe it was.
Q. It was?
A. MR. CUMMING: No, I said I don't believe it was.
Q. Thank you. The field staff have been working remotely since early 2020. Do you believe the field staff have the tools they need to complete their job remotely?
A. MR. CUMMING: I do believe so.
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Q. Okay. Thank you for your time, Mr. Cumming. That would conclude my questions for the...

THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Methera1, Mr. van Huigenbos.

MS. VANCE:
Mr. Chair, I'm sorry to interrupt. I do have a possible response to the undertaking --
THE CHAIR: Oh, okay.

MS. VANCE:
-- if that would be helpful.
I understood the undertaking was the date that the then approval was sent out for internal review. I'm not here to give evidence. I'm happy to let Mr. Sonnenberg do it, but he would have to search his emails as well. I was fortunate enough to be copied on that email, and I can tell you that it was March the 16th.

THE CHAIR:
So March the 16 th is when the decision was circulated for further review by other approval officers. Do I have that right?

MS. VANCE:
Yes.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you. Mr. Metheral, you heard and understood? Is Zoom still online?

MR. METHERAL:
Yes, we're on, and just one minute to better understand that response.

THE CHAIR: Just more curious as long as you heard the response. You'11 have an opportunity in
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closing or final argument. I think you're closed -you indicated you're closed with your questions, so we're ready to move on.

MR. METHERAL:
Sure.
THE CHAIR:
So, Mr. Kennedy, do you have any questions?

MR. KENNEDY:
I thought if Mr. van Huigenbos, A\&D Cattle, had questions from arising from the undertaking, this would be the time to do that. I think they were purely asking for the date. I don't know whether any questions might arise from that.

THE CHAIR: Yeah, sorry, my assumption is they asked for the date, and that's what was provided, so I didn't see other questions.

Mr. Metheral, did you have a question about the date?

MR. METHERAL:
No, that answers our questions.
Perhaps if we can add that to public record, the email or correspondence, that would be great.

THE CHAIR:
That will be part of the transcript and part of --

MR. KENNEDY: Well, I'm not sure --
THE CHAIR:
Is that going to be an exhibit?
MR. KENNEDY:
I suspect it may not -- I mean, internal deliberations on these things are often not

## J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING

Questioned by Mr. Ceroici
made as exhibits, so...
MS. VANCE: Yeah, the undertaking was not to introduce a piece of exhibit, which I cannot do anyway. It would have to go through Mr. Sonnenberg.

And I would agree with Mr. Kennedy. This is not something we would likely be inclined to give a copy of anyway, but I can tell you the date, which is March 16th.

MR. METHERAL:
Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
I think we're good, thank you.
Mr. Kennedy?
MR. KENNEDY: I have no questions, Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIR:
A11 right. Thank you.
Ms. Roberts?
MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chair, I have no questions.
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Ceroici?
MR. CEROICI:
Yes, I have just hopefully a short question.

MR. CEROICI QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. On the issue of completeness of a permit, I just wanted to get maybe a little more explanation on what does it mean when a permit is complete in the review process?
A. MR. CUMMING: Is that question directed at me, Mr. Ceroici? Will I answer it?
Q. Yes. Yes, please.

## J. SONNENBERG, A. CUMMING

Questioned by Mr. Ceroici
A. MR. CUMMING: Thank you. I think I touched on this when -- when I gave evidence initially, but essentially what we are looking at when we determine an application to be complete, that there is sufficient information included in that application for it to start to be processed.

It does not preclude that more information may be required as questions or further review of the application may generate some questions. But it -- in order to be deemed complete, it would have to have sufficient information for it to begin to be processed. I trust that would answer your question.
Q. So I guess I just want to probe a bit about -- about the missing water well information and the extra acreages for manure spreading.

So would that be considered information required to decide if an application is complete, or would it be considered information that could -- you know, would be required later on after further analysis?
A. MR. CUMMING: So typically with applications, we
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lands, that's when things such as slopes, waterbodies, setbacks from property lines and -- and things like that would be looked at in - in far greater detail, and it's at those points in time when additional information may be required.

We have had situations as well in the past with -with some applications where information has changed over time, and so that -- that information would then come in and add to or change what -- what was included in the original application.
Q. Okay. Thanks very much, Mr. Cumming. I have no further questions.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. I have just a couple of questions.

THE CHAIR QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. Mr. Sonnenberg, you indicated that, I believe, on December 21st, you sent a letter to parties as a courtesy -- I think I have that right -- indicating that public notice would occur on January 5th. Do I have that right?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: That -- that sounds -- sounds about right. I don't remember the exact date, but it did go out particular the closure.
Q. So my understanding, then, and also based on what Mr. Ceroici has asked, then, if you were able to
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provide that letter on December 21 st that notice would be coming January 5th, the application would have been -- you know, from your perspective is complete on the 21 st, because you know already you can issue the notice on January 5th. Is that fair?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yeah. Yeah, that's fair.
Q. And so the reason that those dates were linked later is more for, I suppose, (a) administrative purposes to start the clock but also to tie the deemed complete to the timelines that the legislation allows for public notice. Is that fair?
A. MR. SONNENBERG: Yes, hundred percent.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Cumming, we heard a lot about Christmas closure and timelines and the reasons and just a couple of quick questions surrounding that. It's a government policy, yes, but NRCB doesn't have to follow and we don't necessarily follow -- I work for the same organization -- all government policy when it comes to human resource type policies, but we have on this one,
A. MR. CUMMING: I do not recall the exact details why, no. Sorry.
Q. Okay. And part of it might revolve around some questions from Mr . Metheral around working remotely and
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working from the office, but, you know, my recollection is that offices need to be open if we use them, and they're shut down, and we use many provincial buildings. That might be a reason.

I'm not here to provide some evidence, but I'm just sort of thinking out loud for a little bit partly because we all work for the NRCB in the end. But the interesting part is working remotely and working from the office, are those the same thing, in your mind?
A. MR. CUMMING: Yes. Yeah, the physical location of where the person is sitting and doing the work would be different but that they would be doing the same work and having the same access to NRCB resources, data basis, things like that, yes, they would have that from both locations.
Q. And over the last two years of working remotely, you haven't -- or have you seen issues around getting the job done, responding to clients?
A. MR. CUMMING: No. In fact, our approval officers and all of our staff have been very positive about communications with -- with clients. We do have -- or we have had a pandemic response plan in place, which does give guidance with respect to meetings and -- and things like that, but respect is being provided through the period that we had the COVID
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outbreak.
Q. And so my earlier question, working remotely is sort of the same as a facsimile of working from the office, so would that mean that during Christmas closure if we're working remotely, would staff be expected to work differently or be working because they're working remotely rather than from the office that is closed?
A. MR. CUMMING: I'm not sure that I fully understand your question. I think what I'm understanding from you is that if there's a Christmas closure, would we expect staff, if they were in the remote location, to work on their Christmas closure, and the answer would be no.
Q. Yeah, that was my question.
A. MR. CUMMING: It would be the same -- it would be the same as a statutory holiday. We wouldn't expect staff to work in the office on a statutory holiday, and we would not expect them to work remotely on a statutory holiday.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you. Those are my
questions.
Ms. Vance do you have any redirect?
MS. VANCE:
I don't. Thank you, sir.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. We11, thank you. So we're sort of at a natural break potentially, because we've
got --
Mr. Methera1, you and Mr. van Huigenbos are up next, but it's a little bit early -- I'm not sure if lunch is in Lethbridge. I think it was going to be delivered, $I$ 'm not sure if it's ready or not. I'm just trying to figure out if we should kind of start the next section, because --

Mr. Sonnenberg, Mr. Cumming, by the way, thank you. You are now released from the panel.
(PANEL STANDS DOWN)
THE CHAIR:
So it's whether or not we kind of start the next section with A\&D Cattle. Can anybody advise if lunch is ready for Lethbridge? I think we had some lunch coming in, so...

MS. VANCE: They just took my order, so I would think it's not here yet. Un1ess they're very good.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Okay. We11, I think we ought to start then to use the time effectively, but, Mr. Metheral, we'11 have sort of the same rule. We'11 probably need to -- I'm guessing we'11 need to break in between, so Mr. van Huigenbos will be under oath at that time.

So let's start with direct evidence. Mr. Metheral, if you're ready to go -- I presume you're
ready to go.
MR. METHERAL:
Yes.
THE CHAIR:
And we'll kind of aim for noon,
but I guess I'11 look for a hand up or perhaps,
Ms. Friend, if you find out earlier through text or something if there's an obvious time we can break in terms of lunch at Lethbridge, because I think we have quite a few people at Lethbridge office.

Sorry, please proceed.
MR. METHERAL:
Okay. So Adrian and I will -- are
in the same room. I will try and present some of the questions for him to respond to.

THE CHAIR: Right. And, Mr. Metheral, you're not presenting any direct evidence because we need to have the court reporter swear in -- so the court reporter will need to swear in Mr. van Huigenbos for sure, and if you're presenting evidence, I think we need you to be sworn in as well.

MR. METHERAL: We were uncertain how this would be best suited for the Board. Certainly, Mr. van Huigenbos and I worked on these documents together. He and I are both capable of responding to the material presented. Perhaps --

THE CHAIR: I guess if you're doing more than asking questions and if you're going to be answering
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some of our questions, then you need to be sworn in. So if the answer to those is yes, this gets you sworn in.

MR. METHERAL:
If it benefits the Board, I can certainly answer questions, and so perhaps I should.

THE CHAIR: We11, you need to tell me that. I'm just asking the question.

MR. METHERAL: Yes.

Okay. So, Court Reporter, please swear in both. Don't tell me we lost --

THE COURT REPORTER: No, I'm here.
C. METHERAL, A. VAN HUIGENBOS (For A\&D Cattle Ltd.),
affirmed
MR. METHERAL EXAMINES THE PANEL:
THE CHAIR:
MR. METHERAL:
The floor is yours, Mr. Metheral.
If $I$ can be in the screen here.
Q. Mr. van Huigenbos, how long have you lived in the Fort Macleod area?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: I was born in 1999 and I've lived
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Board for a review of this decision?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: There were goals I was working toward, and I feel that I was not treated fairly and with enough -- wasn't treated fairly by the NRCB.
Q. Okay.

MR. METHERAL: File manager, can we pull up Exhibit 22, page 6? That's right.
Q. So to provide a bit of evidence on your behalf, if we can go through your submission here. Please confirm -I asked you to complete a timeline that you believed was -- that you believe illustrated your activities with the NRCB?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes, that's my timeline. I completed it with you, yes.
Q. And to confirm, you submitted your application on July 17th. Engineering work proceeded in September, a submission of an engineering report on October 19th, or, perhaps, the engineers working on October 19th. And then to confirm, Joe -- Mr. Sonnenberg was on site on November 3rd?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes.
Q. Okay. At that time, I'm trying to understand awareness about the municipal development pl an and perhaps changes that the county and town were going through.

You indicate here that you did discuss the town
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and the county's proposed intermunicipal development plan. Do you recall that visit?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes.
Q. And do you recall that discussion about the IDP?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes, I talked to Joe about it and he was aware that it was coming into place, and -- or that there was the talk of negotiations between the town and the MD.

And he also told me that there was another client of his that was also having the same problems -- or was also affected by it.
Q. Okay. And did you feel any pressure to get your application through the system as quickly as you could?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes. I had quite a bit of pressure and felt the need to get the permit done.
Q. And then in November, we see some submissions and some response from the NRCB about the engineering report, manure spreading lands, but, ultimately, everything was submitted on November 23rd. Is that accurate?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes. And then I was told that the public notice could not happen in 2021, so at that point, I decided, since $I$ was waiting anyway, I would add four more corrals, and this was completed, I believe it was in end of November, and the -- all this information was in on December 3.
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Q. Okay. So some minor changes were completed to your application, but it was based on Joe's direction that public notice wouldn't occur in December. Is that accurate?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes. If public notice was stil1 going to go through, I would never have made any changes and I would have had all my -- all my documents in on the 23 rd , and it would have been deemed complete at that time.
Q. Okay. And it's your position here that you, on December 3rd, you had sent in what would be kind of a final email that said there's nothing more that I'11 be submitting. You approved the application as you had submitted it?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes. The NRCB asked me if that's all and said that they -- they had it all, so I confirmed with them, yes.
Q. Okay. Moving forward into January, we saw that Joe provided you with some statements of concern, and perhaps referrals. The first one came quite quickly, January 5th, but there was -- there's an indication here that he told you he would send these comments as soon as you were to get them -- or as soon as he was to get them; is that accurate?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes. So on January 5, Joe -- I
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believe Joe had called me, unless it was through an email -- no, we had a phone call, and we discussed that first concern, which was from Alberta Environment, and we had discussed that the concerns would come in to me as soon as I -- as they came into the NRCB. That way I could have a quick chance to look at it and keep the ball rolling as fast as we could.
Q. Okay. So you believed he was working as diligently as he could to get your application reviewed and through the approval process?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: In the beginning, when he came for the site visit, $I$ believed that he was doing a good job. He helped me with filling out the paperwork. Throughout the permitting process, I lost faith. I never received any phone calls. I was always making the phone calls.

I had people telling me that, hey, this is taking too long, something is not right. I said, well, I need -- he told me he's doing this, so I believed it, but as time went on, it took quite long.

On March 10, I called Joe, seeing where the permit was, how far it was, didn't hear anything back from him for a month, or since the January -- February 7 phone call, and I just wanted to see how far things were. At that phone call, he asked for more information about
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the water well and the manure spreading 1 ands.
This -- this made me think was $I$ the one that should be doing the work or at what point was Joe going to ask me for this information. Like, if I didn't call him that day, how long was he going to wait? Yeah.
Q. So to clarify, you initiated contact with Joe asking about the statements of concern, and it was only then that you felt like you prompted Joe into sending you those statements for review?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes, I called him and then that's when he said, "Oh, I'11 send them out later in the day."
Q. Okay. So from February 7th to March 10th, the process has -- basically the review process -- sorry. After February 7th, the statements of concern are in and it's now more of a review process. So when you reached out a month later, did you have some expectations that the permit would have been complete?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes, I was hoping to hear that he was very close to a decision, and that, in the next
Q. Okay. So the idea that you prompted Joe and then he asked for more information regarding the water wells and land base, does that seem like something that could have been done perhaps in January or February?
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A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes, most definitely.
Q. Because what we're finding out here is that these minor delays really impacted the outcome of your decision? Would you agree with that?
A. MR. VAN hUIGENBOS: Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's maybe talk about your communication with the municipality. When did you become aware that the municipality had approved the IDP?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: So I became aware when I spoke with Derrick about the adoption of IDP in March ' 22.
Q. And then you received your decision on April 1st, and you reached out to the NRCB, both the approval officer, and the director?
A. MR. VAN hUIGENBOS: Yes.
Q. Is that accurate? And you expressed your concern about the decision?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yeah.
Q. Okay. I think that would -- you did ask a little bit about office closure and were provided the reasons why some of the delays occurred?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes, I called -- or had a chat with Andy and, yeah, he stated what we've been hearing the last little bit. And Andy also told me that it was unfortunate -- the timing of this permit was very unfortunate for me.
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Examined by Mr. Methera1
Q. Okay. On that note, did you feel like -- sorry, I lost my page here. Here we go.

When we look at the December delay, do you feel as part of the public and a producer that can ask for a timely decision, do you feel that the December delay was appropriate considering there were working days in December where the public could have provided notice?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: No, I -- I believe that in December there was lots of time when neighbours could have a time to look at it. I don't believe that in NRCB, in the rules it says that they have to be 20 consecutive days.

So what could have happened is the public notice could have gone for, for example, ten days in December and ten days after with a space, a break during Christmas.
Q. As a member of the public, that makes sense to you, that --
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes.
Q. -- the public notice could have proceeded irregardless
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes.
Q. I might ask you a little bit about the way Joe was supporting -- or Mr. Sonnenberg was supporting your application. What did he provide you to start with?

## C. METHERAL, A. VAN HUIGENBOS

Examined by Mr. Methera1
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: So he provided me the information to fill out on the Part 1. I believe Sylvia gave me the Part 1 information. I filled that out. Then that prompted discussions with Joe -- Mr. Sonnenberg, and we got the soil testing done. And then the discussions between the engineer and Joe -- Mr. Sonnenberg and myself were started, which was in October.

In November, I sent out -- or end of October, I believe, I sent out my first Part 2 which had -- was not all the way complete, so that prompted Joe to come out, do a site visit, help me fill out the Part 2 information to skip having to send emails back and forth fixing information.

At this time, $I$ felt confident in Joe --
Mr . Sonnenberg, that he was doing a good job and was working for me. But as time went on, it felt like I was not a priority anymore.
Q. Did it feel like the approval officer had taken responsibility in any way for the completeness of your application?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: No. It's -- I ended up getting a denial and there -- all the blame goes on to AOPA rules and regulations and time and that it was completed in 61 days out of their goal of 65 . I -- I understand that. But that -- that timeline was too long for me,
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and it ended up a denial.
Q. Okay. Did the approval officer ever talk to you about the municipal development plan --
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes.
Q. - - in 2021?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes, we had -- we had discussed it at the site. So the MDP -- it was in line with the MDP and DP, yes, and that -- because my permit was in 1 ine with the MDP, that prompted public notices and to continue working on my permit. And if -- if my permit was not in line with the MDP, I would have had a denial way sooner.
Q. Would the approval officer have even proceeded with the public notice if the application was not consistent with the MDP?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: No.

MS. VANCE:
I'm going to object to that question, because $I$ don't think that's evidence that Mr. van Huigenbos can give. That was a question about the approval officer. But you've already answered it,
Q. MR. METHERAL: I wish I would have asked the approval officer.

Was there anything that would talk about a denial in any form or fashion?
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Examined by Mr. Methera1

1 A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: No.
Q. Okay. And as far as you're aware, you were required to submit, based on the MDP, and no other information was required. It was -- in essence, the application was out of your control?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes. It was -- I understand that Joe was looking at the MDP and basing it off of that.
Q. Okay. I would offer to the Board that those are the end of our submissions and testimony. We are available to answer some of the written submissions. I don't think the Board wants us to go through those details at this time.

THE CHAIR: Thanks, Mr. Methera1. And, yes, we've all read them thoroughly, so thanks for your comment and appreciate you being succinct on your direct.

So we will proceed with some questions, and I'm just kind of waiting for a potential break. We might get through anyway before 1 unch break.

But MD of Willow Creek, Ms. Finlay, do you have any questions for $A \& D$ Cattle?

I'm not sure if Ms. Finlay -- I'm just looking for her icon here. Is Ms. Finlay on? I see MD of Willow Creek. I'11 1oop back.

Ms. Agrios, Town of Fort Macleod?
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MS. AGRIOS:
No questions from me.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you.
Mr. and Mrs. Conner?
Oh just I see Ms. --
MR. CONNER:
Yeah, I don't think we have any questions.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. And, sure. Are you certain about that? I was going to loop back to Ms. Finlay. I see that she's here now. So why don't you just take one minute, and I'11 get back to you.

Ms. Finlay, do you have any questions?
MS. FINLAY: No questions, sir.
THE CHAIR:
Oh, okay. Thank you.
So I'm back to you, Mr. and Mrs. Conner.
MR. CONNER: There. Can you hear me now?
THE CHAIR: Yeah, there you go. Yeah.
MR. CONNOR:
Okay.
THE CHAIR:
I can see you looking for the mute button. No problem.

MR. CONNER:
No, we don't have any questions
for Mr. van Huigenbos.

THE CHAIR:
MR. LEWIS:
THE CHAIR:
MS. VANCE:

Okay. And Mr. and Mrs. Lewis?
No questions.
Okay. Ms. Vance?
Just, I hope, two quick questions.
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Cross-examined by Ms. Vance

These are for Mr. van Huigenbos.
MS. VANCE CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. In your testimony, you spoke of pressure to get your application through the system. You'11 agree that that pressure did not come from Mr. Sonnenberg?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: No. I -- I wanted to get the permit done myself. I want -- tried to put a bit of pressure on and made frequent phone calls. Never did I, from the time the application was deemed complete, so which is January 5 to the day -- or till the -April 1, I did not receive a phone call from Joe, even when he needed information. I got a phone call from Joe on April 1 saying that my permit was denied.
Q. And you understand, you'11 agree with me, that Mr. Sonnenberg works for the NRCB, not for you?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: I understand that he works for the NRCB as representing my application and being that it is -- the NRCB is the only option for producers to get their permit. This would mean that they should -- the NRCB should be trying their best to meet the producer's goals.

If -- I understand -- I understand I was not paying Joe, but there is a level of -- "service" is not the word -- a level of expectation that I believe the NRCB should meet when working with producers/clients.
Q. Thank you. Those are my questions.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Vance.
Mr. Kennedy?
MR. KENNEDY:
Yes.
MR. KENNEDY QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. I only have a couple of questions, and they're both for you, Mr. van Huigenbos, and just to clarify the evidence you gave in your direct. And part of it may be a follow-up or a partial follow-up in the question posed to you by Ms. Vance.

Two things that you mentioned: One is you said people were telling you that the processing of the application was taking too long. Who told you that?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: So I had a phone call with my dad, and he suggested that the -- the approval officer was delaying and taking his time. I just that day -- that was the day I had a phone call with him, and then I -- it -- that was when he asked for more information. And I've had my -- I've had a brother that said -he -- should I say it? He is a member -- so he also was really pushing for my permit, but $I$ don't want to get him in difficult position. So -- but he was really for my permit, and he -- yes. So there was several people.
Q. When you say "several," so it was your brother and your
father. Anybody else?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: And then I have other brothers representative -- another -- a neighbour, a representative of the MD of Willow Creek. They were all wanting me to get the permit done and have it go fast to get a decision.
Q. And in terms of explanation, understanding of the NRCB process, what expertise do these people possess?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: So my dad, he's applied for permits, and so has my -- I have another brother that's -- I have two other brothers that are -- have feedlots. They've gone through the NRCB process, and they've got their permit. This one, I applied -- I put in my Part 1 on July 19th. I had all my information in on November 3.
Q. And, sorry, I'm going to stop you, because that's not my question. My question was related to who was telling you that the NRCB process was taking too long?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Okay. Yeah, so that was my dad and some brothers and other feedlot owners.
Q. Okay. And then at one point in your evidence, it seemed to me that in 2021, somebody advised you -- and I think you said the name Derrick -- advised you of the IDP process that was in development.
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yes.
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Q. And I also got the sense that you, at that stage, identified that advice as creating a deadline for your application to be approved. Did I hear that correctly?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: So I talked to Derrick. He is from the MD of the Willow Creek. That phone call with him was because $I$ received a phone call from Joe saying that my permit would be denied -- was going to be denied. I received that phone call on the 17 th or the 18th of March, I believe. I tried to call Derrick that weekend -- or Friday, but it was too late.

So then I got ahold of him on Monday, and that's where he said, Well, your permit should not get a denial, because he's, like, the IDP was not fully adopted yet.

It -- what happened is the MD, they did their first, second, and third reading, but the IDP was not adopted as in was never signed by the Minister of Agriculture, I believe, or Environment had to sign that first. So that's where he said that you should not be receiving a denial.
Q. Okay. I thought I heard in your earlier -- in your direct that that conversation with Derrick might have taken place in 2021. I gather from your comments that you did not have --
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: No.
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Questioned by Ms. Roberts
Q. -- that conversation with Derrick?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: No. That was in March of 2022.
Q. MR. KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you. And those are my questions, Mr. van Huigenbos, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you, Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Ceroici?
MR. CEROICI: I don't have any questions, thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Roberts?
MS. ROBERTS:
Yeah, I have a question or two.
MS. ROBERTS QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. Mr. van Huigenbos, you had said that you had purchased the property in the spring of ' 21 , but you did not get possession of it until September '21; is that correct?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Correct.
Q. Okay. So can you just explain to me, then, if you actually didn't have full possession of the property, how you were able to submit a Part 1 application on July 17, 2021?

And in your chronology -- chronology you talk about September 1 as being -- as having the report on soil samples done, so presumably those soil samples were done prior to you having possession of the property.

So can you just explain to me how that all worked
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out?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: So in spring or summer -- I forget which month it was, maybe June or so -- we ended up getting -- yeah, our bid was the highest, and we got -we got the property.

I got a waiver from the owner -- previous owner allowing me to put in a Part 1 application and to do soil samples on the property. So that's how I ended up starting on the permit earlier. I felt the need to start earlier and wanted it to get complete, and it ended up taking a very long time.

The September one was the day we got possession, and I also believe that was the day that the driller came out to start drilling, if I'm not mistaken. So that's what I mean. September 1, the driller was there.
Q. Okay. Thank you. It's also my understanding that this IDP has -- says that within the exclusion zone, no new or expansion to existing CFOs are allowed.

Now, if this Board did overturn the approval
officer's decision and permitted what you're asking for, 2,000 head beef feedlot, does it cause you any concern for the operation's future that the IDP says no expanding CFOs?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: So this is where I -- originally,
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my dad had told me apply for 1,000 head feedlot, and I -- I felt the need for 2,000. I did a 2,000 head feedlot. And I -- I understand that un1ess I'm upgrading and modernizing, $I$ won't be able to add more numbers.

This is not -- at this point, it is not much of a concern, since I'm happy with 2,000 head at this point. I'm a young farmer, and I'm not planning to become a big guy in -- in a year or two.

I -- we paid over market value on the property, and now we've received extra costs on -- on Board review, time, hiring people to help me. So using -- or having all these extra costs, I -- I don't know how I would be able to pay for that without getting income from a feedlot.

But concerning the question, down the road, if I -- I won't be able to upgrade -- or expand, then having to look for another location with another feedlot and using this as a starter feedlot or something, I could accommodate that. Hopefully down the road if $I$-- if all goes well.
Q. And one last question. When -- do you recall when you were aware that this IDP process had begun and that this land you were either considering to purchase or had already purchased, depending on the timing, was
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located on the mapping within this CFO exclusion zone?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: So when I bought the property, I heard -- it didn't occur to me really that you are going to be in there and you won't be able to get a feedlot. I knew that town was working with the MD and that there was a little bit of a battle, let's say, on who gets what, but it never occurred to me that town would get so much say that far outside of town. It's $11 / 2 \mathrm{mile}$ added onto town's already big boundaries.

And I'm not even -- if we go with the southwest winds, $I$ 'm not even really downwind of where town is located right now. Maybe in many, many years when town develops lots, $I$ may potentially be downwind, but at this point, I'm not anywhere close to downwind of them.

And I can't even -- when I looked at the property you don't even know town is there. There's actually a big hill in the way. So you can't -- unless you really look at Goog1e Maps and you measure it out, you don't know where town is.

So -- so when I bought the place, I didn't
have -- didn't know what was going on and it wasn't till -- I think January is when I really started seeing the full extent of, hey, I'm in here and this could affect me. But at that point, $I$ still didn't believe that the town and MD would come to an agreement with
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the boundary I'm in. I believe that it would be cut off a half a mile or so.

And with that, the reason $I$ believe that is because they only went southwest of Fort Macleod and any other direction north, east, or west, they didn't go -- they didn't even go half a mile that way. So I thought it's a little bit crazy almost that they went that far just to the southwest. I thought we don't only receive or only get southwest winds out here. So I thought this is --
Q. And then just a follow-up question to that, then. Had you seen any public notices or were you aware of or did you attend any public hearings with regard to the proposed IDP?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: So I did attend a public hearing prior to -- so prior to March so I think it was maybe -- middle of February $I$ would have seen the notices in the paper, toward the end of February, that there was hearings for the town and MD.

I did not attend the MD public hearing. I did attend the town public hearing. We went there with several neighbours, all within a half a mile or last quarter all the way along. If you follow -- if town would have backed off half a mile, all of us neighbours would have not been in the CFO exclusion area. And we
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went to town, and the town listened but did not really accommodate any of our requests.

I -- so I stated, when it was my turn to speak, I said that town was shutting down an industry, and they said, Well, we're not shutting down, we're just stopping. If you're there, you're allowed, if you're not, then no more new feedlots or CFO exclusions.

So then I asked them, Well, if you'd cut back half a mile, all of us would be happy, we'd all go home. She said, Well, that wouldn't be -- then a councillor wanted to reply. She said, That wouldn't be fair to everyone else that would still be in it.

And I said well, no one else that's in that that mile is here. It's just everyone that's on that last half mile. And then she didn't know what to say. And I thought, Well -- later I thought, We11, if we're going to talk about fair, then $I$ think we should be going 1 half miles all the way around town, not only southwest.

But town, they went and they put it in
through -- there was another neighbour that they said, We11, we'11 consider your request, but in that same night, they passed Hearing Reading 1, 2, and 3 without any discussion or any idea of looking to accommodate any requests.
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Questioned by The Chair
Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. van Huigenbos.

MS. ROBERTS: Mr. Chair, that's all my questions.

THE CHAIR: Good old mute. I'm sorry, just a quick couple of follow-ups.

THE CHAIR QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. One is, the meeting you were just speaking about to Ms. Roberts that you attended on the IDP with the town. When was that meeting? You may have said it, but I just missed it.
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: The beginning of March. It was -- I think it was the 1 st or 2 nd of March. The MD had theirs the end of February, and then the town had theirs the beginning of March.
Q. Of 2022?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yeah, 2022, yes.
Q. And that meeting was to gain input on the IDP or to tell you that it was done?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: There was never a meeting to gain input. These were just readings.
Q. It was a council meeting on the readings?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: It was a council meeting and they were doing the readings and they passed Reading 1, 2, and 3 .
Q. Thank you. And just a quick follow-up question. We
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had asked parties and, of course, A\&D, if the Board were to, you know, find that the IDP was relevant, what would be the potential reasons that it be approved despite an inconsistency with the IDP, and you provided four bullet points.

Number 3 is other non-agricultural activities were encouraged within IDP, but no reasons of CFO growth. So we' 11 hear potentially from the County and the town about their rationale to the exclusion zone, so I'm not going to ask you that.

But on Number 4, you state AOPA provides the appropriate protection to neighbours and the environment for setting the CFO. So the MDS is used to do that, you're correct, but the exclusion zones are used for perhaps other purposes.

So is there something you want to add to that in terms of if there is an exclusion zone and there's development in the future, what is it the Board might want to think about in terms of why or why not your operation may provide or perhaps be more of a nuisance to development that might approach you over the future? Or why it will not be a nuisance to that development that might approach you in the future?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: So are you wondering about the feedlot development compared to other developments?
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Q. Well, or just specifically why your feedlot ought to be approved despite an inconsistency?
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: So like I said already, I'm not directly downwind or upwind of town, and it's a 2,000 head feedlot. We're not talking 25,000 head feedlot with lots of smell and all of that.

Town, in their IDP, or in the IDP, it's mentioned that the town never -- or is not planning to develop on the other side of the proposed highway that they have going in that area. So they are never planning to develop close to my land.

So -- and another thing, if town would smell me, being southwest, we also receive north and east winds, but the town has argued -- or the IDP argues by only -- by not adding any CFO exclusion on those sides of town that -- from the north and the east, you don't smell feedlots; only from southwest.
Q. Okay. Thank you --

MR. METHERAL:
Mr. Chair, can I support your question on that?

THE CHAIR:
Well, you can -- I mean, you're providing testimony, so I mean you can add to it. I'm not sure I'm looking for support to my question. If you have further to -- in terms of an answer to Mr . van Huigenbos, continue.
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A. MR. METHERAL: I think your question asked why -if this application were to be approved, what other impacts it might have on that area or that development, the zone?

Can we pull up the -- it's page 4 of Exhibit 22. So with this submission, we did include a picture of the IDP and the area identified as a CFO exclusion zone. We hope the Board does consider this map and the location of the CFO. It is right on the boundary.

Had it been on the other side of the property line, which is only a few...
A. MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: 100 metres.
A. MR. METHERAL:.. .100 metres away, this would have been in another quarter and we might not be having this discussion.

So what we did notice about the IDP -- and I'd love to question the town and municipality about this, is this CFO exclusion zone seems to accommodate the development of the highway. While it does mention odour and prevailing winds perhaps, we do know that there is accommodation for highway.

So, on that note, this facility is actually further southwest of that highway. It won't be inside or near that highway. So when we talk about impact of other facilities or other developments, I think this
falls out of that zone.
And a curiosity, which I'll ask, is that this zone appears only -- the exclusion zone appears only to impact CFOs. While the municipality does promote agriculture, CFOs are targeted. The IDP does promote things like commercial growth, solar farms, wind farms, but I would question why an exclusion zone isn't included for those?

If we were to put a solar farm where the new highway was going, I don't think that would be proper planning. So I would like to --
Q. I'll maybe just stop you there. I'm the wrong guy to ask, so you'11 have an opportunity to ask the town and the MD after lunch.

So I think -- unless you have other comments to add in terms of the CFO facility itself, my questions have been asked and answered. Thank you.

MR. METHERAL:
No, very good. Thanks.
Q. And did you have any redirect because that's the end of the questions? Did you have any redirect based on the

MR. METHERAL:
THE CHAIR:
(PANEL STANDS DOWN)
THE CHAIR:

Not at this time, thanks.
Okay. All right. Thank you.

And maybe lunch is cold now in

Lethbridge. I hope not, but I think this would be an appropriate time to break. I assume things are ready for everyone.

Just before we do that, Ms. Agrios and Ms. Finlay, how long on your direct do you think you will be? I'm just trying to figure out if we need to scrunch lunch at all or not.

MS. FINLAY: I can address that. I can tell you that in direct I don't expect to be very long. Obviously, we'll address a couple of the things that came up this morning and get that direct evidence out so that we're as efficient as possible, but I would say like half an hour would be generous.

I think it will probably be less than half an hour in direct, and otherwise they'll be available for questions from the parties.

THE CHAIR:
Questions, of course, yeah. And, Ms. Agrios?

MS. AGRIOS:
Less than 10 minutes.
THE CHAIR: Okay. I think we're going to be fine for time. We've said that before. So I hope I'm right here. Let's break -- is 45 minutes or an hour -I'm not sure if anybody has to run out or not, but if 45 minutes works for everyone, we could reconvene at $1: 15$. Is there any objections to that? Can people

4 THE CHAIR:
Panel members, $I$ think there is a breakout room we can get to, maybe not right away, but maybe just enter there and we'11 hook up a little bit over the 1 unch hour.

Thank you very much. See you at 1:15, everyone. (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 12:29 P.M.)
make that work for 1 unch?
MS. FINLAY: No objections.

MS. AGRIOS: I have no objection. Let's start back at 1:15. And,

```
PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED TO 1:15 P.M.
```

$\qquad$
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5 (PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 1:18 P.M.)
6 THE CHAIR: Okay. Let's get started. We completed direct evidence and questioning for A\&D Cattle, and next on the list is MD of Willow Creek. And, Ms. Finlay, are you ready to present?

MS. FINLAY:
Yes, if perhaps we could get a screen up that shows the MD of Willow Creek and Diane and then myself. So are all those people -- if they can all turn on their video?

THE CHAIR: Now, we may not be able to have them all show up at one spot. Is that okay or --

MS. FINLAY: That's fine. That's fine.
THE CHAIR:
Okay.
MR. FINLAY:
Perhaps what we can do is proceed to have Mr. Derrick Krizsan, Cindy Chisholm, as well as Diane Horvath sworn in.
D. KRIZSAN, C. CHISHOLM, D. HORVATH (For MD of Willow

Creek), affirmed
THE CHAIR:
Ms. Finlay, I would say just before you get started. I think it's Ms. Chisholm that
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THE CHAIR:
is a little difficult to hear.
A. MS. CHISHOLM: I'll make sure the mic is right in front of my mouth. Is that better?

Marginally. Still a little quiet,
for sure.
A. MS. CHISHOLM: I'11 do my best to talk louder.

Thank you
A. MS. CHISHOLM: Thank you.

MS. FINLAY: Thank you.
MS. FINLAY EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. I don't think that we'll be too long this morning before we open it up for cross-examination, but I just wanted to have you all address a couple of questions.

This first question perhaps $I$ can ask Derrick or Cindy to respond to.

Can you, please, tell the Panel about any public meetings or meetings with the public with respect to the IDP process with the Town of Fort Macleod that preceded the process before the Land and Property Rights Tribuna1?
A. MS. CHISHOLM: I can speak to the open house that was held in the town of Fort Macleod in council chambers on June 11th of 2019. And public was notified of that. Addresses were given to ORSC of all the landowners within the MD, and those notifications were
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sent out, and also there was publication in the newspaper -- the local newspaper, the Fort Macleod Gazette.
Q. Thank you. I refer to the Land and Property Rights Tribunal process. Derrick, can you speak to the engagement of that process as it relates to the development of the IDP between the MD of Willow Creek and the Town of Fort Macleod?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: You bet. The town and the MD had been engaged for -- prior to my arrival in September of 2019 through an IDP process. It was -- the two communities went through mediation process, and mediation was not successful. And the parties applied to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for this matter to -- to proceed to the Municipal Government Board, as a decision could not be reached.

And so the ministerial order was issued.
MSD 04521 was issued on May 17th, 2021, referring the matter to the Municipal Government Board for recommendation.
Q. And the Municipal Government Board became the Land and Property Rights Tribuna1; is that correct?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: It did, yes.
Q. And can you tell me about the public notification process that was provided in connection with that LPRT
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process?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: From the -- from the time that the -- the process was turned over to the Land and Property Rights Tribunal, both communities provided address information, the name information of all the affected parties within an area that the Land and Property Rights Tribunal deemed to be appropriate.

Al1 that information was provided to the -- to the Tribunal, who then distributed notifications and public notices from that point forward.
Q. Okay. And in connection with that process, were there documents that the MD posted on its website in connection with that process?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Yes, I believe both the town and the MD were required to post notices and information pertaining to the process as well as there were -there were display ads placed in the Fort Macleod newspaper, Fort Macleod Gazette, indicating that if residents had any questions, that they were to contact the town or the MD to -- to seek questions to their enquiries.
Q. And can you tell me around what the timeframe was of that public notice and the posting of those notices on the MD's website?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: We11, those -- those -- all the
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public notices, we posted them as the -- as the LPRT required. There was a number of them, including the -the final draft through correspondence with LPRT. We received notice that we were to post the -- the draft documents on our website and make them available at our offices.
Q. And did that posting include previous versions of IDPs?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: I can't recall. I think it was the most current version that was to be -- that was to be posted, if I recall correctly.
Q. Thank you.

MS. FINLAY:
If I could -- just one second.
If I could -- if I could have Exhibit 19 brought up. And, actually, I think page 2 of the pdf. Great. Thank you.
Q. Mr. Krizsan, could I just ask you to review what is identified as paragraph 2 ?

MS. FINLAY:
So if we could just scroll up a little bit in the document so that the whole of paragraph 2 is available. That's great, that's great, thank you.
Q. Mr. Krizsan, could you, please, review that paragraph?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Okay. Yes.
Q. Okay. Can you, please, tell me, the first sentence indicates that the town and the MD reached an agreement
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with respect to the form of the IDP on November 19th, 2021. Can you tell me what needed to occur in order for that form of the IDP to be formally adopted by the MD?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: In order for that to be adopted in accordance with the Municipal Government Act, there would have to be a first reading, a public hearing, and then the second and third readings.
Q. And between November 19 th and the third reading, were there changes and steps that needed to be completed, and can you describe them?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: There was some additional municipal matters between the two communities that were continually ongoing, a water services agreement that was negotiated between the two communities, which was concluded on or about January 19th or 20th, I believe. But in interim, the MD's first reading was conducted on January 19th to consider that bylaw.

At that meeting, the MD set a public hearing date for February 23rd, and at that meeting, we became aware there were was additional amendments to -- requested as a result of the agency notifications that we sent out. We received a notice back from the NRCB that there was some suggestions in wording that they wanted to amend the -- suggestions for amendment to the IDP.
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So that public hearing on February 23rd was recessed without the second and third reading, because we understood that the town's public hearing was being conducted on February 28th as well, and we were -- didn't want to go ahead and adopt a document until after we were certain that there was no further amendments coming from the town as well.

On March 9th, that -- that public hearing was recessed until March 9th, and at that meeting, the amendments were considered. And second and third readings were passed, and the bylaw was officially adopted.
Q. Great. Thank you.

So just to confirm, the form of the IDP as of November 2021 was not the same one as was finally adopted?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: It was not. There was an amendment that was proposed by the -- suggested by the NRCB and was considered by both municipalities and were adopted as part of the final IDP.
Q. Okay. Perhaps I can ask -- maybe I'11 address this now. Previously in this hearing, you heard some commentary from -- some evidence from Mr. Huigenbos about a conversation that he'd had with you.

First of all, do you recall when that conversation
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might have occurred?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Yes, on March 22nd.
Q. Okay. Of 2022?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: That's correct.
Q. Okay. And can you tell me what you recall of that conversation?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Sure. I received the phone call from Mr. Huigenbos late in the afternoon on March 22nd and had indicated to him that the IDP was adopted on March 9th and also indicated as this matter was under the purview of the Land and Property Rights Tribuna1, I was not certain as to how that process would affect the adoption of the IDP.

And it wasn't until later that we received a letter that was issued by the Land and Property Rights Tribunal on March 23rd and that was sent to the Minister -- I believe it was -- the letter from the Minister was dated April 7th and indicating that the Minister agrees with the recommendations of the Tribuna1. And we received that on April 14th.

So I did, indeed, have a conversation with Mr. Huigenbos and indicated that although the IDP was adopted, we were not certain how that process is impacted with -- with this process being under the purview of the LPRT.
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Q. Okay. And just so that we're very clear, did you say to Mr. Huigenbos that you thought the NRCB had incorrectly or should not have refused the application or the approval?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: I don't remember the exact words I used, but I don't believe I used those words. I -- the uncertainty surrounding how this -- the adoption of the IDP and the LPRT raised some questions in my mind as to what the official adoption date or what the Minister was going to say in terms of the -- this -- the adoption of the IDP by the two communities.
Q. Thank you.

Now, if I could just ask -- Ms. Horvath, if I could ask you -- I could ask you one or two questions. Can you tell the Tribunal generally the purpose of and the role of having a CFO exclusion area in an IDP?
A. MS. HORVATH: Yeah, normally IDP exclusion areas are considered by urban and rural municipalities. We don't -- we sometimes will find them between rural and rural municipalities, but the idea behind them is to limit and -- the severity of any nuisances that may be produced by confined feeding operations.
Q. I'm just going to stop you right there. Can you hold on for one second? I'm really sorry.

Sorry, I really apologize.
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Sorry, please continue.
A. MS. HORVATH: I mean, I think one of the comments I'd heard earlier was why do we -- why as municipalities do we only look at confined feeding operation exclusion zones and not other types of development; for example, industrial or group country residential?

And if, given that opportunity in some of the other provincial legislation, AOPA allows for municipalities to have input into the approvable process through these CFO exclusion zones and, therefore, municipalities, both urban and rural, utilize them to their benefit.
Q. So if I could ask you to speak specifically to the planning considerations in this IDP that relate to the establishment of the CFO exclusion zone and the particular location that it is -- that it's been put into place.
A. MS. HORVATH: I may defer this to Mr. Krizsan. Again, I also entered the process late, and I understand there was many versions of what the CFO exclusion area may look like until it was finally decided upon. So perhaps if Derrick could provide some information on that, that might be more relevant.
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Certainly. Like any negotiation,
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there's two opposing views, and, over a course of time, compromises are made.

There was a significant change in the size of the -- reduction in size of the exclusion zone from the first draft that we saw to where we ended up, and -- but that's a pretty typical type process for these types of negotiations.
Q. And either Diane or Derrick, can you speak to some of the planning considerations? I guess, to some degree, we'11 have to wait for the town also to speak to that, but any of the planning considerations that support the fact that this is a reasonable -- or it is the CFO exclusionary that was agreed to. So specifically the planning considerations.
A. MS. HORVATH: I think I can probably answer that one as well, and maybe if Derrick or Cindy has something to add to that.

I think things that were considered when we're looking at CFO exclusion zones are the types of development that is in close proximity. So in this case, there were fewer CFOs in this location.

Part of the discussions between the two municipalities was this water agreement that was considered, and, in such, which would allow water to be extended into the municipal district in this location
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which again would promote residential or non-residential development and that would not be agriculturally-related. So, again, that could cause conflict, I guess, between additional CFOs in this location.

There is a map that is provided by the town within the IDP that does show all of the existing CFOs in close proximity to the town, as well as their minimum distance separation to each -- between them.

So, again, there is a large concentration to the north and to the east of the community, and as such, with the size of Fort Macleod, which has 9 square miles within its boundaries, some of those -- the river is also to the north. So there is some topography that was taken into consideration when this CFO exclusion zone was considered by both municipalities.
Q. Great. Thank you. That's all the additional evidence that we intend to provide, but at this point if the MD, Derrick, and Cindy, as well as Diane, could answer the questions of any of the other parties as well as the Panel, that would be great.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Finlay. Thank you, pane1.

Ms. Agrios, do you have any questions?
MS. AGRIOS: I do have a few questions for
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Mr. Krizsan.
MS. AGRIOS CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. And these are some more just specific questions relating to the public notices that were provided regarding the IDP process. And so if I could have put up Exhibit 19, page 63.

So, firstly, Mr. Krizsan, you can confirm, then, that on November 19th, 2021, the town and the MD reached an agreement with respect to the form of a draft IDP; correct?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Yes.
Q. And that particular draft of the IDP, that was posted to both the MD's website and the town's website either on November 19th or within a day or two after?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: I believe so. That's correct, yeah.
Q. And if I could then have you go -- we'11 go to page 65 in Exhibit 19. And you can see this is cover page of a draft intermunicipal development plan, November 2021. So can you confirm that this would have been the version posted to -- posted to the MD's website on or shortly after November 19th of 2021?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: That appears to be the version, correct.
Q. Okay. And I know you indicated -- and I appreciate
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that there were some changes that were made to the draft IDP between November 19th and when it was finally adopted on March 9 th, but I'd like to go to page 78 now in Exhibit 19.

And so you'11 see the map of the CFO exclusion area. And I take it that you can confirm that the CFO exclusion area, that was not changed between November 19th and final adoption on March 9th?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: That's correct.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Those are my questions.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Agrios.
Mr. and Mrs. Conner, do you have any questions?

## MR. CONNER CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:

Q. MR. CONNER: The only question we had really was in relation to, more or less, that the town just talked about was the fact that the MD was working on an IDP CFO setback zone and more or less had the draft done in November but still put in a letter of support to A\&D Cattle to more or less backing them.

I was more or less just wondering why they would work on having a setback zone and then still supporting A\&D for having a review of decision, like what their purpose was on that, but.

I don't know if this is the right time to ask this question, but...
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A. MR. KRIZSAN: Certainly, I can answer that. The letter of support that the MD provided by way of council resolution was related to the process, and no other reason.

They believe that, based upon the information that Mr. Huigenbos provided to council, that there appeared to be an unusually long time -- period of time taken to review what appears to be -- what appeared to be a relatively simple application.

And so it was not -- it was a very specific letter of support and it was concerned about process and no other reason.
Q. That was the only concern we had was more or less the letter of support on one side only. But other than that, I don't think we have anything.

THE CHAIR: No other questions?
MR. CONNER: No, nothing now, no.
THE CHAIR: Mr. and Mrs. Lewis?
MR. LEWIS: No, not yet.
THE CHAIR: Mr. Methera1.

MR. METHERAL CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
MR. METHERAL: Hello?
THE CHAIR:
Yes.
Q. MR. METHERAL:

Yes. Hi. We do have a couple of quick questions.
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Just to confirm, we see some adoption -- some readings and some adoptions. What would be the official date, then, that we should consider the IDP was adopted by the municipality?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: The final third reading was undertaken on March the 9th.
Q. And you spoke about the Minister signing off. What's the relevance there?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Well, this process was during the -- from the time period of May 17 th, 2021 , until we received the concluding letter from the LP -- from the Minister on April 14th, 2022. This matter was under the purview of the -- the Municipal Government Board, which later became the Land and Property Rights Tribuna1.

And so this process is, you know -- frankly, was very new to us, and we were not certain how the -- what impact the consideration of this -- the adopted IDPs would have -- when the final adoption date would be. Would the Minister have to approve it?

Would the Land and Property Rights Tribunal have to issue a recommendation for approval, but the correspondence we received on April 14th indicated that the -- that the Minister accepts the recommendations of -- of the -- that the Minister agrees with the
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recommendation of the Tribunal that the MD and the town were able to successfully complete and adopt an IDP.
Q. Thank you. You suggested that that letter was dated April 14th?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: The letter from the -- let me just check my date here.

The letter - the Land and Property Rights Tribunal correspondence was dated March 23rd. The letter was sent by the Minister which contained the LPRT correspondence on Apri1 7th, and the communities received it on April 14th.
Q. Okay. These dates are after March 9th. Are any of these dates relevant? Should we be actually looking at some of the approval dates from the Minister?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Based upon the correspondence, upon review of the correspondence on April 14th, I don't believe those dates are relevant, given that the Minister simply agrees with the Land and Property Rights Tribunal notice that the MD and the town have adopted the IDPs. And so I don't believe that those dates are relevant today. The relevance is with respect to the conversation that $I$ had with Mr. Huigenbos on March 22nd.

At that time, we were unaware of what impacts, if any, the LPRT and the Minister's decision would have on
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the adoption of the IDP, but the correspondence is quite clear that there is no impact on that March 9th adoption date.
Q. Okay. Can you maybe clarify the need for a tribunal? It was just because you were new to the process?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: No. The two communities had been in the process of negotiating the IDP, they entered a voluntary mediation, and the communities agreed that the mediation was not proceeding in an expeditious fashion so an application was made to the Minister to take this matter to the Municipal Government Board. At that -- at that point in time, it fell under the Land and Property Rights Tribunal process.
Q. Okay. If a tribunal was needed to get you guys to work together, shouldn't their signoff have a priority, then?

MS. FINLAY
I'm going to object to that question. From my perspective, that's a legal conclusion that you're asking the witness to draw. He's not qualified to give a legal opinion.

MR. METHERAL:
Is there anybody from the municipality that can answer that question?

MS. FINLAY: We can certainly address it in argument.

MR. METHERAL: Thank you.
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Q. Moving on to the exclusion zone itself, let's pull that exhibit up. I think we found it on Exhibit 19, page 65. Oh, sorry, page 78.
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Yes.
Q. Okay. In this illustration, we see the town boundary, and that's identified by the green area. Is that accurate?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: That appears to be correct, yes.
Q. Okay. And we see an exclusion zone in the town boundary. Is that accurate?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Correct.
Q. Okay. And we see an exclusion zone that extends south and west?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Yes.
Q. Okay. Can you help confirm why there's no CFO exclusion zone on the east and north side of the town?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Through the process of negotiation, this was where the two councils landed and the town felt -- my memory, if my memory serves, the town felt that this was the most important area for the exclusion zone given the southwest winds, was what was indicated to us through the negotiations.

This area was significantly smaller from the first version. I believe at one time, the exclusion zone was 2 miles -- at least $21 / 2$ miles surrounding the town,
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and through the process of negotiation, this version was deemed to be the most appropriate by the town.
Q. Sorry. To confirm, you say $21 / 2$ miles outside the city boundary?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: That's correct. That was the version that was reviewed at the open house in June of 2019.
Q. Okay. To confirm, then, the IDP appears to only be 2 miles outside of the town boundary. How would a 2 1/2-mile exclusion zone fit that map?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Well, this is the -- this is the final version. The -- and that intermunicipal development plan boundary that's a consultation boundary, that's where the information is shared by the MD with the town regarding development, land use bylaw amendments, et cetera.

The June 2019 version -- was it larger, Cindy? I'11 just check in our -- yes, the boundary on the -on the west side was as it is exists -- or, sorry, on the east side is 2 miles. The boundary on the west side was $21 / 2$ miles. The boundary on the south was 3 miles. And the boundary on the north was 2 miles.

So through the process of negotiation, that intermunicipal development plan boundary was reduced to the size as shown on this map.
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Q. I see. And to accommodate the large area to the southwest, the reason for that exclusion zone there is because of the winds?

MS. FINLAY: I think to some degree some of these questions would have to also be posed to the town. I think this witness can only answer questions as it relates to the MD's position and reasoning on these.
Q. MR. METHERAL: Well, perhaps I can hear the municipality's and town's position on why.
A. MR. KRIZSAN: That - the prevailing winds was -- we were -- if my memory serves, the predominant factor here was the prevailing wind.
Q. Okay. And it appears to be quite lopsided.

This was -- in the IDP, it also was -- I'm also aware of an interchange, a large highway. This seems to also fit the CFO exclusions and also seems to fit where that highway will be constructed. Is that accurate?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: There is a conceptual plan that Alberta Transportation has as a bypass around the town of Fort Macleod that would be included within this -the south portion of the town of Fort Macleod as well as through the -- the southeast quadrant of the town itse1f, yes.
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Q. Okay. And maybe, lastly, we see a map distinctly outlining CFO exclusion zones. Why are there no other exclusion zones that talk about limiting or encouraging -- maybe "exclusion" isn't right. Why are there no other maps that indicate exclusion areas for other industrial or commercial or other growth?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Through the IDP process, there is a great deal of flexibility for communities to address numerous different types of issues, and -- and for this particular IDP, a CFO exclusion area was the primary issue that was brought forward by -- by the town.

There are other maps in the town. I believe we have a map that indicates, if I'm not incorrect, important intersections and transportation routes. But insofar as a map for exclusion zone, this is the only map that appears in that IDP.
Q. Okay. So is it plausible, then, we could see a large-scale wind or solar farm in the location of where the proposed highway is going to be?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Could you repeat that question?
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is -- is through the Alberta Utilities Commission. Municipalities have very little input. But I would suspect that that type of development in that location would be unlikely.
Q. But there's no restrictions in your IDP?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: There's -- there's no restrictions; however, wind development in proximity to the town of Fort Macleod airport would lead to concerns by the AUC for safety of aviation and -- and I -- and I doubt that type of application would be -- would be approved at that location.
Q. Okay. But you believe that it's appropriate to have a CFO exclusion zone but not exclusion zones or areas for other developments?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: We have a land use bylaw that -- that permits certain development, makes certain development discretionary and prohibits certain development, but there are certain types of development that fall out of our ability to regulate such as wind and solar.
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exclusion zone?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Through the process of negotiation, the -- the two communities, where we started, was a much larger area from the town's perspective and a much -- very much smaller area from the MD's perspective. And through the process of negotiation, that existing version was adopted by both communities.

It was a matter of -- it was a matter of trying to seek the best possible solution inter-municipally while trying to balance potential loss of opportunity for development by -- by our agricultural community.
Q. Okay. Prevailing winds suggests a scientific tone, but you're saying that this was more of a negotiation between the public. Was there any science that helped you arrive at this conclusion?

MS. FINLAY: That's not -- that's not accurately what -- that's not what he said. That wasn't his evidence.

MR. METHERAL: Let me rephrase.
Q. Was science used to arrive at the 1.5 mile setback?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: What we used was the experience of the Town of Fort Macleod and the knowledge of their loca1 conditions and community.
Q. Their experience. What type of experience would allow
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someone to take make that sort of judgment?
MS. FINLAY: Are you asking him to speak for the Town of Fort Macleod?

MR. METHERAL:
Perhaps that's a better question -- you're right. Perhaps that's a better question for the Town of Fort Macleod. Thank you.
Q. And just to confirm, earlier, you were presented with this map. You said -- you were asked if this map came from the November 21 st draft, which was published on your web page?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Yes.
Q. Good. It was published on your November 21 st web page, and I believe the question was whether the CFO area had changed. And I believe your response was that there were no changes to this map between November and today.
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Correct.
Q. Okay. I also understood that the public notice and readings occurred in March of 2021 -- sorry, 2022. How did the town -- or how did the municipality consider that feedback when you talk about give and take and not
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Through the course of a public hearing, the public has an opportunity to provide comments to council on draft bylaws, and there were a number of individuals in attendance who discussed the
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IDP with council. And council heard those comments, the -- and considered amendments that were proposed by the NRCB at that meeting and then further at the March 9th meeting when the -- when the public hearing was resumed.

So there's an opportunity for the public to communicate their thoughts regarding draft bylaws.
Q. So they were able to provide their comments, but, ultimately, there were no changes to the proposed exclusion zone?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: To the exclusion zone, no. There was to the draft document, though.
Q. Okay. Thank you. That would conclude my questions, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Metheral.
Ms. Vance, does Field Services have any questions?
MS. VANCE:
Yes, very short questions.
MS. VANCE CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. This was Mr. Krizsan's evidence characterizing the NRCB as suggesting proposed changes. Now, this question may be more appropriately answered by Ms. Horvath, so whoever can answer this.

Isn't it true that the NRCB did not propose changes but rather encouraged clarification?
A. MS. HORVATH: I would say you are correct.
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5 MR. KENNEDY QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
6 Q. I only have a couple of questions, and I'm not sure who from the MD is best suited to answer them, so I'11 simply ask the questions and leave it to you.

So in Exhibit 20, pdf page 2, so this is your submission to the hearing, and you start off your submissions saying: (as read)
"If the decision to deny the approval proceeded without delay resulting from
either -- and you list two items, (a)
and (b) -- $1(a)$ and (b) -- then Willow
Creek takes no position on the issuance of the approva1."

I think the Panel might be interested in why you would take a position in any event.

And in terms of a little background. It's pretty common that we get municipal participation -- municipal government participation in situations where they are taking issue with the Board's approval of a CFO application. But I think it's fair to say this is the first time the Board will have seen a municipality
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coming forward advocating for an approval of an operation.

So my question simply is why are you taking -- why does the municipality take a position on the NRCB's decision -- approval decision?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Could -- could you repeat that, Bill? I'm not quite sure -- thank you.
Q. So as we see the introduction, so paragraph 1, it says if these two items -- if these two possible sources of delay don't exist, then the municipality takes no position on the Board's consideration and decision to deny this approval.

And my question to the municipality is why are you taking a position in any event?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: We11, as indicated in our -- in our request for review, our concern is about process. And if the Board determines that - that the process has been followed and that the applicant received a fair review of his application and a timely review, then we have -- take -- then we are neither in favour or -- or opposed to the decision of the Board. Our concern here is -- is process.
Q. So and not to be difficult, but the MD has a process if you're receiving an application. The NRCB process, which we've heard much of this morning, we heard about
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the NRCB's process. What specifically is the MD's concern with respect to the NRCB's consideration of this particular application, and how does that affect the municipality?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Un1ike the NRCB, the MD's process for review and approval of development applications is -- is very specifically defined within the Municipal Government Act. There are very specific dates and timelines that the municipality must meet.

This -- the same process, from what we've heard, is, you know, a guideline that -- that 85 percent or 80 percent of the applications should be reviewed within -- or be approved within 65 days. That -- that seems a bit different than what municipalities are -- are required to do. And understanding, of course, that the NRCB is not a municipality.

But these types of timelines arise - lead to situations that we see here. Some of our ratepayers, the clarity on when they can receive an approval, it's -- it's not clear.
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to decision. And so our concern is -- is with process specifically.
Q. And am I fair to say -- so I made the observation that this is a bit of a unicorn in that it's unique. I've never seen it before, and I think it's fair to say I'm relatively familiar with the municipal participation in NRCB reviews.

Do you think what the municipality has done here in terms of an intervention is in the ordinary course of municipal responsibility?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Well, oftentimes, you know, we are placed in a position where we do not have authority for many of the developments that occur within our municipalities, NRCB being one, processes defined why the Alberta Utilities Commission being another. And so, often times, we are thrown into these types of -into these types of situations where we have little authority to comment or regulate.

Our concern is -- and I believe that the MD's position on NRCB regulation of feedlots and confined feeding operations is long -- long understood by those in the industry. Our concern is is that the rules of the game should be well understood, particularly by the app1icants.

These are costly applications. Many of them have
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timelines involved for their operations, and we have concerns that the process must be fair and consistent.
Q. So, essentially, your intervention deals with oversight of the NRCB timelines; is that fair?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: That's our primary concern in this case.
Q. And in paragraph 2 you say, "although there was ample time to review the application." And then you go on. And how did you come to the conclusion of what "ample time to review the application" was? What sources did you access, who did you speak to, and why did you come to the conclusion that you did?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: We have -- we are made aware of these applications when we receive Part 1 and Part 2 applications from the approval officer. We're given opportunity to provide comment.

So part of this comes from our own observations, but also from information provided by the applicant, and some of the experience that we've had with other -- other applications through time.
Q. So this application, $I$ think we saw that it kind of met the performance measures that the NRCB has in place. How many other instances have there been where the MD of Willow Creek has stepped forward and said, "We want to talk about your timelines?"
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A. MR. KRIZSAN:

As far as $I$ know, this is the first time, given -- given the circumstances surrounding this -- the adoption of the IDP.
Q. And when did you first become concerned about the timelines associated with this application?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: We11, we were aware that there was this and other applications that have been submitted. And, of course, we don't receive information on the decision until after the fact, and $I$ became aware of the timeline for this situation on March 22nd when the applicant contacted us.
Q. And so that's the first time you had any concern about -- despite the ample time to review, there were delays -- inappropriate delays?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: That was the -- the information that the applicant provided to us following March 22nd, and based upon the information that we received from him, the council felt that there was a need to express our concerns about timelines.
Q. So is it fair to say you're relying on communications
A. MR. KRIZSAN: That was the only source of information -- primary source of information that we
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had with respect to this matter, yes.
Q. And when did you first reach out to the approval officer and express concerns about the timeliness of the review process?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Perhaps I could turn this to Cindy Chisholm for answering.
Q. Sure.
A. MS. CHISHOLM: Yes, I believe it was March 22nd of 2022. That's emails between myself and Joe Sonnenberg.
Q. And before you sent that emai1, did you have a discussion about the timeliness of the NRCB review process?
A. MS. CHISHOLM: Not myse1f, I have not.
Q. Are you aware of anybody else within the municipality that might have?
A. MS. CHISHOLM: Not that I am aware of.
Q. Thank you, pane1. Those are my questions.

Thank you, Mr. Chair, for your indulgence.
THE CHAIR:
Ms. Roberts, do you have any

MS. ROBERTS: I have one question.
MS. ROBERTS QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. A couple of times comments were made about amendments to the IDP resulting from NRCB input. Ms. Vance
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commented or made a comment about that they were for clarification.

Can someone tell us what those amendments are? I'm curious.
A. MS. HORVATH: I can probably speak to that.

Again, what our process is when we are adopting a new planning document is we do circulate to agencies, NRCB, Alberta Transportation, in this case, the school district as well that's within the close confines.

The response back from Mr. Cumming was, as indicated, that he takes no position on the IDP one way or the other. But for clarification for their approval officers to review applications in accordance with our IDP or MDP, he indicated that we had in our Section 4 -- and I don't have the page number here, I'm sorry -- of our intermunicipal development plan which speaks about confined feeding operations, we had previously referred to approvals, meaning everything, as in registration approvals. And he indicated that permits would be a more appropriate verbiage that would make it more all-encompassing. And the second one was clarification on future expansions of permits.

So, previously, we had indicated that new confined feeding operations were not to be established as well as anything beyond their current animal numbers. And
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so that was a little bit clunky language so it was changed to be quite clear in our first policy 3.1. And it was to read: (as read)
"New confined feeding operations and expansions to existing permits which would increase livestock numbers are not permitted within the confined feeding operation policy area."
Q. Okay. And so these clarifications to the IDP had -- then had nothing to do with the outline of the CFO exclusion zone; is that correct?
A. MS. HORVATH: It was just wording changes, not map changes.

MS. ROBERTS:
Okay. Thank you.
That's all my questions, Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you. Mr. Ceroici?
MR. CEROICI:
I do have one question for Mr. Krizsan.

MR. CEROICI QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. Just maybe to follow up on Bill's probing a bit about the expertise of the town to get involved or comment or make suggestions with respect to the suitability of a particular CFO.

In Exhibit 20, the MD indicates that -- there's a suggestion that the -- this A\&D Cattle application may
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not be complex.
I just wanted to maybe probe a bit as to what expertise was relied upon to make, you know, that statement or that suggestion?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: What section is that?
Q. It's 9 -- sorry -- 10.
A. MR. KRIZSAN: I think that was a judgment that -- that the MD used based upon review of prior applications.

This is a relatively small feedlot operation, not terribly complex in terms of size or location or topography, and given the location and the size, it really -- given the -- compare a number of applications that we've seen that are significantly larger or have challenges, including topography or transportation, et cetera, it was the consensus of -- of the council and the staff that this was a relatively simple application.
Q. So, essentially, it's a best-case scenario without really, you know, considering other potential factors
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Based upon the information we had.
Q. Okay.
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THE CHAIR QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. Mr. van Huigenbos raised an issue around the highway that is proposed by the Alberta Transportation, and I think, Mr. Krizsan, you answered a question that, based on the highway that it would be in the exclusion zone on the southern -- or near the southern portion.

I presume, then, it would fall between the proposed site for this CFO and the town of Fort Macleod; is that right?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: That's correct.
Q. And does it primarily go east-west, then, or?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: It does. From the west boundary, it travels southeast to the south boundary, and then it extends from the southeast -- southwest boundary of the town to the -- to the northeast to reconnect to Highway 3.
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So it's a loop around the south edge of the town.
Q. Okay. Al1 right. So probably -- that's great clarification.

I might ask the town, then, if there's any development -- or is the town boundary right to the southern end of the CFO exclusion zone?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: I believe on that map, it is outlined, the town boundary.
Q. Yes, but does it go right to the southern edge of the exclusion zone?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: It does not, no.
Q. It does not. So is there municipal plans to develop residential or other activities that would be in conflict with a CFO south of the highway up to the edge of the exclusion zone?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: As far as I'm aware of, no.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions.

Ms. Finlay, do you have any redirect?
MS. FINLAY: Just give me a minute.
THE CHAIR: Sure.

MS. FINLAY RE-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. Mr. Krizsan, can you perhaps just describe -- maybe I'11 just back up for a minute.

Is there a council resolution that relates to this
request for review?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: I would have to check our records, but I believe we did have a resolution, yes.
Q. Okay. Who was it that directed you to -- that made the decision with respect to the participation of the MD of Willow Creek in this review?
A. MR. KRIZSAN: Council of the MD of Willow Creek.
Q. Thank you. Those are my questions.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you.
Any follow-up or questions of Ms. Finlay based on redirect?

Hearing none.
Okay. Well, thank you very much, Ms. Finlay and to your pane1. The panel is now released, and thank you very much.
(PANEL STANDS DOWN)
THE CHAIR:
So we turn to Town of
Fort Macleod.
Ms. Agrios, the virtual floor is yours if you and your panel are ready?

MS. AGRIOS:
Yes. Thank you.
My name is Janice Agrios. I am counsel for the Town of Fort Macleod, and the witnesses on behalf of the town are Adrian Pedro, who is the town's director of operations, Kelly Sanford who is the town planning
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and development officer, and Gavin Scott who is a senior planner with the 01d Man River Regional Services Commission.

And so I'd ask that the witnesses be sworn.
A. PEDRO, K. SANFORD, G. SCOTT (For Town of Fort Mac1eod), affirmed

MS. AGRIOS EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. Thank you. Now, I'm just going to outine how I propose to proceed in the interest of making this as efficient as possible.

The town's submissions are at Exhibit 19 and so my proposal is to just briefly review some of the attachments in that exhibit and just direct the Board's attention to some of those exhibits?

I will then have Mr. Scott outline the planning rationale for the CFO exclusion area and then, of course, all of the witnesses will be available to respond to any questions about the exhibits.

THE CHAIR:
That sounds like a great plan. Thank you very much.

MS. AGRIOS:
Thank you.
So the first document, and these are all in Exhibit 19, and so the first page, it's pdf page number 13.
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And so then just again for the Board's reference, this is the final version of the IDP that was adopted by both the town and the MD.

And if I could then go to page 15. For the Board's reference, again, you'11 see with respect to the town, you can see at the bottom there's an indication as to dates of the first, second, and third reading, and the final adoption date of February 28th, 2022.

On page 16-- and, again, this is with respect to the MD now, you'11 see the dates of first, second, and third reading, final adoption date of March 9th, 2022.

I now turn to page 63 in the pdf. And page 63, and the pages that follow are the correspondence that was leading up to adoption of the IDP by both the town and the MD. And so you'11 see there's the email exchanges that were occurring on November 19th, 2021, indicating the agreement reached between the town and the MD with respect to a draft IDP.

That is followed by -- and if you'11 bear with me,

I did not note the page number -- it is page 65.65 in the pdf, that is the version, the draft that had been agreed to in November 2021 and was the version that was posted to both the town and the MD's website on or within a day or two after November 19th of 2021.
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As you've heard, there were some amendments based on a circulation and some of the feedback. The CFO exclusion area from the November 2019 draft is at page 778 of the pdf, and that is the version that was posted in November of 2019, and that remains the same throughout.

If you go to page 103 in the pdf, and, again, this is correspondence from myself going to the Land and Property Rights Tribuna1, and as you heard from Mr. Krizsan, actually, there was the delay or the lag time between November of 2019 and the adoption because there were steps that needed to be taken in order to have the IDP adopted.

And so that is all I wanted to say in terms of the documents that I wanted to draw to the Board's attention.

I will now turn it over to Mr. Scott and ask that he address the planning rationale for the CFO exclusion area.
A. MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Janice.

The planning rationale for the exclusion zone, I guess a few things that have been said prior to by both Mr. Krizsan and Diane Horvath really do cover off the nature and basis of the beast of what is a exclusion zone for CFOs.
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The question of whether or not they're scientific, I would say that that is unlikely as these are political processes for the most part.

Prevailing wind is one of the key factors in the design of these things, and prevailing wind, as a planner, in my estimation, is much larger and perhaps a rationale as to why we started with a larger format for capturing who should be in the exclusion zone. But as political process take place, that gives you what you have currently for the boundary.

The exclusion zone certainly is not an uncommon feature in IDP. It is common across hundreds of municipalities in Alberta. And as such, it is one of the few mechanisms the AOPA provides us in controlling feedlots around communities.

And as one of the few mechanisms, it is certainly taken seriously by municipalities in negotiation, and as a result, very few would avoid the opportunity to implement.

So that's my answer to that question. Thank you.
Q. And, Mr. Scott, I'm going to ask you to comment on one other aspect of the IDP.

MS. AGRIOS:
And if we could go to, it's in Exhibit 19, page 32 of the pdf, and this is the "Servicing Policy Area" map.
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Q. And, Mr. Scott, could you just comment again on how the servicing policy area -- how that area relates to the CFO exclusion area? Are they covering different areas or similar?
A. MR. SCOTT: They are exactly the same except that the town boundary is not included in the servicing area, as the servicing area was meant for the town to provide water to that area indicated in the hatch.
Q. Yes.
A. MR. SCOTT: As such, with the negotiation between the two councils, it was identified that if the MD was going to give up a portion of 1 and for CFO exclusion, something was to be given in return, and that was to provide water to a certain area of the plan, being the exclusion zone.

From that, you can understand that with water capabilities, you could expect a furtherance of residential development, perhaps other development, depending on the processes that would follow. Thank you.
Q. Yes. And thank you, Mr. Scott. Those are all my questions for you.

And, Mr. Chair, that is all the direct evidence on behalf of the town, so the town's witnesses are available to answer any questions.

A. PEDRO, K. SANFORD, G. SCOTT Cross-examined by Mr. Methera1

1 THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Agrios.

6 THE CHAIR:
7 MR. CONNER:
THE CHAIR:
MR. LEWIS:
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Metheral?
MR. METHERAL CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
MR. METHERAL: Yes, hi. You can hear us?
THE CHAIR:
Yes, we can.
Q. MR. METHERAL: We appreciate the municipality's review of our questions or responses to our questions, and we'd like to forward the majority of them on to the town also.

So to confirm, the official date that the town adopted the IDP was February 28th; is that accurate?
A. MR. SCOTT: That's correct.

THE COURT REPORTER: Sorry, was that Mr. Scott? Did you answer? Was it --
A. MR. SCOTT:

THE COURT REPORTER:
THE CHAIR:

Yes.
Sorry. Okay. Thank you.
Scott, yes.
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MR. METHERAL:
I would direct my questions to Mr. Scott.
Q. We'11 move on from the questions about the Alberta Environment and Minister.

Perhaps, though, we could ask a bit about why the exclusion zone -- there is no CFO exclusion zone on the east side of the town.
A. MR. SCOTT: I believe I did answer that question. This is a political negotiation. At one time, it was included. There was a large boundary included around the entire town. And as negotiations happened, that boundary was reduced.
Q. Okay. And, again, to the -- it's larger to the west, southwest. Again, a political negotiation is how we ended up with that area?
A. MR. SCOTT: Yes.
Q. Okay. And the exact distance of 1.5 miles, how did we end up with that setback from the town boundary?
A. MR. SCOTT: Same process.
Q. And what was it based on, the 1.5 mile?
A. MR. SCOTT: Negotiation.
Q. Where does the prevailing winds come in?
A. MR. SCOTT: Through a discussion that was held in camera with council.
Q. Did town council bring in an expert to talk about
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prevailing winds?
A. MR. SCOTT: Not to my knowledge.
Q. Does the town have anybody in employment that is an expert in wind direction or climatologist?
A. MR. SCOTT: Not to my knowledge.
Q. So then who would have provided the recommendations from the town for 1.5 miles setback?
A. MR. SCOTT: Town council.
Q. Are any of the council members experts in weather patterns?
A. MR. SCOTT: They may be. I don't know.
Q. Why do you think -- why do you suppose town council picked prevailing winds to -- as a reason for their setbacks?
A. MR. SCOTT: Prevailing winds is a typical discussion regarding a noxious odour problem with this industry. So, again, like $I$ said, the prevailing wind, from my point of view, would have been much larger as an advisor, but this was negotiated downwards from there.
Q. I see. Much larger. So the prevailing winds bring dust and odour from CFOs? That's the logic?
A. MR. SCOTT: I believe so.
Q. Did they provide any other reasons other than nuisances -- CFO nuisances as to how or why the setback
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was determined?
A. MR. SCOTT: Not to my knowledge.
Q. Does the town realize the AOPA addresses odour and dust from CFOs?
A. MR. SCOTT: The town was given the opportunity to understand issues under AOPA as well as a full understanding of the MDS and its pseudoscience.
Q. You believe that AOPA is based on pseudoscience?
A. MR. SCOTT: I believe MDS is.
Q. And what is your belief on how your councillors determined the setback? How is their science made?
A. MR. SCOTT: Politically based, not scientifically based.
Q. Thank you. Can we have a minute here?

THE CHAIR: Just take a minute.
MR. METHERAL: Sorry for the delay. This information is critical to us, and we wanted to make these questions pointed.
Q. Mr. Scott, when we talk about prevailing winds, was there any studies or technical information that was
A. MR. SCOTT:

No.
Q. So do we even know what the prevailing wind is for the town of Fort Macleod?
A. MR. SCOTT: As answered, I preferred that it
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was a much larger area.
Q. AOPA provides us with some direction on how to calculate MDS. For this application, the CFO size is 2,000 head, and that makes the setback of about 4,268 feet. The exclusion zone that you've created is over -- is approximately 8,000 feet. And, sorry, this is to Category 4 residences.

Do you have any idea if there will be developments in the intermunicipal development plan area? Does the town plan to develop in the CFO exclusion -- sorry. Let me repeat. Does the plan town (verbatim) to develop in the intermunicipal development plan area?
A. MR. SCOTT: The town does not.
Q. Does the town plan to build any residences in the CFO -- or in the intermunicipal development plan area?
A. MR. SCOTT: I should clarify. The intermunicipal development plan area does include the town boundary. So the answer is, yes, they do plan to build.
Q. Okay. The developments that would occur, residents that are built, if there are any, would be based on the municipality; the municipality would be permitting those residences.
A. MR. SCOTT: Which municipality?
Q. The Municipality of Willow Creek?
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A. MR. SCOTT: In the CFO exclusion zone, that is correct.
Q. Okay. So based on the site that we have here, approximately -- I'm just guessing here, was it 3 miles from your house to the town?

MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Closest residence, 2.8.
Q. MR. METHERAL: 2.8 miles from the residence -- sorry, it's about 2.8 miles from the CFO -- proposed CFO to the town boundary?

MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: To the town residence.
MR. METHERAL: To the town residence. This would suggest that there's ample room under AOPA for this type of facility. Why should a CFO exclusion zone be in place if AOPA -- if there's no impact from -- as looked at from AOPA?
A. MR. SCOTT: I think you're trying to ask -have me answer a question that was politically answered by the negotiation of the town and the MD.
Q. Okay. We won't proceed further on that line of questioning. I can see the dilemma you're in.

Lastly, when we talk about odour and dust from agricultural operations, there is actually a feedlot -- or, sorry, an auction market located inside the town boundary.

Why does a CFO exclusion zone -- why is it
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appropriate when there is already an acceptance for agricultural activities even within the town of Fort Macleod?
A. MR. SCOTT: The auction mart is not regulated by NRCB, and the numbers of animals at that location do not meet the threshold of an NRCB approval.

Yes, if possible, that is in a bad location, and, in my opinion, it would be nice to be moved, not likely in the near future.
Q. Thank you for your responses. I would conclude my questioning. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Metheral.
Ms. Vance, do you have questions on behalf of Field Services?

MS. VANCE: I do not. I do not, thank you.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Kennedy, do you have questions?
MR. KENNEDY: I do not. The questions I had have all been addressed. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Mr. Ceroici.
MR. CEROICI: Just a minor clarification.
MR. CEROICI QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. I'm not sure who to address the question to, but it relates to the last page of Exhibit 19 where it refers to -- suggest that the review is inconsistent with the
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agreement to the CFO exclusion area with the MD. And it carries on in Bullet 44 -- sorry, it would be the last page of the main submission. I don't know it -- I think it's page 9. It's Bullet 44. Thank you.

There it talks about -- suggests that the MD's agreement to the IDP, including the CFO exclusion zone, pre-dated submission of the Part 2 application on December 3rd.

So is there a suggestion there by the town that somehow the IDP should have had precedence over the municipal development plan at that point? I'm not sure what the reason for that statement is.

MS. AGRIOS: I can respond, sir, because that does come from the legal argument that I drafted. And the basis for that statement, it simply refers to the MD's position.

And the MD, as of November 19th, had agreed to a CFO exclusion area, so it seemed inconsistent that the MD would then subsequently be supporting a CFO in an exclusion area that they had previously agreed to.
MR. CEROICI:
So, legally, there's no obligation or no impact on the existing MDP; is that correct?

MS. AGRIOS:
Once adopted, it does.
MR. CEROICI:
Yes, but not at this point?
MS. AGRIOS:
Not as of that point in time,
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that's correct. So it was simply commenting on the MD's support -- the support for it, and the support did seem to be inconsistent with the MD having already agreed.

And, again, it still had to work its way through a process. So there's necessarily a time lag between when the agreement is reached and between when there can be advertising and three readings of the bylaw in a public hearing, but in that intervening timeframe, it does seem inconsistent that the MD would then support a CFO when they've already reached an agreement and are in the process of passing the necessary bylaws to implement that agreement.

MR. CEROICI:
Okay. Thank you.
That's all my questions, Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you.
Ms. Roberts?
THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Roberts, you're muted.
Ms. Roberts, you're muted.
MS. ROBERTS: Thank you.
MS. ROBERTS QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. I have one question and it's with regard to planning, so probably Mr. Scott's perhaps to answer.

I would like to know how the town plans for future expansion are considered when you're working towards
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developing an IDP with the county, and how that all kind of fits together with the CFO exclusion zone and such.
A. MR. SCOTT: Well, early on in the process, it was clearly discussed between the town and the MD that the MD certainly should not expect an annexation on behalf of the town at any time soon. We have ample land within the boundaries of the town to grow. That growth will extend to the southern boundary with residential, so that was discussed, as well as other growth plans that had been provided in our own MDP and other concept plans that had been drafted for consideration by town council, all of which was discussed with the MD to give an indication of what exactly the town would look like out into the future as far as its own internal growth.
Q. Thank you.

MS. ROBERTS: That's all, Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIR: Thank you.
THE CHAIR QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. So, Mr. Scott, just to follow up on Ms. Roberts' question, then, and also $I$ guess a follow-up to a question $I$ have with the MD about development, you've answered that part.

So it seems to me -- I just want you to confirm

A. PEDRO, K. SANFORD, G. SCOTT<br>Re-examined by Ms. Agrios

whether my understanding is correct or not, it seems to me that the exclusion zone is a method or politically agreed-to, as you put it, distance for excluding CFOs to protect the existing town, but not future development -- or development within the existing boundaries of the town, not future development or future potential annexations?
A. MR. SCOTT: I think that would be true, and yet the exclusion zone would also protect MD residents, which you have a few here today.

Anybody building a residence in the proximity of this exclusion zone, those MD residents would also be protected.
Q. Thank you. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR: Ms. Agrios, do you have any redirect based on questions?

MS. AGRIOS: Yes, sir, I did have just a few questions.

MS. AGRIOS RE-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. The first one -- and if we could go to Exhibit 19, page 28, this is the CFO exclusion area map.

And, Mr. Scott, I just wanted to clarify, there was some questions of you as to whether or not it would be the MD dealing with permitting in the CFO exclusion area.

A. PEDRO, K. SANFORD, G. SCOTT<br>Re-examined by Ms. Agrios

I just wanted to clarify, based on the map, firstly, the extent of the CFO exclusion area and, again, who would be dealing with permitting within the CFO exclusion area?
A. MR. SCOTT: Yeah. So, quite clearly, there's two jurisdictions here within the town boundary, decisions made by the town and within the MD of Willow Creek side of things, the decisions would be by the MD of Willow Creek.
Q. Thank you. Now, there was also, through questioning, discussion about how the CFO exclusion area is, to some extent, a political process.

As a planner -- and I believe you touched on this, but I just want to make sure that we -- that I heard this correctly -- as a planner, what would have been your recommendation with respect to the size of the CFO exclusion area?
A. MR. SCOTT: Now you're trying to make me a politician.

Certainly, we started from a point of view of what was the maximum extent that we've seen in other municipalities that was acceptable to the NRCB.

I had understood from conversations with other planners, and perhaps even with the input from Andy, that should a municipality seek to go out beyond

A. PEDRO, K. SANFORD, G. SCOTT<br>Re-examined by Ms. Agrios

5 miles, that may be viewed by the NRCB as being an egregious distance.

So we did start at 3 miles in the south and the west and 2 miles on the north and the east. Those parameters were working parameters, but not necessarily recommendations.

Certainly, from the point of view of prevailing winds and the guesswork having to go into those, I do prefer a much larger boundary than was finally adopted.
Q. Thank you. And my last question, and if we could go to page 27 of Exhibit 19.

And so this is dealing with some of the policy related to the CFO, and I'm looking specifically at Policy 3.8. And, again, it's dealing with the obligation of the MD to update its MDP.

And I appreciate that you aren't representing the MD and that you're not here as a politician, but as a planner, given the servicing that's being extended into the CFO exclusion area, what type of development would you expect to see when the MD updates its MDP?
A. MR. SCOTT: I don't expect the MD to physically define what is the potential for growth there, be it residential, commercial or industrial.

I think the plan left itself open to that coming forward through natural processes whereby they would
A. PEDRO
K. SANFORD,
G. SCOTT
Re-examined by Ms. Agrios
circulate to us as proposals came forward, that it wouldn't necessarily have to be residential although the implementation or introduction of water, and water was meant for household use.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Scott. Those are my questions, and that concludes all of the evidence on behalf of the -- on behalf of the town.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Agrios.
Did anyone have a follow-up question based on that redirect?

MS. FINLAY:
We do not.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. And hearing nobody else, I think we're done.

Thank you very much, Ms. Agrios, and to your panel as well. Appreciate the input. Thank you very much.
(PANEL STANDS DOWN)
THE CHAIR:
So, Mr. and Mrs. Conner, it is your opportunity to provide direct evidence or statements that you'd like to make in terms of this CFO permit application.

Now, I just see Shauna Finlay's, kind of, box up here, I'm not sure if we can get back to the -- let's see. Here we go.

Now, Mr. and Mrs. Conner, you're there?
MR. CONNER:
Yes.

## W. CONNER

1 THE CHAIR:
Okay. Were you wanting to speak
to the application?

4 W. CONNER (For Mr. and Mrs. Conner), affirmed
direct evidence. We, more or less, just have what was on my rebuttal. I think it's Exhibit 15. More or less just the main concerns in regards to water leaching, contamination, water usage, and just the smell all around.

We reside outside of Fort Macleod, but we do work in town and we do have kid activities in town, and we've talked to numerous people that have been affected just from the manure spreading on adjacent lands, and so those are kind of our main concerns anyway. But...
THE CHAIR:
Thank you. Is that a11?
MR. CONNER:
Yeah. I don't think -- there's no point in really reading back through it, I don't think, is there?

THE CHAIR:
No. I mean, if you want that to stand on it, that is no problem at all. We don't need to reread it into the record, we have it in the record, we've all reviewed it. So that's fine.

MR. CONNER:
Okay.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you very much.

## W. CONNER

You know what I didn't do is have Ms. Vespa swear or affirm you in, and that was my fault, because you're not represented, so it's my job. I think we could probably still do that now in case there's any questions.

Ms. Vespa, maybe you can make it past tense? Was there anything that he has said?

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, I can take care of that. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Perfect. Ms. Vespa bails me out again.

Excellent. Thank you. So opportunity for some questions to you, Mr. Conner.

MD of Willow Creek, Ms. Finlay. Anything?
MS. FINLAY: No questions, sir.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you.
Ms. Agrios?
MS. AGRIOS:
No questions.
THE CHAIR:
Mr. and Mrs. Lewis?
MR. LEWIS:
We sent in a statement of our concerns already. I guess we don't need to go over that --

MR. CONNER:
I think it's just if you have questions for us.

THE CHAIR:
Yeah, I'11 give an opportunity for

## W. CONNER

4 THE CHAIR:
Mr. Metheral?

MR. KENNEDY: you.

THE CHAIR:
MS. ROBERTS:
THE CHAIR:
MR. CEROICI: thank you.

THE CHAIR: light here, Mr. Conner. I should just ask you a question just because.

MR. CONNER:
THE CHAIR: pretty clear. Thank you very much for your participation today. Thank you.

MR. CONNER:
THE CHAIR:

No, I don't.
Okay. Thank you.

No, we don't have any questions.
Ms. Vance?
No questions.
Mr. Kennedy?
And I have no questions, thank

Ms. Roberts?
I have no questions, Mr. Chair.
Mr. Ceroici?
And I have no questions either,

Wel1, you're getting off pretty .

Might as well, eh?
No, I have no questions. It's

Thank you.
Mr. and Mrs. Lewis, now is your

## D. LEWIS

opportunity to present any evidence or sort of reinforce something that you've already submitted that you'd like the Board to pay particular attention to. So this is your opportunity. Take it away.

MR. LEWIS:
Okay. Thank you.
THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. Did you want him sworn in?

THE CHAIR:
Please swear him in first. Thank you.

THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
D. LEWIS (For Mr. and Mrs. Lewis), affirmed

THE COURT REPORTER: And if I could just ask you to speak up, sir.

THE CHAIR: Yes, I was going to do that. It is a little bit difficult to hear you, Mr. Lewis. So if you could -- and even perhaps -- it's probably -the microphone is probably in the camera at the front of that room. So if you need to move up a little bit, that might help as well. Go ahead.
A. MR. LEWIS: Okay. We have our concerns, we sent them in already. You have them on record.

I had a couple of things I wanted to bring up. When they're talking about the distance of this feedlot -- this proposed feedlot and their distance,

## D. LEWIS

according to the maps we have, it's 1 mile from the town -- from the town boundaries.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. So I would presume in questions, somebody will ask you about where you got that information and how you measured it. I'11 allow the A\&D to do that in a second.

But please proceed if you have other points to make.
A. MR. LEWIS: In the discussions about the wind and the wind experts, and if you were to ask Vestas out there, I'm sure they could tell you exactly how many days out of the year the wind blows from the southwest.

THE CHAIR: So, sorry, you're asking a question of?
A. MR. LEWIS: Previous, there was the discussion about the wind, and they were asking who was an expert about the wind direction out there.

THE CHAIR:
Okay.
A. MR. LEWIS: And I was saying, if you talk to Vestas, they have all the wind mills out there, they could tell you exactly how many days out of the year we have a southwest wind out there, which would eliminate the problem of not having an expert on wind there.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you. And are there other points that you wanted to make, Mr. Lewis?

## D. LEWIS

A. MR. LEWIS:

THE CHAIR:
No, that's -- that's good for now.
Okay. Well, thank you very much.
Ms. Finlay, did you have any questions for Mr. Lewis?

MS. FINLAY:
I do not, thank you.
Ms. Agrios?
No questions.
Thank you.

And the Conners, do you have a question for Mr. Lewis?

MR. CONNER:
No, we have no questions.
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Metheral?
MR. VAN HUIGENBOS:
Not a whole lot of questions concerning how far away I am from town boundaries. I just quickly tried to look it up on Google Maps here --

THE CHAIR: We11, I think, yeah, I mean, I think, you know, really it was for Mr. Lewis. I think he's made an assertion.

Perhaps in your closing, you can address, you know, distances that you're aware of or clarify what you want to clarify in terms of the distances.

So this is your opportunity to ask Mr. Lewis question, but in your final, you might want to do that.

MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Sure. Yeah, then I don't have a whole lot of questions, then, about anything that was

## D. LEWIS



## D. LEWIS

## Questioned by Mr. Ceroici

## 1 MR. CEROICI QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:

2 Q. I'm just curious about in the RFR -- the RFR submission, Exhibit 10, he indicates that they are they -- they feed a large number now, probably close to 1,000 and by adding another $2,000-$ I was wondering where -- the source of the 1,000 number.
A. MR. LEWIS: I was talking about the water in that area. And there's already a calf feedlot in there that probably had approximately a thousand head already, and it's going to draw more on that same water supply.
Q. Okay. So to be clear, you're referring to a different operation of a thousand?
A. MR. LEWIS: Yes. It's different from this, but they're both side by side.
Q. Okay. Thanks for the clarification. That's all my questions.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thanks, Mr. Ceroici.
And, Ms. Roberts, did you have a follow-up?
MS. ROBERTS: I have no questions.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. And, Mr. Ceroici, you've asked the question $I$ was thinking about as well, so thank you.
(WITNESS STANDS DOWN)
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Well, and I don't believe
there will be any redirect. I think I have that right, Mr. Lewis. I think you had just the one quick question from Mr. van Huigenbos. So I think we can move on to -- and thank you very much for your participation today, both Mr. and Mrs. Lewis.

Mr. Methera1, did you and Mr. van Huigenbos have any rebuttal evidence that you want to present today? And if you do, we'11 need to swear you back in.

MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: No rebuttal.
THE CHAIR: Oh, okay. No rebuttal.
And, Mr. Methera1, that's for both parties?
MR. METHERAL: Sorry. This isn't the closing statements?

THE CHAIR:
No.
MR. METHERAL:
Okay. No rebuttal. Thanks.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Thank you very much.
But now it is your turn again. So in closing argument -- we can move to closing argument with A\&D Cattle, Mr. van Huigenbos and Mr. Metheral.

MR. METHERAL: We've accumulated some additional thoughts and positions based on the back and forth that we've seen.

Would the Board be able to give us -- give me ten minutes to add some of these arguments to my closing statement? Because I wasn't prepared -- I didn't know
what $I$ didn't know.
THE CHAIR:
And I think, you know, I mean, we're kind of combining the previous section with this one.

And, Mr. Kennedy, if I've got this wrong, maybe just step in, but, you know, the rebuttal evidence, you know, there's an opportunity for you. It's really in response to what you've heard throughout the day. And if that's largely what it is, I think this is your opportunity and Mr. Kennedy.

MR. KENNEDY:
Yeah, so rebuttal evidence is the opportunity to advance evidence that would rebut the evidence brought forward from other parties during the course of the hearing. And typically it's -- well, it's -- in our proceedings or in our AOPA proceedings, it's not commonly used, because it's not -- folks don't find it necessary. But clearly if you have -- you think you need to rebut some of the evidence you've heard, this is your opportunity.

And then final argument is just that, is you don't get to introduce new evidence. You can refer to the evidence that has been introduced during the course of the proceeding and advocate how you would like the Board to consider that evidence and the outcome that you would like to achieve through your participation.

Is that helpful?
MR. METHERAL:
I'm more focused on final arguments and -- and having a bit of time to prepare -ten minutes to prepare for my final argument. Are we talking about this now?

THE CHAIR:
We are -- I think we are, you know, on schedule --

MR. METHERAL:
(Indiscernible).
THE CHAIR:
-- No, I think we are on -- we are on schedule, and I think it is appropriate to have a bit of a break -- post 1 unch break, anyway. I have no issue with taking, you know, until 3:30, give you a bit of time, and then that will give everyone a bit of time to kind of get their notes together. If there's no objections, break unti1 3:30 and then complete the hearing with closing arguments. Are there any objections to doing that.

MS. VANCE: No objections here.
THE CHAIR: Okay. Let's break for just over 15 minutes and re-adjourn at 3:30.

## (ADJOURNMENT)

THE CHAIR: Welcome back, everyone.
It is just past 3:30. I don't see Mr. Methera1, he's first up, but I see Mr. van Huigenbos. Oh, there we are.

So, Mr. van Huigenbos, are you going to be presenting as well or Mr. Metheral? Or is it just you? MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: Yeah, it's probably going to be mostly Cody -- or Mr. Methera1.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. I see everybody's name plate is up, and I'm sort of making the assumption everybody is ready to roll and perfect. We kind of stick to these times, and you folks today have been really good with that, so I really do appreciate it. It really makes the day run smoothly, so thank you. Okay. That little flash is perfect. Thanks. Thanks, everyone.

Okay, Mr. Metheral, closing arguments.
MR. METHERAL: Great. This is what I've been looking forward to. Feels like a long day in this seat.

Okay. I would present some closing arguments, and Mr. van Huigenbos would follow up with a small piece also.

So, we would like to thank the Board and other

In summary, A\&D Cattle state the following: It's our position that this application was quite straightforward. It met all the technical and planning requirements that were submitted back in November of 2021. There were no changes to the application after November 30th, 2021.

However, through no fault by A\&D Cattle, the application saw unwarranted delays associated with the review process. Some of these delays were intentional and some perhaps not.

A\&D Cattle believe the decision to delay public notice due to the NRCB office closure was inappropriate. NRCB office closure was at the end of December and into January of 2022. However, this policy delayed the review process and ultimately delayed the approval officer's decision.

It's our position there were 16 working days in December prior to the NRCB office closure. The approval officer justified the December delay, suggesting it was important for staff to be available and that field office be open in case there's public review -- in case public review is warranted.

However, it's understood that the Lethbridge field office has been closed since 2020 due to COVID restrictions, and NRCB field office was not open in

December of 2021.
While AOPA does require 20 days for public notice, it does state that these days need to be consecutive nor that the notice period be delayed to accommodate statutory holidays for government days off.

The approval officer and the director confirmed that the AOPA approval officer was working remotely and had all the tools he needed to communicate with the public. Therefore, A\&D Cattle believe that the argument provided to delay this decision was not suitable.

During this hearing, we also heard new testimony that the approval officer had to accommodate the publication dates for the Fort Macleod Gazette. I believe Mr. Cumming mentioned that Friday was the deadline for the following Wednesday date publication.

In this -- in this case, A\&D Cattle would accept that the public notification could have been moved to as early as December 8th. This calculates to 12 working days' delay in December.

Mr. Sonnenberg agreed that he could have met publication dates in December; however, his main argument was still based on the NRCB office closure policy.

Equally important to Mr. van Huigenbos is that he
was not aware of the NRCB closure policy until it was mentioned to him in December. Given a deadline, Mr. van Huigenbos could have adjusted his submissions to meet any deadline given to him. But how should he have known this? As late as November 16th in his email, the approval officer was talking about proceeding with public notice. Okay?

A\&D Cattle also believe there were delays during the review process itself. For example, the approval officer was required to be prompted in order to provide statements of concern, and, again, checking on the status of the application, there was a request for additional information. It's estimated there were over 40 working days from January, February, and into March, and yet it's as late as March 14th where we see the approval officer is looking for more information.

A\&D Cattle -- A\&D Cattle was disappointed that the approval officer was still collecting information that could have been easily collected earlier.

A switch in gears, I've made an effort to better
approval, which was sent for internal review prior to the adoption of the IDP by the County. It was determined that this process review was initiated by March 16th, so it's likely that the approval officer had made his decision prior to that date.

I would like the Board to consider when the approval officer actually made his decision. The issue date becomes less relevant because AOPA speaks about when the approval officer determines if the MDP or other planning tools are considered. This logic would determine that as the approval officer went through the review process, he made his decision prior to March 16th.

Regarding the appropriateness of the IDP and CFO exclusion zone, testimony was given that the CFO exclusion zone is based on a negotiation between the town and county. The distance from the town and direction of the CFO exclusion zone was set based on prevailing winds because of the potential for nuisance from other CFOs. It was determined without scientific merit or documentation; however, we know that AOPA addresses nuisance and impact from neighbours.

Without clear, scientific reasoning, how can the municipality reasonably adopt an exclusion zone that is fair and appropriate?

In conclusion, the A\&D Cattle would suggest that their feedlot application experienced unwarranted delays throughout the NRCB process and had these delays not occurred, it is likely that the application could have been assessed based on the MDP which was in place prior to March 9th.

In total, we estimate about 28 days of delay. Perhaps these dates are up for negotiation, but the point is, without the delays, it is possible that the approval officer could have issued his decision in February.

Further, had the approval officer been efficient, as some of his other actions, the decision could have been even earlier than that.

A\&D looks forward to the Board's decision and requests that the Board reverse the approval officer's decision and it grant an approval for the site.

Thank you. Thank you. I would pass -- I would like to hear from Mr. van Huigenbos with his thoughts as a final argument, too.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. van Huigenbos.
MR. VAN HUIGENBOS: So a little bit of a background on myself. I was born on a family farm northwest of Fort Macleod. I lived there until we moved off in 2017 when my dad sold the farm.

On June 9, 2015, I broke my back, burst my spleen and fractured one of my ribs when a loader bucket landed on me. Spent ten days in the hospital and left the hospital with a back brace and was not allowed to lift more than five pounds for half a year.

A month and a half later, I was working on the farm driving equipment. Two months later, I was doing the same work as I was doing before -- excuse me here -- before my accident, just being a little more careful.

In 2017, my dad sold the farm to my brother, and I was hoping myself that one day I'd be an owner on the farm but that didn't happen because my brother took the farm a long ways, and it wasn't possible for me to become owner there. So I had to start looking for my own place.

I started driving around and looking at my neighbours' places and we found a farm, a neighbour or someone that wanted to sell, but all of a sudden -- he was looking to sell in spring, but all of a sudden he sold to his neighbour.

In the spring of 2021, the NE 27-8-26-4 went up for bids. We ended up -- knowing that it had a potential for a small feedlot and that it was quite a ways away from town, we put in a bid that was well over
market value and ended up getting it. We spent some money to get the soil tested and engineered and waited a long time to get a decision. It was not easy for us to wait this long to get a decision, but it got harder after we found out it got denied.

The denial was very hard on my wife and me since our second child is on the way and we live in an old small house that doesn't have room for a growing family.

Starting a feedlot would give us a good income and then we'd be able to build a new house. This denial made it feel like we had no more future and that we would have to sell and move back to town. We had one chance to get our permit and that was to have a Board review, which we are having right now.

This costed a large sum of money to hire Cody Metheral and many hours collecting information. Between the denial and this Board review, there are many days that I was frustrated, disappointed, depressed, angry. I don't know what we'll do if we don't get this permit. This application is for a small feedlot and cannot be compared to a 25,000 head feedlot.

According to the AOPA, the footprint of a 2,000 head feedlot is 500 metres, but the economical impact
of this would be a lot -- would be much greater. The surrounding land increases in value due to manure and demand. Everyone benefits when a small local business gets ahead. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. van Huigenbos and Mr. Methera1. Much appreciated.

Ms. Vance, do you have any closing arguments?
MS. VANCE:
I do. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
And thank you to Mr. Metheral and Mr. van Huigenbos for your submissions in front of me.

As our written submission says, the NRCB Field Services and the approval officer aren't taking a position on the outcome or remedy of this hearing today, and I'11 refer the Board to our written submissions, which is at Exhibit 21.

I don't see any utility in repeating information that is already before the Board. And, for the most part, you will recall that our submission provides relevant information without taking a stand. And, of course, the one exception relates to the alleged delay, which is a word that has been used in many different senses today.

You've heard evidence from Mr. Sonnenberg on his recollection of how this application file unfolded. You've heard that he, in no way, deliberately,
improperly, or unnecessarily delayed issuing this decision.

Not only do approval officers handle multiple files at once, but, of course, many of the hiccups that may happen in a file are not entirely under their control either.

Mr. Sonnenberg told us today that he was trying to get this one out the door. He told us he was working in the ordinary course. And I observed that he issued his decision within the 65-day -- working-day performance goal that -- that we have internally here at the NRCB.

Still on the issue of the timelines, I might just reply to A\&D Cattle specifically.

It was suggested that the approval officer made his decision on a date other than April 1st. I would say, first of all, that this is a brand-new argument that nobody has seen in this proceeding today. And I suppose I can just say that there is no evidence to support that. The evidence is that the approval officer made his decision, issued it on April 1st.

In relation to the holiday closure, I think that has been well covered in testimony. Of course, if the Board feels that the longstanding practice at the NRCB of not having public notice bridge that holiday
closure -- if that is no longer a valid or reasonable practice, we, of course, welcome guidance from the Board on how this can still protect the integrity of public notice and public input on which the NRCB so greatly relies.

There also appears to be some misunderstanding on the part of Mr. van Huigenbos and perhaps even on the part of the MD of Willow Creek as to the role of the NRCB. And I think I can speak for our organization to say that we do strive to get out there and provide information on the NRCB, and we would be happy to continue to do that.

The NRCB is a regulator. Our staff do their job under AOPA, which is a statute, that governs their actions. The NRCB, as a regulator, is an independent arm's-length agency of the Government of Alberta. We do not act or represent producers. We do not act for or represent municipalities or environmental groups; we simply do our job under AOPA.

And, finally, there was some suggestion that Mr. Sonnenberg was not as efficient as he has been in other files or maybe not as efficient as other approval officers have been on other files.

A\&D made this argument, and the MD of Willow Creek also argued that this file should have been processed
in the same manner and timeline as Double $H$. That was the decision that they used.

And the two arguments -- the two decisions that A\&D cited, I would observe that one wasn't even issued by this approval officer.

And it's not quite comparing apples to oranges, but I'm thinking it would be like trying to find two apples that are exactly the same in an orchard full of apples. This is really an impossible thing to do. The NRCB has issued thousands of decisions over the past years and they are all different, I believe.

You've listened to Mr. Sonnenberg speak, and Mr. Cumming as well, about how each file is different. And you've also heard that he had a dozen or so files on his desk at that time.

I submit that, given the evidence that is before the Board, there is no merit to the suggestion that there was unwarranted delay in this matter. Otherwise, as stated before, we do not take a position on the other issues under consideration. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Vance.
Ms. Finlay, MD Willow Creek?
MS. FINLAY:
Hello?
THE CHAIR:
Hello. It's all working.
MS. FINLAY:
So the MD of Willow Creek's
submissions on this matter are at Exhibit 20. And I don't propose to read through those. The Board is capable, and as the Chair has indicated, those submissions have already been reviewed, and so I don't propose to do that. But I do want to address a couple of points and highlight a few points in our submissions.

The first thing that $I$ wanted to address relates to Willow Creek's participation in this proceeding. Municipalities may not have participated in these proceedings in the same way as Willow Creek in this proceeding, but there's nothing that precludes them from doing so.

And, in fact, in other types of regulatory proceedings, municipalities do participate, and they do so to support in some cases their constituents. For instance, when there are routing decisions for power 1 ines through certain areas, residents will often intervene, but sometimes so does the municipality.

So our submission is there's nothing inappropriate or contrary to legislation or otherwise with respect to Willow Creek intervening here.

Its concerns are limited, and they're limited to the process and, in part, part of what the review process allows the municipality to do is obtain more
information about that process and ask questions about that process.

And the Willow Creek's position is narrow. If that delay -- or if any of the delays were in the ordinary course or they're the delays that result from ordinary processing, then Willow Creek takes no position on the issuance of the approval.

Specifically, it was concerned about intentional delay resulting from the two things that are identified in paragraph 1, which are that it would have been delayed by the pending approval of the IDP or that it was delayed to account for the pending decision with respect to Double H Feeders.

And so through these proceedings today, we've had lots of evidence on the nature of any delays. And the reality is there were some delays. The real issue is were they inordinate? Were they unreasonable? And this Board will have to determine if that's the case.

I think the other thing I really wanted to point out and direct your attention to is the technical document from the approval officer, which is an attachment to the Willow Creek submissions.

And the only thing that $I$ want to say about that is that I invite you to review it. As Ms. Vance just stated point, you review -- the NRCB receives many of
these applications. There are thousands of decisions on them. And, of course, you review these on a regular basis. And I think you are in a very good position to review that technical document and come to your own conclusion about how that review proceeded and when most of the review was done. And you're in a good position to determine, again, whether there's any suggestion or whether it's valid that there were delays that were inordinate.

So that's what I wanted to say about that.
The other point that $I$ wanted to make about Willow Creek's participation is that, of course, these decisions -- and I believe that's why municipalities are affected parties and able to initiate reviews is because, of course, these decisions do have an impact on them and on the communities and ratepayers that reside within them.

And so Willow Creek understands that the NRCB is a provincial regulator. They understand that. But those decisions and those processes do have an impact on the municipality, on what occurs in the municipality, and it has an impact on the ability of its residents to make a living. And that's not to say that in this case, the application should go one way or the other. That's the tough decision that you have to make.

But to suggest that the municipality has no interest in ensuring and understanding the process through which those decisions are made is not accurate. They do have an interest in that.

The last thing that I want to touch on very briefly is the question of when the approval officer should have considered compliance with the IDP. And what I want to say with respect to that is simply you have our submissions on that. It is conceded that the decisions that we've referred to at least with respect to the consideration of compliance with land use bylaws, yes, there are decisions that suggest that changes after an application has been made do not app1y.

But it's fully conceded that in the case of both Love v. Flagstaff and Boyd, both of those did deal with permitted uses or what uses they were permitted for a short period of time within which the application was made.

The reality is, at least with the work that I did,
I could not find a comparable situation to this, and I would certainly submit that this isn't a circumstance where the applicant has a vested right as of the date that they make an application. It is a discretionary application, and an approval officer has to make a
determination based on all the information that they have whether or not they're going to grant the application.

The only thing that $I$ would high1ight, though, is the wording of Section 20 , which is, of course, the section of AOPA that requires the consideration of compliance with an MDP. And, of course, it does say "MDP." I'm not going to go into the debate that occurred during the hearing of the Double H Feeders decision. I think an MDP does have to comply with an IDP, and, therefore, I don't disagree with a finding that says, effectively, when you've made an IDP revision, your MDP is required to be compliant.

But when you look at how the review process is to occur, it does seem to suggest that that review process occurs before the application goes out to the public, because if it is non-compliant with the MDP, then it gets denied. And if it is compliant, then you go on with the public notice.

And so certainly one conclusion that this Board could come to is that that is the appropriate time to consider whether there's compliance with an IDP.

And other than that, I'm certainly to open to answering any questions, but those are our final arguments.

Thank you, Ms. Finlay.
We'11 move to the town of Fort Macleod.
S. AGRIOS:

Thank you. And for the Board's reference, the town submissions are found at Exhibit 19, and that is primarily where I will be referring to various pages in that submission.

This development is within the CFO exclusion area as identified in the town of Fort Macleod/MD of Willow Creek intermunicipal development plan. Both municipalities agreed to the CFO exclusion area on November 19th of 2021. There was time required after that date in order to implement the agreement, and so both the town and the MD gave first reading to the IDP bylaw in late January of 2022. The town passed its IDP bylaw February 28th of 2022, and the MD passed it on March 9th of 2022.

Now, in Mr. van Huigenbos's submission -- so I'11 just give you the reference; it's at Exhibit 22, page 6 -- he acknowledges that he was aware of the IDP as of November 3rd. And according to his submission, Joe Sonnenberg, approval officer, came for a site visit and helped fill out the Part 2 application.

We also discussed the town of Fort Macleod and the MD of Willow Creek's proposed IDP.

As stated I would like to see that this application gets a decision soon.

So he was aware that there was an IDP coming as of early November and prior to submission of the Part 2 application.

In addition, as you heard, the draft IDP that references the CFO exclusion area, that was publicly posted to both the towns and the MD's website on or within days of November 19th of 2021. And, again, that showed the CFO exclusion area, which was ultimately passed.

And so it could not have been a surprise to the applicant that there was a CFO exclusion area that ultimately was adopted. I say "he." He was aware that something was coming early November, 2021. It was publicly made available in later November 2021 all prior to submission of the Part 2 application.

As you also heard today, the IDP, in fact, had been in process going back to 2019, and the original versions of the IDP were proposing a much larger CFO exclusion area. And you heard that the MD, in fact, had an open house going back to 2019.

So, again, this was publicly known and publicly out there that there was a CFO exclusion area under discussion between the town of MD and had been for a
number of years.
I want to address the arguments regarding timing and at what point in time -- or what bylaws the approval officer should consider and at what point in time. And these points are addressed in my submissions at paragraphs 33 to 41 , and that starts at page 7 of the pdf Exhibit 19.

And so the starting point is that land use decisions are made as of the date -- the bylaw is in effect as of the date of the decision, not the date of the application.

And I have cited cases to this effect at paragraph 34, and those are found on pages 7 and 8 on the pdf at Exhibit 19.

In its submissions, the MD referenced the Boyd Builders case and made a suggestion that the decision should be based on the law enforced at the time of the application. Boyd is distinguishable from the present case. It did have very unique facts in Boyd.

To begin with, in Boyd, the new bylaw -- so the bylaw changed because of a process in place in Ontario for adoption of bylaws. The new bylaw actually wasn't even in effect at the time of the decision. So it wasn't in effect at the time of the application; it wasn't in effect at the time of the decision, so
clearly not applicable.
The more important point for Boyd is there was an express finding of bad faith. And so in Boyd, the Court had found that the purpose of passing the bylaw was in order to defeat a particular -- that particular application.

In this case, we don't have those facts. There's no suggestion of bad faith with respect to the IDP. The IDP had been in process for years prior to this application. It was agreed to prior to the Part 2 application.

And an IDP is something that's mandated by the Municipal Government Act. So, in fact, what the town and MD were in the process of doing was following the requirements imposed on them by the Municipal Government Act to adopt an IDP.

The IDP had also cited the decision of Love v. Flagstaff as a supporting -- again, citing that decision to support that the decision should be based on the bylaws as of the date of the application.

The MD, I submit, has misinterpreted the Love decision. So Love was dealing with a change in facts post application; it was not dealing with a change in the law. And so the Love decision, the Court found that a subsequent change in facts cannot defeat a
permitted use application, but it does not deal with the impact of a subsequent change in the law.

And, of course, I've cited all the cases that say with respect to changes in the law, it's the law in effect at the time the decision is rendered.

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, is that both the Boyd decision and the Love decision are based on permits that the applicant was entitled to as of right. So the Court was able to find that the applicant's rights crystalized when the application was made, because as soon as the application is made, the applicant is entitled to a permit.

That is not the case with respect to an application for an approval under AOPA. The approval officer does have discretion whether to approve or deny. And Ms. Finlay, I believe, quite fairly conceded that an applicant under AOPA does not have a vested right or a crystalized right as of the date of the application.

And so, therefore, the usual law -- and that is that the decision is based on the law in effect at the time of the decision -- that is what's applicable.

So it's my submission that the approval officer was correct to deny the approval based on the IDP CFO exclusion area that was in effect as of the date of the
decision.
And so we now come to the NRCB and what should the NRCB do, because, of course, this Board is not bound by the IDP. But, nevertheless, I submit this Board should follow the IDP unless there are sound reasons not to do so.

And you heard from both planners, Ms. Horvath and Mr. Scott, as to the planning rationale for the CFO exclusion area, and some of it is actually discussed in the IDP itself, some of it is discussed in the submissions.

And so as a starting point, the land in the south corner of the town is designated as future residential in the town's MDP. That is found at Exhibit 19, starts at page 138. The land use map is at page 139 -- these are the pdf page numbers -- 139, and there are the 1and use descriptions at page 140.

And so as a starting point, again in recognition of the future planned residential within the town, and as you've heard the prevailing winds, the CFO exclusion area was confined to the southwest corner of the IDP plan area. So the idea was to try to balance the needs of agricultural users with residential uses. And so when you look at the IDP, again as Mr. Scott indicated, it did start with a complete -- a complete circle
around the town but that was reduced, and so it was reduced again to the area where the future planned residential is within the town. It was based on the prevailing winds and, therefore, confined to just a portion of the IDP area.

The IDP recognizes existing CFOs, and it also preserves existing policies for ILOs. The point is or the purpose is to minimize conflicts and nuisances between CFOs and residential uses. It does represent a compromise reached between the town and the MD as to reasonable restrictions for CFOs. And, as Mr. Scott described it, it was a political negotiation.

As a planner, he would have recommended, or he did recommend, a larger area, but it was part of a political negotiation, and part of that negotiation and what you see in the IDP was there is an area designated as a CFO exclusion area, but that same area also now qualifies for municipal services from the town.

Now, this is important because there was -- and I did hear some discussion regarding the highway -- or the future planned highway and future development plans in the MD.

Exhibit 19, page 32, that is where the servicing area is set out. And as you've heard, the introduction of services into the CFO exclusion area provides an
opportunity for future residential development. And so this includes areas south of the future planned highway as well because those areas also qualify for future servicing.

And so given the potential for servicing as you've heard, there is an expectation for eventual residential development in this area.

So what you have is the town's MDP, future residential development in the south corner of the town, and you also have now an IDP that provides for an extension of services into the CFO exclusion area and that provides an opportunity for future residential development in the County -- sorry, in the MD as well.

And so based on the foregoing, the town's request is that this Board uphold the approval officer's decision to deny the application based on the property being located within the CFO exclusion area.

I'd be happy to answer any questions. Those are al1 my submissions.

THE CHAIR:
Sorry about that. On mute.

MR. CONNER: Not much. More or less just to touch on Ms. Agrios' town (verbatim), on the fact that we believe if you were going to pay above market value
for 1 and and do a bunch of research and put money in and invest, create a feedlot, that you would have initially talked with somebody at the MD. It's not like the IDP is a new process that's only been around for six months or a year; it's been around for a few years.

And so you think that you would have -- because, eventually, you'd need a development plan or something with the MD to construct buildings and everything for a feedlot, that you would have been in initial conversation where this IDP would have been broughten up, and I think that would have saved a lot of heartache. But that's kind of our only finishing comment, I guess.

THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Conner.
Mr. Lewis.
MR. LEWIS: Yes, I just want to comment as a person who is going to be living out there, and what an impact it's going to have on the community out there.

First concerns are our health, our air quality, our water quality, and quantity, the odour and dust, our property values. And the big thing is manure management.

Where we live, the land based for manure spreading will be to the north, the west, and the south of us.

So we're completely surrounded by land that's going to have manure on it eventually. And that's my concern, just as a person who is -- who is living out there and wants to stay living out there. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Lewis.
So, Mr. van Huigenbos, Mr. Metheral, you have an opportunity for reply to the arguments made after your submission on closing argument. Did you have anything in reply?

MR. METHERAL:
Yes, hi.
I do have a couple of quick comments.
We do appreciate that the NRCB field staff have asked the Board to review the NRCB office closure policy. We are in a strong belief, and we will reiterate, this policy resulted in a direct delay of the approval process -- a review of this application, full stop.

The NRCB provided justification for the policy, but A\&D Cattle do not believe their argument has merit.

The approval officer had all of the tools he needed to do his job in December.

A\&D Cattle do appreciate the arguments from Ms. Finlay regarding when an approval officer should consider the appropriateness of an MDP. This topic was not really explored today in the hearing, but I think

Ms. Vance will find the basic arguments in the County's submission, Exhibit 20.

Like the NRCB office closure policy, we would encourage the Board to fully explore when the approval officer actually reviewed the MDP and issued his decision. Perhaps it is before the issue date. I would repeat that. We would encourage the Board to fully explore when the approval officer considered the MDP. It is possible that it was prior to having the team review the document through the internal review process and not when it issued.

Ms. Agrios, I'm sure I said that wrong, would suggest that Mr. van Huigenbos was aware of the IDP as being discussed, and that he should not be surprised by the CFO exclusion zone. After three years of negotiation, including a provincial tribunal with multiple CFO exclusion zones and multiple IDP areas, neither the town nor the County's historic actions would suggest that there was anything tangible from A\&D Cattle for them to consider.

I would conclude those comments for now. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Very we11. Thank you, Mr. van Huigenbos and Mr. Metheral.

We11, that concludes the evidentiary
cross-examination, closing arguments, so, essentially, the hearing process.

I'd just like to close with a few comments and a few thank yous, if you don't mind, and we are just after quarter after 4. So one of my first thank yous is for folks keeping focused and time so we could complete the hearing in one day.

And on behalf of the entire Panel, I would like to thank everyone for their participation in the review process. You know, no doubt, these are a little intimidating and we heard a little bit of emotional evidence given by -- or testimony given by Mr. van Huigenbos, and so -- and one of the neighbours. It is a formal process that you're not used to, not comfortable with necessarily, so we really appreciate the fact you came out, you gave it your best and you provided information for us that will be extremely useful in reaching our decision.

Field Services, thank you for bringing your -- well, for legal counsel. And, Mr. Cumming and
believe that there's actually human beings behind the scenes doing this. It just seems like it's just a computer generating this. So thank you very much to our document managers. It really makes our job easier, and it makes the hearing process run smooth1y when we have the documents up on the screen so everybody can see what we're referring to as we move along. So thank you very much.

Ms. Vespa, once again, a great job on keeping me in line and also the transcripts, which will be coming out very shortly, but thank you very much for the hard work on court reporting.

And also to Mr. Elhakim from MNP in ensuring that our Zoom virtual platform operated flawlessly today.

And on behalf of the Board, I would like to thank Ms. Friend and Mr. Kennedy. The hearing is arranged and works because of Ms. Friend's behind-the-scenes work. Thank you very much.

And, of course, the Panel relies heavily on Mr. Kennedy and his questioning and also his advice through the whole process for the Pane1. So thank you very much to both of you.

And as I've said, we have received a lot of helpful information through both direct evidence and through the cross-examinations. We will consider the
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