

## RFR Rebuttal Letter

To: Laura Friend

Subject: Re: NRCB Notice of Filed RFRs and Rebuttal Opportunity for G&S Cattle Ltd. RA21045

From: Mike and Gaylene Bodnaresk

Status: **Directly Affected Party**

Legal Land Description: 5-02-046-34-SW

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

We agree with the NRCB decision of September 13, G & S Cattle Ltd. RA21045 to deny the construction of a 4000 beef finisher confined feeding operation, and request that a review should be denied. In the decision summary that the: “proposed CFO would pose materially negative and long-lasting effects on the community, and that it would not be an appropriate use of the land,” is the best conclusion. We also ask that the Lake communities also be included as an “affected party.”

We own an acreage in a residential zoned area, at present we do not have a residence on the property and have used the acreage primarily for recreation purposes enjoying the lake for boating and fishing. The 40 acre property is located at the highest point dividing the Pigeon Lake and Battle Lake water shed regions, it is within the Boreal forest with some of the largest birch, pine and poplar trees in Alberta, we have worked towards developing the landscape with a future homestead in mind. We have a fenced in large garden area providing vegetables and fruits for family and friends with fruit trees including Saskatoon, Evans Cherry, Choke cherry and Apple trees. We intended to start building this year a retirement residence, however we have put this on hold as we are not willing to invest in a home at a location that would be problematic to our health, as studies have shown that over 168 gases are emitted from CAFO waste. Ironically if the CFO is allowed to be constructed, then under the County of Wetaskiwin bylaw we will not be permitted to build a residence.

1.4.4 A new residence is not permitted within the Minimum Distance Separation of an existing Confined Feeding Operation/Intensive Livestock Operation, unless the residence is associated with the operation.

The majority (not all were known until the NRCB ruling) of the affected parties have agreed to support Gloria Booth and Dave Labutis to be our representatives along with the PLWA as the CFO is entirely located within this region. For this reason we agree that the NRCB considered the PLWMP an appropriate document. We are aware of the millions of dollars spent to improve and protect the Lake and the fresh water sources and agree with the ruling that adding a CFO into the mix will have a negative impact on the Lake and consequently the whole community.

We can not think of any positive impact this CFO would have on our community, most of the employees are not local, most of the feed is not local, only the nuances of increased traffic, noise and stink are, and that is already an issue at the existing load. Furthermore the property depreciation is an unknown at this time but will most definitely impact resale value, studies have shown that proximity is a factor ranging

from 10% within a mile and half to 40% at closer range, definitely not a positive. In short we are not against agriculture within reasonable limits, but this proposal far exceeds the limits that this community and lake can withstand. As such we agree with Nathan Shirley's(Approval Officer) conclusion.

Regards,

Gaylene & Mike Bodnaresk