September 27, 2022

RFR Rebuttal Letter- RA21045

To: Laura Friend

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

From: Julie Roussel

Status: Directly Affected Party

Legal Land Description: SW 3-47-2 W5M

Email:

Mailing Address: Leduc Alberta T9E 6L8

Statement of Concern

The NRCB decision of September 13, G&S Cattle Ltd. RA21045 to deny the construction of a 4000-beef finisher confined feeding operation should stand. Respectfully a request for review should be denied.

As per my original letter submitted April 2022, still stands but additionally, I personally agree with the decision as stated in NRCB item #10. "Conclusion Approval RA21045 is denied due to it not being an appropriate use of land and due to unacceptable effects on community, proposed CFO would pose materially negative and long-lasting effects on the community, I have also concluded that it would not be an appropriate use of the land."

Having read the Request for Review, please consider the general statements that are relevant to me:

- I am an acreage owner
- I am directly affected
- I am immediately down stream of the proposed CFO; we are not able to utilize us well for any water requirements even to provide water to the animals or water our gardens.
- I appreciate living in the transitional area of the community between farms and Pigeon Lake.
- Protecting fresh water sources is essential to sustaining traditional farming operations and we support all watershed management efforts.
- As I am nearing retirement in the area, living on our farm, I depend on the close proximity of the shops at the Village at Pigeon Lake to get my groceries and medication. I can also do my banking, mail letters, and meet my friends for coffee.
- We recognize that the Village at Pigeon Lake would not have been built without the large number of local lake residents who live in the area because of the high value of a healthy lake.
- If the Village at Pigeon Lake does not thrive this will affect all the farmers and acreage owners in the area.
- I support the findings of the expert panel presented in the rebuttal of the directly affected parties--Gloria and Randy Booth and Dave Labutis.
- We ask that the NRCB grant directly affected party status to all of the parties from our community that have requested directly affected party status. These parties are part of our community and will be impacted by this decision.
- A healthy lake in this area ensures we have a strong business community and the economic benefit from tourism supports our community including farmer, acreage owners, lake residents, Maskwacis Four Nations, and visitors. For example, we have a pharmacy, grocery store, bank, post office without having to travel an hour away.
- We fish, swim and boat in Pigeon Lake
- We use the lake and benefit from the amenities of this recreational area.

 Make statement about the impact on the local community versus his stated impact on the Effects of the Decision on the Applicant

Therefore, I wish to comment the following reference and comments on the "Grounds for Review of the Decision".

In reference to the decision summary on "negative impacts on the community and inappropriate use of land" and linking this with supporting evidence from the County of Wetaskiwin Municipal Development Plan and other evidence you can provide. For example:

Statement:

• The "unacceptable negative impact on the community" is a valid aspect of the NRCB decision. The NRCB Board must understand that in this community, which has established a plan and standard for watershed management and invested millions of dollars in watershed management to protect fresh water sources, no level of risk to the economy, environment, as well as human and ecological health is acceptable. This includes the County of Wetaskiwin's policy on traditional farming as outlined in the municipal development plan.

Examples of Evidence:

• County of Wetaskiwin their land use plan, as stated in the MDP, makes a commitment to Quality of life and environment. (See snippets from the MDP below)

Municipal Development Plan County of Wetaskiwin No. 10

Statement of Purpose

"The County of Wetaskiwin will strive to maintain a balanced approach to diverse development while protecting our agricultural heritage and rural environment."

The statement above was developed by the Strategic Planning Committee based on public input and issues raised by County staff.

Development and land use decisions will be guided by the Statement of Purpose. Land use planning requires a balancing between the rights of an individual landowner and the long term greater public interest. The County will try to avoid negative impact to environment and inefficient use of natural resources when making decisions.

Objective 1.2 Protect agricultural land to remain in production

Traditional extensive crop farming is the strong backbone of the County's farming industry, which relies on high capability agricultural soil. Once the land is converted to non-agricultural use, it is very difficult to convert it back to productive farmland due to the change in soil characteristics, fragmentation, and possible contamination. At the same time, lower rated land in the western part of the County has traditionally been used for grazing. A typical ranching operation requires a large tract of land to be viable.

Non-agricultural land uses and the more intensive agricultural practices, such as greenhouses, or intensive livestock operations, do not require a large tract of land or highly productive soil but still can be profitable. These land uses have a lesser reliance on the soil capability, and may be directed away from high capability, unsubdivided agricultural land.

At the same time Farmland value should be established for fair evaluation of the ranching or non-traditional agricultural operations.

- 1,2,1 Productive agricultural land includes:
 - a) land in production with a farmland assessment value of 30 % or more;
 - b) grey-wooded soil producing hay, forage or other crops; and



Objective 1.4 Minimize the land use conflict with Confined Feeding Operations and surrounding land uses

While the Confined Feeding Operations are under Provincial jurisdiction⁴, it is the County's intent that any negative effect from the Confined Feeding Operation should be minimized. The Municipal Government Act requires the municipality to identify where new Confined Feeding Operations should locate.

Additional <u>evidence</u> to demonstrate that the impact on local community (over 334 letters of concerns submitted) is important compared to G&S Cattle- Greg Thalen's argument who is forgetting we are humans, farmers, retirees, families, neighbours and perhaps summer folks or campers etc. We may not be a big farmer like G&S Cattle- Greg Thelan, but we still all matter and there is no need for this feedlot near us or our water way (Pigeon Lake). We also grow crops and farm in our communities. The difference in the matter is we are needing profit to live but G&S Cattle- Greg Thelan is pushing for financial gain in profits to financially bankrupt us famrers.

- G&S Cattle- Greg Thelan- Feed is not provided by local farmers and the bulk of their "mineral-rich" feed/supplement is coming from outside the county as reference in the submission from Heartland Feeds, which is based in Ponoka to which is where G&S Cattle- Greg Thelan home base is and this decision does not effect him.
- G&S Cattle- Greg Thelan are not employing a local veterinarian
- G&S Cattle- Greg Thelan only has two local employees
- G&S Cattle- Greg Thelan drivers of the trucks and names of companies coming in and out of the property are not local and majority of the transportation is concluded at night
- G&S Cattle- Greg Thelan continued to vindictively harass and bully us with placing the huge Manure pile so close to our home until they were requested by NRCB Board to remove it.
 Meanwhile we were infested with wasps and flies.
- Or how G&S Cattle- Greg Thelan continued harassing us that there was an agreement for the new Owners (Us at that time) to supply G&S Cattle- Greg Thelan with water supply to their 1500 head of cattle when we did not have water at our own home in the winter. Had to have a lawyer deal with the situation as he was not working with us, but he and his Farmhand Sheldon harassed and threatened us.
- Or how the second day of moving to the property that our dog was hit on the road by one of his workers travelling at a high speed while our dog was fishing a dead calf carpous left on the side of the road.
- Or how we had to call the NRCB board to do a site visit for how the manure was laying around in the fields and not disposing of the sick animals in the proper way or being neighbourly and fixing his broken windmill that defended the neighbourhood or showing respect with the non-stop truck hauling.

I have videos but am not able to attach them to this letter but am able to send the memory stick to you for your review but here are some latest pictures of the way G&S Cattle- Greg Thelan actually runs his currently so called four hundred head of cattle and calf operation.



- Only was there a full clean up once the Newspaper released a story and the NRCB was going to perform a visit (1 month after it was reported but visit was completed)

 Sick animals, hurt animals, dirty animals, over four hundred heads of cattle and buffalos.
- G&S Cattle- Greg Thelan not once took concern of how my family and animals were ill due to his operations. Since we have moved, we have not had major health issues both us humans or animals. No reoccurring pneumonia, bronchitis, pink eye, allergies among other illnesses. So, I can argue that the effect on the surrounding community is in fact great, etc., not to mention he never reached out to me, as a neighbour beforehand, and so his point he is a community likeminded business & individual is false.
- G&S Cattle- Greg Thelan refused to communicate with us on any basis once the proposal was submitted to the point that we had to sell our home.
 Had to deal with several fake buyers that were sent from G&S Cattle- Greg Thelan to offer cash sales and tie up the sell of the home that we lost funds on.
- Also, I believe that the Trans Canada Trail, Sunset Harbour, Wood Pines Campground, Zeiner Park & Provincial Parks are all recreational communities are most definitely closer and within much closer proximity (his argument states no such community exists for at 6 kms).
 Nor is G&S Cattle- Greg Thelan respecting the community of over 334 letters of concerns requesting for this proposal to be rejected.

Final comments, I will repeat my beliefs and wish the NRCB decision of September 13, G&S Cattle Ltd. RA21045 to deny the construction of a 4000-beef finisher confined feeding operation should stand. Respectfully a request for review should be denied.

Julis D Roussel Regards,

Julie Roussel

Directly affected & Concerned Community member

Pictures are too big to send via email.

