No 6 - REQUEST FOR REVIEW: RA23022 / Mitchel Kroetsch
-

Filed By:	Dallas Oberg
Deadline for RFRs:	September 11, 2024
Date RFR received:	September 11, 2024
Status of Party as per Decision Summary:	Directly Affected Party

0	
NRCB	Natural Resources Conservation Board

Request for Board Review (RFR) of an Approval Officer CFO Application Decision

Instructions

- Eligibility. Only those parties listed as "directly affected" in the approval officer's CFO
 application decision, or those parties requesting reconsideration of their status (see
 section #3), are eligible to request a Board review (RFR).
- Jurisdiction. The Board's jurisdiction in Alberta to review a decision by an approval
 officer is set out in sections 20(5), 22(4), and 23(3) of the <u>Agricultural Operation Practices</u>
 <u>Act</u> (AOPA).
- Deadline. The NRCB must receive an RFR by the deadline specified in the approval
 officer's decision cover letter. The AOPA Administrative Procedures Regulation does not
 allow consideration of time extension requests or late submissions.
- 4. Public Documents. RFRs and attachments are public documents.
- Submission. Submit this form and any attachments by email to Laura Friend, Manager of Board Reviews at laura.friend@nrcb.ca. Contact her at 403-297-8269 for assistance.
- 1. Confined Feeding Operation (CFO) Application Details

NRCB Application No.	RA23022
Name of Owner/Operator or Operation	Mitchel Kroetsch (U)
Type of application (if known)	□ Approval □ Registration □ Authorization
Location (legal land description)	NW-15-42-16 W4M
Municipality	Heister

2. Status Declaration

I hereby request a Board review of the approval officer's decision: (You must check one)

	I am the owner/operator (directly affected party)
	I represent the owner/operator
	I represent the municipality (directly affected party)
W.	less listed as a directly affected party in the approval officer's decision
	disactly effected party in the approval officer's decision and
	I am not listed as a directly arrected party arrect

Page 1 of 5

A second
5. Board Action Requested
If the Board grants a review of the approval officer's decision (either an approval, denia cancellation, amendment, or deemed permit), only the "directly affected" parties are eligible to participate (see section #3). A review will be in the form of either a hearing owritten review.
If the Board grants a review, I would like it to:
Reverse the approval officer's decision
Amend or vary the approval officer's decision
If the Board decides to grant a review on a permitted decision, it may decide to amend o vary the permit terms and/or conditions.
Are there any new conditions, or amendments to existing conditions, that you would little Board to consider?
2. Comment with inspection of Ungal Counsel or Representatives (If amplicable)

	Dally, Kerry, Dexter, Berten Ob
Street/Box Address	3 7
Town/City/Postal Code	Foresthurg, AB, TOB-INO
Legal Land Description	42127 RR 164
Telephone Number	_
Email Address	
Date	September 10/24
7. Contact Information	on of Legal Counsel or Representative (if applicable)
Name	
Name Address	
Address	

Page 5 of 5

nrcb

Dallas Oberg -

Wed 2024-09-11 3:05 PM

To:d

I will start off with I STRONGLY OPPOSE the building of this CFO as it only benefits basically one family who doesn't even reside in our area.

To say we are concerned is an understatement, we have bought our forever home in a nice quiet location which now is being threatened for the gain of one family and the loss to many other families and residents in our area. Which seems completely and utterly appalling that the building of this CFO around so many acreages is even being considered.

We certainly would not have bought anywhere near a feedlot even if it was smaller in size due to the undesirable situations and problems that can arise, so once again, I sound like a broken record but why should our family be unfairly subjected to all of the undesirable problems coming our way.

One of the major problems we are most concerned about is the dust and airborne particles that result from having 5000 animals stomping around the pens creating a dust storm of dirt mixed with feces, and the chemicals created from having that much excrement in a confined area. Our son Dexter has severe allergies and is seeing specialists because they are so bad. He is on prescribed medications twice a day to try to help with his respiratory problems caused by the allergies with one of the worst ones being dust which was diagnosed through testing.

We are also very concerned about groundwater contamination which I believe has not been addressed adequately because the reason that the St. Marys cemetery also known as the WANDA cemetery which is less than 1.5 miles away has ceased to allow burniels because of groundwater contamination. Our water table was so high that when we were not in drought conditions the water table came up too high to the surface.

Another note about groundwater contamination is that you did not take into account that THE BATTLE RIVER is not only to the west of the feedlot but the creek that you talk about and low lying areas are also running to the south which flows through the Hastings coulee which in turn enters the battle river.

Since first hearing about this application, from the very beginning it has caused our family an unbelievable amount of mental distress as we seem to have no control or even get consideration of how this will impact our lives. Its really sad when your six year old son cries because he is worried about his allergies, and asks what he can do to stop the feedlot from being built because he loves to play outside.

We beg and hope you will reconsider the cancellation of this application and put a stop to the disruption of our lives which are already complicated enough. Just the start of Mitchel building his feedlot has already started to cause problems from the large amount of dust clouds he has already created.