

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Laura Friend](#)
Cc: [Fiona Vance](#); [Bill Kennedy](#)
Subject: Mitchel Kroetsch Proposed CFO
Date: Monday, April 14, 2025 8:49:41 PM
Attachments: [NRCBapr12.pdf](#)

Caution! This message was sent from outside your organization.

[Allow sender](#) | [Block sender](#) | [Report](#)

April 14, 2025

Attention: Laura Friend
Manager, Board Reviews, NRCB

Re: Board Review of Decision to Permit a Confined Feeding Operation (CFO)
operated by Mitchel and Lindy Kroetsch at
NW 15-42-16 W4M in Flagstaff County

Please find attached a letter of concern submitted by some of the directly affected parties in regards to recent correspondence between Mitchel Kroetsch and the NRCB

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter

Sincerely,
Thomas and Heidi Rohe
Dallas Oberg and Family
Rick Hewson
Nancy Hewson
Bob & Ruth Burke

April 12, 2025

Attention: Laura Friend
Manager, Board Reviews, NRCB

**Re: Board Review of Decision to Permit a Confined Feeding Operation (CFO)
operated by Mitchel and Lindy Kroetsch at
NW 15-42-16 W4M in Flagstaff County**

As a group of directly affected parties in regards to the above application, decision and review, we would like to respectfully address the situation in regards to Mitchel Kroetsch and his continued pursual of the Confined Feeding Operation which he has not yet received approval for.

Our concerns continue to increase as time passes and we witness Mitchel's apparent disregard for NRCB procedure and lack of consideration for the citizens in the neighbourhood who will be affected by his proposed Operation. We feel that recent developments have clearly indicated his attitude - not only towards NRCB regulations and deadlines but also towards all of the directly affected parties in this area.

It is difficult for us to believe that Mitchel will respect and adhere to the standards and regulations once he is in operation (should he be granted that right) when he has shown no respect or regard to do so up until now.

Since purchasing the land he is developing, Mitchel has made no effort to meet or communicate his intentions with any of us or shown any regard to our concerns. Perhaps if he would have met with us prior to proceeding we would have been less concerned. Instead, Mitchel has no intention of living in the area and is proceeding with his plans as if he already has full approval. He hasn't made any attempt to address our concerns or communicate his plans - and although it is not a mandatory step in proceeding with an operation such as this, some effort to work with us or at least communicate his plans and intentions early on could have diminished our concerns.

We find it disappointing that the NRCB can and will reject letters of concern from directly affected parties if they arrive past the specified time deadline, and yet Mitchel did not respond to the requirements assigned him in the NRCB's review until more than a month after his deadline. This was an assigned deadline to receive approval and yet he didn't follow up on his submission to be sure it was received? Interesting that a critical response to criteria necessary to receive approval could get lost in cyberspace!

When the NRCB made the decision to review Mitchel's plans because of concerns about the water table, it was our understanding that he would have to submit new revised plans for the catchment basins to effectively deal with water he encountered when excavating. Although new revised plans were submitted he continued to develop the lot and bring in cattle even though he had not yet been approved to proceed. He claims it is a cow/calf operation and yet it appears that the majority of the animals are not calving and are not being held to calf. He didn't have 500+ head on the premises prior to applying for a CFO license so this was not an existing operation that just happens to be there. His disregard for following procedure does not bode well for what we can expect in future, should he be granted approval. Will he actually be following the correct protocol once he is given the right to actually operate, or will he continue to do whatever he wants to do?

It was also our understanding that until he received his water license, he could not proceed with having any cattle on the premises. This past week we spoke with David Toop, M.Sc. P.Geo. Senior Water Administration Hydrogeologist for Alberta Environment & Protected Areas Regulatory Assurance Division to inquire regarding whether or not Mitchel had been granted his water license and were told that until the NRCB approved his application, the water license application would not be fulfilled. So with the approval being reviewed, why has he proceeded with housing and feeding cattle?

In Mitchel's last submission, it doesn't appear that he addressed all the criteria that the NRCB had asked him for.

Was the site already inspected and given approval for use?

Is there a requirement to install a geotextile to monitor ground water level?

The integrity of the catch basins was not explained - even the engineer seemed to express some concerns about this type of liner's integrity, should the water table level rise.

We continue to have serious concerns for the issues and complications that could arise as the water table levels are rising back to more normal levels after the moisture we were blessed with this winter. The past 5+ years are not normal water table levels for this area and hopefully as our weather patterns bring more moisture to this area that will be apparent. However, that could become a serious contamination problem for operations such as Mitchel is proposing.

How and when will ground water levels be tested and who will be responsible for ongoing monitoring of this? Those of us who have resided in this area for 20 or more years know that the current water table levels are much lower than normal and if he has already encountered the water table in excavating, this will be a bigger problem once levels continue to rise. This spring there was an oil lease reclamation taking place on the neighbouring quarter south of Mitchel's proposed CFO. During the procedure, one of our concerned party spoke with an operator and they said they encountered ground water at 3 meters. This is another example of why we are continuing to raise concerns about the impact his operation will have in this area and on the watershed.

We appreciate that the NRCB has continued to monitor and review the situation and sincerely hope that this development will not be allowed to proceed unless all the criteria and concerns have been satisfactorily met and that in future, Mitchel will be held to the same stringent deadlines and criteria that we have to respectfully adhere to.

Sincerely,

*Tomas & Heidi Rohe
Dallas Oberg & Family
Norm & Lorraine Congdon
Bob & Ruth Burke
Rick & Nancy Hewson*