

<b>#2 - REQUEST FOR REVIEW: PR19005 / Stant Enterprises Ltd.</b>	
<b>Filed By:</b>	<b>Stan Black and Darlene Bacque</b>
<b>Deadline for RFRs:</b>	<b>May 15, 2020</b>
<b>Date RFR received:</b>	<b>May 11, 2020</b>
<b>Status of party as per Grandfathering Decision:</b>	<b>Directly Affected</b>

# 1. PARTY STATUS

(IF YOU ARE NAMED A DIRECTLY AFFECTED PARTY IN THE APPROVAL OFFICER'S DECISION, YOU DO NOT NEED TO COMPLETE THIS SECTION)

Party status ("directly affected" or "not directly affected") is determined pursuant to the provisions of the *Agricultural Operation Practices Act* (AOPA) and its regulations. Upon receipt of an application, the Approval Officer must notify any affected parties. Affected parties include municipalities and owners or occupants of land as determined in accordance with the regulations. To obtain directly affected status, the owner or occupant notified in the above process must provide a written submission to the Approval Officer during the stage at which the Approval Officer considers the application. The Approval Officer will then determine who the directly affected parties are and include this determination in the Decision Summary.

Under its governing legislation, the Board can only consider requests for review submitted by directly affected parties. If you are not listed as directly affected in the Approval Officer's decision, you must request that the Board reconsider your status (*please note that under the provisions of AOPA, the Board cannot reconsider the status of a party who has not previously made a submission to the Approval Officer during the application process*).

In order to request your status be reconsidered, you must explain why your interests are directly affected by the decision of the Board. Please list these reasons below:

**My grounds for requesting directly affected status are as follows:**

Adjacent <sup>Quarter</sup> Section (NE 18-40-4W5M) next to the Stant Enterprise feedlot.

WE share a fence line,

All Concerns are noted in our Writing letter DATED Friday September 18/2019.

---

## 2. GROUNDS FOR REQUESTING A REVIEW

(ALL PARTIES MUST COMPLETE THIS SECTION)

---

In order to approve an application, NRCB Approval Officers must ensure the requirements of AOPA have been met. Your grounds for requesting a Board review should identify any requirements or specific issues that you believe the Approval Officer failed to adequately address in the Decision.

**My grounds for requesting a review of the Approval Officer's decision are as follows:**

Sent letter of concern regard the feedlot with  
no response or feedback - As per your 3.3 Notice  
Process of Agricultural operations Practice Act.  
HAVE NOT BEEN ADDRESS,  
SEE LETTER FROM September 18/2019

---

### 3. REASONS YOU ARE AFFECTED BY THE DECISION

(ALL PARTIES MUST COMPLETE THIS SECTION)

---

In order to support your reasons for requesting a review, please explain how you believe you would be affected by the Approval Officer's decision.

I believe that, as a result of the Approval Officer's decision, the following prejudice or damage will result:

Again see letter Friday September 18/2019  
Attachment,



**4. ACTION REQUESTED**

(ALL PARTIES MUST COMPLETE THIS SECTION)

I would like the Board to take the following actions with the respect to the Approval Officer's decision:

- Amend or vary the decision
- Reverse the decision

Please describe why you believe the Board should take this action:

According to Agricultural Operation Practice Act we have not been properly notify and our concerns on the matter have not been properly addressed. Our land & farm operation is greatly affected. it can at that capacity.

Please see letter attached that was sent out September 18, 2019

If the Board decides to grant a review (in the form of either a hearing or a written review), all directly affected parties are eligible to participate. The Board may consider amending the Approval, Registration, or Authorization on any terms and conditions it deems appropriate. **Please note the Board cannot make any amendments unless it first decides to grant a review.**

If a review is granted by the Board, are there any new conditions, or amendments to existing conditions, that you would like the Board to consider? It is helpful if you identify how you believe your suggested conditions or amendments would address your concerns.

- Maintenance on fence line.
  - letter / concerns not addressed properly
- Please see letter attached that was sent out September 18, 2019

## 5. CONTACT INFORMATION

(ALL PARTIES MUST COMPLETE THIS SECTION)

### Contact information of the person requesting the review:

Name: Stan Black

Address in Alberta: NE 18-40-4W5M)  
PO Box 626 ECKVILLE AB TOMOXD

Legal Land Description: NE 18-40-4W5M

Phone Number: [REDACTED] Fax Number: \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail Address: [REDACTED]

Signature: [Signature]

Date: May 11/2020

Please note that all sections of the form must be completed in order for your request to be considered. Also, if you do not meet the timeline identified, your request will not be considered. Form must be signed and dated before being submitted for Board consideration

If you are, or will be, represented by another party, please provide their contact information (Note: If you are represented by legal counsel, correspondence from the Board will be directed to your counsel)

Name: DARLENE Bacque

Address: PO Box 626 ECKVILLE AB TOMOXD  
NE 18-40-4W5M

Phone Number: [REDACTED] Fax Number: \_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail Address: [REDACTED]

**When you have completed your request, please send it, with any supporting documents to:**

Laura Friend, Manager, Board Reviews  
Natural Resources Conservation Board  
19<sup>th</sup> Floor Centennial Place  
250 - 5<sup>th</sup> Street SW  
Calgary, AB T2P 0R4

Phone: 403-297-8269

Email: [laura.friend@nrcb.ca](mailto:laura.friend@nrcb.ca)

Please note, Requests for Board Review are considered public documents. Your submitted request will be provided to all directly affected parties and will also be made available to members of the public upon request.

For more assistance, please call Laura Friend, Manager, Board Reviews at 403-297-8269.

Stan Black & Darlene Bacque

CJC Farms Ltd

NE18-40-4W5M

Email Address: [REDACTED]

Phone number: Stan [REDACTED]

Darlene [REDACTED]

September 18, 2019

To whom it may concern,

My name is Stan Black owner of CJC Farms and I am on the adjacent section (NE18-40-4W5M) next to the Stant Enterprise feedlot. I have a small hobby farm operation with a herd of 50 cattle, 5 horses, 2 alpacas 2 cats and 1 dog. I would like to addresses my concerns of the impacts of feedlot operation and the environment issues on the surrounding farms & acreages around the feed lot especially my property. Since 2002 when the feedlot was established, the feedlot has not been in full operation for over 20 years; the feedlot has only been having less then approximately 500 to 1500 cattle on the feedlot. With the feedlot not being in full operation it has not been an issue until now that you would like to increase the feedlot to capacity of 5000 cattle. In 20 years, there have been many changes in ownership of the surrounding farms and acreages and having a feedlot in the surrounding area will have huge impact on the environment and the surrounding farm and acreages owners with the following issue that may occur:

1. One major concern is the water contamination from the urine and manure of the bulk amount of cattle. The runoff quality from the feedlot surface is important when adapting best management practices for minimizing environmental concerns, especially surface water and ground water pollution. The runoff can end up in surface water streams, which may be detrimental to aquatic life and may cause water quality problems for the surrounding farmers.
2. I feel that the facility is not operational to manage 5000 head of cattle with the proper number of constructed pens to maintain the welfare of animals.
3. There will be several issues with the pollution that the feedlot will create: noise, odour and air pollution of the 5000 head of cattle. The noise level will be high with 5000 cattle all day and night.
4. Dust and manure waste disposal can emit hundreds of gases, including hydrogen sulfide, which can cause eye, nose, and throat irritation, and ammonia, an irritant that, at high levels, can cause death. In fact, agricultural operations are the single largest source of toxic ammonia air pollution. Disposing "excessively heavy" manure applications on farmland close to large feedlots is pollution that can cause rising concern to a variety of health and growth problems for plants, animals, and humans in the surrounding area.
5. Runoff from a feedlot may transport large quantities of organic matter that will have impact on the surrounding land around.
6. The traffic increase that will be created at all hours of the day include nighttime from transporting the cattle from the cattle handlers. The creation of dust is another source of continuing complaints that will occur from traffic and the movement of the herd of cattle.

7. The unpleasant odours issue of the feedlots creates problems of air pollution, not including esthetic impacts, and with that amount of cattle will spread diseases from rodents and insects.
8. Another concern is managing the cattle in yard or enclosure area on the feedlot and not intruding on my property. Cattle stay in herds and if they get out of feedlot and among my herd then I have concerns about illness and diseases of feedlot cattle spreading quickly through the herd from my own cattle.
9. Wildlife in area will increase: coyotes, wolves, bears, cougars will be drawn to the feed lot because of live stock; you have dead stock.

With all of these concerns I feel that the feedlot would interfere with the use and enjoyment of a neighboring landowner's property or interfere with the health, safety, and welfare of others.

Feed lot operation will lower property value in surrounding areas. With the growing amount of acreages in the area it will affect the peaceful landscape and standard of living in the country.

Sincerely,

Stan Black

Darlene Bacque