

#1 - REQUEST FOR REVIEW: LA20014A / Hutterian Brethren Church of Granum

Filed By: **Don Chatterton**

Deadline for RFRs: November 9, 2020

Date RFR received: November 9, 2020

Status of party as per Decision Summary: Directly Affected

██████████  
Claresholm, Alberta T0L 0T0  
November 9, 2020

Dear Natural Resources Conservation Board:

**Re: Application LA20014A**  
Hutterian Brethren Church of Granum  
SW 25-11-28 W4

This submission will serve as a summary of what I understand the conditions that were made by the approval officer for Application LA20014, to reiterate conditions I feel need to be in place for LA20014A, and to confirm two submissions that should have been included in the directly affected status.

In reading the conditions of LA20014, now becoming LA20014A, It is understood that the conditions in place are as follows:

- a. The NRCB has granted the approval for the chicken barn, but in reality that approval is conditional, as it is based on first acquiring a water license before construction can begin. *"The email response from AEP confirmed that a water license is required and stated that they have not yet receive[sic] an application for a water licence[sic]. The applicant is reminded that it is their responsibility to ensure that they obtain necessary water licensing for the proposed CFO (LA20014 Decision Summary, page 18".)*
- b. The only other condition mentioned for LA20014 was regarding the spreading of manure. *"Because the quarter section that is listed as available land base for manure spreading (SE 32-11-27) is located in close proximity to Willow Creek, I will include a condition that requires Granum Colony to spread manure in the fall and all manure has to be incorporated (LA20014 Decision Summary, page 22".)*
- c. Furthermore, it is understood the approval of Application LA20014A, by the NRCB, is for only a 20,000 layer chicken barn, nothing more – no colony or additional poultry barns. *"Application LA20014 for the construction of a new poultry confined feeding operation has been approved. (LA20014 Decision Summary, page 1".)*

In the event that the approval is not reversed, additional conditions really should be included. These conditions include, but not be limited to, the following:


- a. The Applicant should be required to consent in writing to continued unrestricted use of the airspace over the proposed CFO, without any restrictions on noise levels or flight height. This would include the requirement that the Applicant not paint or otherwise mark the roof the proposed CFO so as to restrict air traffic.
- b. The Applicant should be required to identify different land for the spreading of manure, which does not pose the same risk of contamination of Willow Creek or other surface water or ground water, while also not posing additional stress on the infrastructure (especially the Webber Bridge).
- c. The Applicant should be required to enter into binding agreements with all directly affected parties in relation to dust control, as suggested by the Approval Officer in Appendix C of Decision Summary LA20014 (Page 16).

- d. The Applicant should be required to commission a study by an independent expert on the potential impacts of the proposed CFO on wildlife and endangered species. Any approval should be conditional upon the Board's acceptance of the level of risk revealed by the study.

For the record, Casey and Barry Arnstead and Vonda Chatterton should be included within the directly affected status. Arnsteads' property is within the ½ mile range. They were on holidays and did not get home until after the first deadline. The approval officer stated that they could send in a submission after the fact. However, when they did it was denied at the Board Review. Vonda is an executor to our mother's estate, so therefore is also directly affected.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me accordingly.

Yours truly,

  
Don R. Chatterton, B. Sc. Ag Econ.  
