

#4 - REQUEST FOR REVIEW: RA21043 / Double T Cattle Co. Ltd.

Filed By:	Stan and Rose Hand
Deadline for RFRs:	June 8, 2022
Date RFR received:	June 7, 2022
Status of party as per Decision Summary:	Directly Affected Party

REQUEST FOR BOARD REVIEW
SUBMITTED TO THE NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION BOARD

Application No:	RA21043
Name of Operator/Operation:	Morris Thalen and Double T Cattle Company
Type of application (<i>check one</i>):	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Registration <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization
Location (<i>legal land description</i>):	NE 15-42-25-w4
Municipality:	Ponoka County

I hereby request a Board Review of the Approval Officer's Decision and have the right to request a Board review because (*please review all options and check one*):

- I am the producer seeking the approval/registration/authorization.
- I represent the producer seeking the approval/registration/authorization.
- I represent the municipal government.
- I am listed as a directly affected party in the Approval Officer's Decision.
- I am not listed as a directly affected party in the Approval Officer's Decision and would like the Board to review my status.

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS

1. You must meet the specified 10-day timeline; otherwise your request will not be considered.
2. Section 1 of this form must be completed only if you are requesting that the Board review your status as "not directly affected". Sections 2 to 5 must be completed by all applicants.
3. This form must be signed and dated before it is submitted to the Board for its review.
4. Be aware that 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.
5. For more assistance, please call Laura Friend, Manager, Board Reviews at 403-297-8269.

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 directlyaffected status are as follows:

We live on the NE 10-42-25-w4 which is 1/2 mile south of the proposed development. Because of the prevailing wind, we are in line for odor, dust and noise from it. In our area there is a large number of CFOs already, several already spreading manure on Mr Thelan;s land. The previous Hog CFO located here should never have been approved as it ruined everyone's quality of life when it was here. At the time only neighbours within 1/2 mile were notified, and the hog farm was in the middle of the section. The water drawn for the dairies and feedlots in the area already plus a proposed feedlot of this size is too taxing for the water supply in the area in our opinion.

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:

I believe an investigation into other operations in the area was not carried out prior the the approval to allow an operation of this size in a populated area,

3. CONTACT INFORMATION

(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:

I believe water supply can be impacted by this decision. Water is something that can't be replaced after it is gone. The town of Ponoka is on the pipeline for water from the Red Deer river because of decreasing ground water locally, the number of CFOs in this area should not be increased because of everyone's desire to be 5 miles off the Qe 2.

4. CONTACT INFORMATION

(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:

I believe the amount of CFO development in our area already exceeds what is healthy for our community.

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.

No

5. CONTACT INFORMATION

(ALL PARTIES MUST COMPLETE THIS SECTION)

Contact information of the person requesting the review:

Name: Stan Hand and Rose Hand

Address in Alberta:

Legal Land Description:

Phone Number:

Fax Number:

E-Mail Address:

Signature: _____

Optional

Date: _____

June 7 2022

Required

If you do not meet the timeline identified, your request will not be considered.

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:

Address:

Phone Number:

Fax Number:

E-Mail Address:

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

Laura Friend, Manager, Board Reviews
Natural Resources Conservation Board
John J. Bowlen Building
#901, 620 - 7 Avenue SW
Calgary, AB T2P 0Y8

Phone: 403-297-8269

Email: 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.