

No 2 - REQUEST FOR REVIEW: RA23022 / Mitchel Kroetsch

Filed By: Heidi Rohe

Deadline for RFRs: September 11, 2024

Date RFR received: September 9, 2024

Status of Party as per Decision Summary: Directly Affected Party

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

---

### Instructions

1. **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).
2. **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 *Agricultural Operation Practices Act* (AOPA).
3. **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.
5. **Submission.** Submit this form and any attachments by email to Laura Friend, Manager of Board Reviews at [laura.friend@nrcb.ca](mailto: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
Type of application ( <i>if known</i> )	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Registration <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization
Location ( <i>legal land description</i> )	NW 15-42-16 W4M
Municipality	Flagstaff County

### 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)
- 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 therefore I am requesting my status be reconsidered (see section #3)

#### 4. Request for a Board Review (RFR)

All parties or their representative must complete this section. If you need more space, include an attachment.

- Approval officers must ensure that a CFO application meets the Alberta legislative requirements before they approve it. Conversely, approval officers must deny an application if the requirements are not met. (Sections 20 and 22 of the *Agricultural Operation Practices Act* (AOPA)).
- If you believe the **approval officer failed to adequately address an issue** (or issues), state the issue(s) and provide your reasoning below.
- The issue(s) must have been in front of the approval officer at the time they made the CFO application decision; the Board will not consider any new issues.
- Include how the decision affects you, such as any damage or bias you believe would occur to you because of the approval officer's decision.

**My grounds for requesting a Board review of the approval officer's decision are:**

See Attachment

**6. Contact Information of Person Submitting the RFR**

Name Heidi Rohe

Street/Box Address [REDACTED]

Town/City/Postal Code Heisler

Legal Land Description 4; 16; 42; 17; NE

Telephone Number [REDACTED]

Email Address [REDACTED]

Date September 9, 2024

**7. Contact Information of Legal Counsel or Representative (if applicable)**

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number \_\_\_\_\_

Email Address \_\_\_\_\_

**These are my concerns:**

We are a directed affected party to the proposed CFO.

When we left Germany in 2008 to immigrate to Canada, we dreamed of a beautiful quiet home in a rural area, where we can enjoy fresh air, clean water, and peaceful nature. It took us nine years and hard work until we found the perfect place; our acreage here in Flagstaff County.

Now, that we have learned about the planned CFO we are very concerned about what our future will bring.

It is a fact that sooner or later a CFO with this number of heads will cause environmental issues and problems, not just for us, as well for our direct neighbors and little community, the Village of Heisler.

We are all on the same aquifer and we are constantly reminded by water experts and politicians like Rebecca Schulz, Minister of Environment and Protected Areas that we are heading toward a scary time of drought in Alberta and to start planning to use less water in 2024. What about the approximate annual 30,000,000 gallons of water 5,000 cattle would consume at the planned CFO? This amount of water could cause massive water supply shortage for our acreage and for the small farmers around us. What if our well will dry out? Who is paying for digging a new well?

A big health concern is long-term contamination of our water from the CFO runoff running into our water source and spreading high volume of manure close by, including antibiotic waste.

We are also worried that the traffic will increase due to cattle transport trucks, feed and grain trucks, manure spreading equipment, etc. and damage our already badly maintained highway and roads. We as taxpayers, will end up paying more taxes for maintaining the roads.

By living on an acreage in the country you always have to live with flies, some years more, some years less. Now we are very concerned that the fly volumes, noise, dust, and poor air quality will increase immensely with a CFO directly across from our home. This is not what we expected when we bought the acreage in 2017.

Reduced air quality, bad odour and more flies, known as bacteria carriers, could lead to health issues. There is an increase of infectious illness amongst livestock kept in high density, high excrement situations and the germs from these illnesses can travel further than the 1.5 mile 'zone' – by air, insects and fallout from dust and manure spreading. We did not move to countryside just to have to worry about our health. In addition, I am suffering from chronic migraines which are also triggered by bad air quality, odour and noise. I did my research and I am concerned that the planned CFO will increase my migraine attacks.

Our acreage was also meant to be an investment for our future, for when we are getting older. Due to poor air quality, increasing fly population, higher traffic volumes and dust - all because of its short distance to the proposed CFO, our property will for sure lose on value and we will lose money which we are counting in for an affordable retirement living.

I conclude by asking that the application (RA23022) to establish a Confined Feeding Operation at NW 15-42-16 W4M will be denied.

Sincerely,

*Heidi Rohe*