

Date: February 5, 2021

Re: TRC-12-074

Name: Ernest Hiebert (7044349 MB Ltd.)

Topic: Applicants Response to Public Comments

I (we) certainly want to take the opportunity to personally respond to the public comments that we received in response to TRC-12-074 (proposed expansion of an existing livestock operation).

It is important to note that we live in close proximity to the site in this proposal. We live approximately 1 km from the site and see ourselves as a family farm operation. We have raised our family here for the last 17 years and very much consider ourselves as part of the community. We desire to provide a farming future for our family and what we are attempting is to make an older existing site more economically viable and sustainable for the future. We too will live with the consequences of how this site would be operated and managed. It is in our own personal best interest to farm in such a way as to reduce odor, nuisance of flies, noise and the negative impact of manure management.

Having read the public response comments, I want to respond to the concerns in the following categories.

1. **Manure Management:** This site would be managed in such a way as to comply with all environmental and agronomic regulations. We would ensure that a site such as this (>300 au's) would file an annual Manure Management Plan with Manitoba Sustainable Development. This would include soil samples to ensure that residual soil nutrient levels do not exceed Nitrogen and Phosphorus limits. Liquid manure would be applied to the spread fields using drag hose technology. With this technology manure is pumped to the fields via supply hose, and a tractor with an attachment on the field injects the manure into the soil. This not only reduces traffic and dust on the road, but greatly helps reducing odor during the manure application process. Manure nutrients would be applied in such a way as to meet the agronomic nutrient requirements of the proposed crops on the fields (eg. N) or to ensure certain nutrients (eg. P) do not exceed regulatory limits. Injection of liquid manure also significantly reduces the environmental risk of run-off. The annual manure application process would generally take 24-48 hours, thus also reducing the nuisance of a prolonged tanker or truck method of hauling and applying manure.
2. **Odor (flies):** Since we too live in such close proximity to the proposed site, we would manage the site in such a way as to reduce the negative impact of odor and flies. The production facility itself would be renovated to modern and industry standards, deadstock would be managed according to regulation standards, garbage cleaned up

and maintenance and upkeep of the shelterbelt around the site. A portion of the odor comes from the ventilation system of the barn itself, and some comes from the liquid manure storage. If the RM would request it, we would be willing to apply straw as a cover to the storage during late spring and summer months. This would also assist in the reduction of odor.

3. Noise: We do not see how this proposed expansion of a livestock operation would increase the nuisance of noise in the area. The LUD of Landmark is surrounded by numerous livestock and grain farming operations and this in no way would noticeably add noise to what already exists.
4. Water: As far as water supply and needs is concerned, this site has its own well and already has a "Water Rights" license. Livestock operations like this are required to attain these in order to operate in a sustainable way.

Thanks for allowing me (us) to respond to the public comments. We trust they answer some of the concerns that were raised.