

PUBLIC INPUT MEETING REPORT

GENERALLY ACCEPTED AGRICULTURAL AND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

FOR MANURE MANGEMENT AND UTILIZATION, CRANBERRY PRODUCTION, SITE SELECTION AND ODOR CONTROL FOR NEW AND EXPANDING LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION FACILITIES, FARM MARKET, PESTICIDE UTILIZATION AND PEST CONTROL, NUTRIENT UTILIZATION, CARE OF FARM ANIMALS AND IRRIGATION WATER USE

September 28, 2011

Pursuant to the Michigan Right to Farm Act, (Act 93 of 1981, MCL 286.471 *et seq.*), the Michigan Commission of Agriculture and Rural Development may define Generally Accepted Agricultural and Management Practices (GAAMPs), developed with assistance by the Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (MDARD) and with written recommendations from Michigan State University's College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Extension Service, and Agricultural Experiment Station, as well as the United States Department of Agriculture's Natural Resources Conservation Service and Farm Service Agency; the Michigan Department of Natural Resources; and other professional and industry organizations. In addition, the Commission directed the Department to hold a public meeting to provide an opportunity for the public to comment on proposed changes to the GAAMPs. This meeting occurred on September 28, 2011, beginning at 9:10 a.m. in the Lake Superior Room of the Michigan Library and Historical Center, 702 West Kalamazoo Street, Lansing, Michigan.

Present from MDARD were Wayne Whitman and Heather Casteel.

Information about this meeting was released to the public and media on September 1, 2011. Over 300 daily, weekly, food, farm, legislative, and environmental media and organizations were notified. In addition, copies of proposed changes to the GAAMPs, were posted on the MDARD website.

All GAAMPs are developed by multi-agency task force committees which are chaired by Michigan State University faculty. GAAMPs are then presented to the Michigan Commission of Agriculture and Rural Development for consideration and adoption under the authority of the Michigan Right to Farm Act, Public Act 93 of 1981, as amended. Since their initial adoption, these GAAMPs have undergone annual review by the respective task force committees, which include scientists and others with expertise, education, and knowledge in the field. The chair of each task force gathers comments from members and then makes recommendations for revisions of the

GAAMPs to the Michigan Commission of Agriculture and Rural Development. The Commission approves, amends, or rejects those recommendations.

At the September 28, 2011 public input meeting, comments were taken on the 2012 proposed drafts of the Generally Accepted Agricultural and Management Practices (also known as GAAMPs), for Manure Management and Utilization, Cranberry Production, Site Selection and Odor Control for New and Expanding Livestock Production Facilities and Irrigation Water Use. The GAAMPs regarding Nutrient Utilization, Farm Markets, Care of Farm Animals, and Pesticide Utilization and Pest Controls have no proposed changes for 2012.

Members of the public attending this meeting were told that a summary of all oral comments and copies of all written comments would be sent to the task force chairs and the Director. The deadline to receive written comments was 5 p.m., September 28, 2011. Copies of all written comments will be submitted when received. Agriculture Commission deliberation on these GAAMPs is currently scheduled for 9 am on December 14, 2011. The Commission meeting is scheduled to be held at the GreenStone Farm Credit Services office at 3515 West Rd, East Lansing and public comment will also be taken there.

In addition to the written comments provided, the following individuals attended the public input meeting on September 28, 2011 and filled out attendance slips:

1. Matthew Kapp, Michigan Farm Bureau
2. Tom Kalchik, Michigan State University Product Center

Only Matthew Kapp provided oral comments at the public input meeting and his comments were related to the written comments he provided at the hearing.

There were no further comments offered and the public input meeting was adjourned at 9:19 a.m.



April Hunt
Hearings Officer
September 28, 2011

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE
SEP 20 2011
ENVIRONMENTAL
STEWARDSHIP DIVISION

LAMOTTE TOWNSHIP
6271 Snover Road
Decker, MI 48426

September 19, 2011

Michigan Department of Agriculture
PO Box 30017
Lansing, MI 48909

Dear Sirs,

Regarding the GAAMPS and manure management, we would like to see included the practice of farms providing dust control on gravel roads when the manure is hauled.

We have a mega dairy in our community and the traffic generated from the farm, especially hauling manure, creates a big dust problem for residents along the gravel roads. The farm uses multiple large, multi-axle liquid tankers, hauling thousands of gallons per load at near highway speeds, load after load after load. It isn't hard to see why dust is a problem.

We normally brine roads twice a year, but the roads used by the manure haulers need to be brined almost daily when they are hauling. Obviously, the township cannot afford to do that.

It only seems fair and good practice for those creating the problem to be required to care for the problem. There is extra expense for blacktop and gravel maintenance as well, but the dust is the biggest issue.

Please consider this when reviewing manure management practices.

Sincerely,

Lamotte Township Board

Supervisor, *James R. D'Arcy*, Clerk, *A. P. B.*, Treasurer, *Jenna Hirsch*

Trustee, _____, Trustee, *Les Phillips*



7373 West Saginaw Highway, Box 30960, Lansing, Michigan 48909-8460
Phone (517) 323-7000

September 26, 2011

Wayne Whitman, Manager
Right to Farm Program
Michigan Department of Agriculture
Environmental Stewardship Division
P.O. Box 30017
Lansing, MI 48909

Dear Mr. Whitman,

The following are the comments of the Michigan Farm Bureau regarding the 2011 annual review of the *Generally Accepted and Agricultural Management Practices (GAAMPs)* as developed under the authority of the Michigan Right to Farm Act, 1981 PA 93 as amended. We believe Michigan's Right to Farm is the model for our country. The Act has allowed all sectors of Michigan agriculture to move forward utilizing GAAMPs on a voluntary basis while enhancing the environment. Michigan Farm Bureau appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes. Comments will be arranged in accordance with the applicable set of GAAMPs.

Manure Management

- We support proposed changes to practice 39 on page 28 that clarify needed protections near surface water inlets to prevent runoff and erosion from frozen and/or snow covered soils.
- We support additional language in appendix C, Item X (page 43) to further encourage a farmer to communicate with neighbors before and after applying manure near their respective homes.

Site Selection

- We support clarifications on Page 5, 6, 7, 8 regarding reduction in setbacks from within the original setback distance and the current use of local land use zoning maps by MDARD in granting setback reductions.
- All non-farm residences built in traditional agricultural areas after the site selection guidelines were established in June 2000 should not be counted when determining an existing livestock farm's setback requirements.
- We support additional language on page 17 regarding mitigation of odor with practices owned and not owned by the farmer if an alternative mitigation plan is provided.
- MFB is concerned that MDARD is requiring review and approval of all manure storage structures by a professional engineer. While we appreciate the benefits of this practice to both the department and the farmer, it is not a written factor in GAAMP conformance determination and it is not necessary for all structures such as solid manure stacking pads. The requirement is not always practical and is costly for farmers.

Care of Farm Animals

- While the public notice does not call for comments on these GAAMPs, the set of GAAMPs is listed as the 2012 proposal with no edits.

Farm Market

- The website refers to a 2012 proposed GAAMP, but the link is for the 2011 GAAMP with no changes. We offer no comments at this time.

Irrigation Water Management

- We support included language in Item 3, page 3 regarding the linking of pumps and irrigation systems to improve water use and energy efficiency and avoid over-application. We also support like changes on page 11, practice 23 to address the same issue for chemigation practices.
- We support additional information included on page 15 regarding registration.
- We support striking language on pages 19 – 22.
- We support expanding the committee to include more farmers.

Comments applicable to all GAAMPs

In addition to commenting on proposed changes, Michigan Farm Bureau appreciates the continued excellent work of the committees to ensure consistent and appropriate references to laws, federal practice standards and peer-reviewed scientific publications. We again ask MDARD to notify GAAMP review committee members electronically prior to public comment opportunities.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. Please call me with questions.

Regards,



Scott D. Piggott, Manager
Agricultural Ecology Department



Matthew D. Kapp
Land Use Specialist



Michigan Milk Producers Association

41310 Bridge Street • P.O. Box 8002 • Novi, MI 48376-8002

Phone: (248) 474-6672 Fax: (248) 474-0924

September 26, 2011

Wayne Whitman, Manager
Right to Farm Program
Michigan Department of Agriculture
Environmental Stewardship Division
P.O. Box 30017
Lansing, MI 48909

Dear Mr. Whitman:

On behalf of the over 2,100 dairy farmer members of Michigan Milk Producers Association, we appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to the Generally Accepted Agricultural Management Practices (GAAMPs). MMPA delegates have continually reaffirmed their support for the Right to Farm Act and the role that GAAMPs play in preserving the quality of our environment while maintaining an efficient agriculture community.

We have reviewed the proposed changes to the GAAMPs and fully support the comments submitted by Michigan Farm Bureau (MFB) and the issues they address regarding the proposed changes in the GAAMPs. In particular, in the GAAMPs for Manure Management and Utilization, we support the proposed change on page 28 that clarifies needed protections near surface water inlets to prevent runoff and erosion from frozen and/or snow covered soils. We further support the additional language on page 43 that encourages a farmer to communicate with neighbors before and after applying manure near their homes.

We have reviewed the proposed changes to the Site Selection and Odor Control for New and Expanding Livestock Production Facilities and support the clarifications on pages 5, 6, 7 and 8 regarding setbacks from within the original setback distance and the current use of local land use zoning maps by MDARD in granting setback distances. In addition, all non-farm residences built in traditional agricultural areas after the site selection guidelines were established in June 2000 should not be counted when determining an existing livestock farm's setback requirements. We also support additional language on page 17 regarding mitigation of odor with practices owned and not owned by the farmer if an alternative mitigation plan is provided.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the 2011 annual review of the Generally Accepted Agricultural Management Practices (GAAMPs).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ken Nobis". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Ken Nobis
President

Whitman, Wayne (MDA)

From: Mahoney, Stephen (MDA)
Sent: Monday, July 18, 2011 2:07 PM
To: Whitman, Wayne (MDA)
Subject: FW: 2012 GAAMPs
Attachments: Recommended GAAMP Changes for 2012.docx

Wayne,

Please advise... My suggestion is to forward this to Wendy Powers.

SM

Stephen J. Mahoney, CPAg
Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
Environmental Stewardship Division
525 W. Allegan Street
P.O. Box 30017
Lansing, MI 48909
517.241.2508
517.335.3329 (fax)
mahoneys@michigan.gov
www.michigan.gov/mdard

From: Dan Mahoney [mailto:danmah47@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, July 16, 2011 3:44 PM
To: Mahoney, Stephen (MDA)
Subject: 2012 GAAMPs

Steve, can you tell me when the "Site Selection & Odor Control" GAAMPs review meeting will be held this year? We would like to submit the attached recommended changes for 2012. Cassassa's will be applying their pig manure to the field across the road from us sometime soon and I have asked them to notify us in advance so we can be prepared for it. This notification definitely should be a requirement. Please see attached and I would be interested in your feedback.

Thanks,
Dan Mahoney

Recommended GAAMP Changes for 2012

When the GAAMP's were created in conjunction with the Right To Farm Act, was the magnitude and effect of CAFO's considered? The Right To Farm Act was enacted in 1981 and amended in 1995. I don't think CAFO's existed in 1981 and were just appearing in the mid 90's. After reading the manure management GAAMP's, it doesn't appear that they satisfactorily cover the magnitude of CAFO operations and their tremendous volume of liquid manure applications. Here are the recommended changes from Dan Mahoney, CAFO neighbor, Ed Oaks, farmer & CAFO neighbor, Hal Mead, ST. Charles Village Manager.

1. Adequately incorporate the liquid manure immediately after application rather than after 48 hours. This would significantly reduce odor and put more ammonia into the soil and not in the air especially with high volume of liquid pig manure.
We currently experience the strong odor from field applications beyond 2 weeks.
2. When liquid pig manure is applied to corn or wheat stubble, it should be plowed into the soil rather than a light discing. The light discing leaves a considerable amount of manure on exposed stubble and produces strong odor for weeks after application.
3. Liquid pig manure should not be allowed to remain on the surface without exceptions ie. No-till, forage, frozen ground, snow. Imagine living within 100 yard of a field that has had several thousand gallons of liquid pig manure applied and not worked into the soil.
4. Neighboring residents within ½ mile of the application should receive 3 days notice before applying liquid manure. Allow residents to cancel home entertainment plans, close up home, no outside laundry, schedule vacation away.
5. Soil samples on fields where liquid manure is to be applied should be taken annually and documented to support the need for added applications. Prevents use as a dumping grounds.
6. Require treatment of liquid manure with an odor reducing agent.

7. Require soil injection for high volume application of liquid manure especially when located near residences.
8. Establish testing procedures for high concentrations of ammonia and hydrogen sulfide. How do nearby residents know if their health is in danger from the ammonia and hydrogen sulfide. Some nearby residents have experienced headache and nasal burning sensation, nausea, when exposed to odor from application of liquid pig manure.
9. Limit the size and number of CAFO's in any given area to avoid excessive odor exposure .
10. Require special permits to sell and apply the manure to other farmers. We should be able to file complaints against the other farmer if we feel there is an odor management problem. These other farmers are typically not aware of the GAAMP odor management requirements.

Whitman, Wayne (MDA)

From: Casteel, Heather (MDA)
Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2011 8:13 AM
To: Whitman, Wayne (MDA)
Cc: Mahoney, Stephen (MDA); Esch, Kristin (MDA)
Subject: FW: gaamps

Hi Wayne, I have received this suggested change to the GAAMPs.

Heather

From: James D'Arcy [mailto:jldarcy@centurytel.net]
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2011 10:58 PM
To: Casteel, Heather (MDA)
Subject: gaamps

MDA
Re: manure management practices

I would like to see something added to the accepted practices that addresses road maintenance issues that result from the transportation of the manure from the source to the field. The manure is often hauled many miles on county and township roads. The weight, speed and volume of traffic required to transport the material in the large tankers causes a real issue with dust control, gravel deterioration and blacktop maintenance.

There seems to be nothing in the road code to address the problems created by manure hauling, feed and trucking from mega dairies.

Could something be added so that the farms involved are made to provide dust control, etc.?

Sincerely,
Jim D'Arcy
Marlette, MI

Casteel, Heather (MDA)

From: thezaluchas@peoplepc.com
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2011 11:18 PM
To: Casteel, Heather (MDA)
Subject: Farm Market GAAMP

The Farm Market GAAMP of January 2010 is more detrimental to locally grown farmers' products than prior to its existence. Our township had provisions in our ordinance for farmers to create farm stands and sell their produce at their homestead (TRUE farmers' markets!). Your GAAMP has overridden our ordinance and now any person (whether living in our township or simply owning a piece of property) can import nearly 100% of their goods from wherever (wholesale distributor) and sell it in our township under the protection of the GAAMP and the illusion of a farmers' market.

The biggest loophole in the GAAMP is the determination of 50% of the products marketed. The GAAMP wording with the 50% retail space allows the property owner (I won't use the word Farmer as it doesn't apply) to import 50% of the retail space with goods from wherever and the other 50% of space displays some products growing on the property. For instance, this allows a property owner to display a heavily concentrated area (say 1 acre) with imported produce/products and have a 1 acre area planted with pine trees for transplant. He simply needs to sell one pine tree a year to validate his 1 acre retail space homegrown marketed product. His gross sales could be 99.9% imported products, but he meets the 50% retail space rule. Until this GAAMP came into existence, we were able to monitor sales through the township 50% sales rule and control the imported goods. But now the GAAMP approves a farm market via the 50% retail space and does allow a township to promote locally grown produce, as we could in the past.

There was no issue with roadside farmers' markets in our township in the past. Now, this unfavorably written GAAMP will allow the creation of roadside stands with imported, non-locally grown produce to compete with the long-time true farmers' roadside stands. This GAAMP will hurt our farmers who want to sell their locally produced goods at a roadside stand instead of creating a better opportunity for them.

Please consider modifying the wording of the 50% rule to prevent the importation of products as I have described. The current wording does not help our local farmers. It in fact, creates competition from property owners (non-farmers) with connections to wholesale produce. I know of one small farmer who will likely discontinue his roadside stand due to the importation of non-locally grown produce at a neighboring farm market (per the rules of the GAAMP) which is in direct competition to his small farm stand. This is absolutely WRONG and the authors of this GAAMP are responsible.

Sincerely,

Paul Zalucha
Webster Township Planning Commissioner
734-426-1969

9/28/2011

Casteel, Heather (MDA)

From: Janet Kauffman [jkauffman@emich.edu]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2011 12:32 PM
To: Casteel, Heather (MDA)
Cc: Dale Rozeboom; Wendy Powers-Schilling; Johnson, James (MDA); Miller, Scott (DEQ)
Subject: comments: Manure Management, Site Selection GAAMPs

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

My thanks to Dale Rozeboom for including me as a guest on the Manure Management GAAMPs Committee this year. I appreciate the effort to address the risks of liquid manure on frozen and snow-covered ground, although there is much more to be done to protect water quality.

My comments here are broad-based, and are for both Manure Management and Site Selection GAAMPs:

It is 30 years since the Right to Farm Act and GAAMPs were set in place in Michigan. Farms and farm practices have changed drastically since 1981. A nuisance concern in 1981 has -- with the construction of CAFOs, and the introduction of liquid manure systems, for instance -- often become in 2011 a much larger concern, a matter of air or water pollution and risk to health. It's time to re-think which practices are truly acceptable to farmers, to agricultural communities, and to the environment.

It's time for a substantive re-assessment of "generally accepted" agricultural practices, rather than the customary annual review and editing. I hope these 2 GAAMPs committees will re-visit ag practices in that comprehensive way in the coming year. The idea of nuisance, for instance, clearly includes degradation of water, air, and rural communities. Should some practices be prohibited because of the risks, not just avoided?

It would make sense to re-assess those practices most greatly changed in the last 30 years, which have had serious impact on resources, on rural communities and the environment, such as:

Manure Management--

- liquid manure application without incorporation
- application of liquid manure to frozen and snow-covered ground
- clean groundwater used to liquefy manure, immediately polluting it
- application of liquid manure in impaired watersheds
- application of liquid manure on tiled fields, designed to drain liquids

Site Selection and Odor Control GAAMPs--

- numbers of large operations in a watershed, in small watersheds, in impaired watersheds
- numbers of large operations in one area, overlapping downwind effects

As changes happen over time, we often overlook the cumulative effects, the systemic risks. We try add-on fixes, complicating practices rather than changing them. 30 years is a good time to stop, look around, and look ahead to agricultural practices we can all live with, and live well.

Sincerely,
Janet Kauffman
14671 W. Cadmus Rd
Hudson, MI 49247

Janet Kauffman, Vice-President
Environmentally Concerned Citizens of South Central Michigan Hudson, MI

ECCSCM is a 501(c)3 nonprofit
...working to protect the water and air and public health in our agricultural communities

Support our Water Monitoring Project! -- click the Donate button on our website -- www.eccscm.org

Casteel, Heather (MDA)

From: Rita Chapman [rita.chapman@sierraclub.org]
Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2011 4:51 PM
To: Casteel, Heather (MDA)
Cc: Rita.Chapman@sierraclub.org; 'Lynn Henning'; 'Anne Woiwode'
Subject: Sierra Club GAAMPs Comments 2011.doc
Attachments: image001.jpg

**MICHIGAN CHAPTER**

Via email to: casteelh@michigan.gov

RE: Public input on Michigan's Generally Accepted Agriculture Management Practices

28 September 2011

To whom it may concern:

Thank you for the opportunity to give input on Michigan's Generally Accepted Agriculture Management Practices, or the GAAMPs. People who live in close proximity to large concentrated animal feeding operations have intimate knowledge of the consequences of many of these livestock agriculture practices, some of which we'll address here. As a resident of Lenawee County, Ms. Henning and her neighbors are impacted many times a month, often every day, and certainly every week.

The Commission of Agriculture needs to fully reassess the entire GAAMPs program used here in Michigan. Many of the practices promoted in the GAAMPs have been banned or are no longer used in other states because they have been found to have deleterious impacts to citizens' and community quality of life and wellbeing.

Animal manure should not be spread on human food crops

A study conducted by University of Nebraska Extension found that animal manure should NOT be spread on food crops that are used for human consumption. Please see the attached document titled *Application of Liquid Animal Manures Using Center Pivot Irrigation Systems*, page 6, last paragraph of section Pathogen Transmission to Animals and Humans.

GAAMPs that conflict with permit requirements should be eliminated.

GAAMPs are voluntary practices. Yet for NPDES-permitted CAFOs, some practices listed in GAAMPs actually violate State and Federal Law. For example, stockpiling of manure is prohibited in the NPDES permit.

Siting decisions and variances should include both meaningful public input by potentially-impacted neighbors, and input from the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality

9/28/2011

Air quality and Siting have caused violations of Michigan's Part 901 law for Quality of Life, and caused one facility, Stateline Farms, to shut down their new barns.

Irrigation GAAMP should not promote aerial spraying of liquid manure

Travel irrigation also includes chemicals in chemigation and fertilizers (manure) in fertigation. But some states have banned irrigation of waste. For example: Travel irrigation has been stopped in Wisconsin.

Tiled fields and buried waterways should not have waste applied over them.

Tile lines should not have irrigation of chemicals, fertilizers, or waste discharged over them because the tiles often cause discharges of the wastes to ditches that lead to waters of the state. Some CAFO facilities have been Sited directly over buried county drains, or have field drainage tiles beneath them. These are often visible on older topographic maps or older aerial photos. Some facilities have been Sited with waters of the state in the production areas.

There is no public announcement of approvals, or of expansions.

Manure is not being analyzed for all contents, including pathogens, viruses, bacteria, chemicals.

The Agriculture Commission for the GAAMPs committee is not mandated, there are no public health officials, nor is USEPA on the committee.

Accepted practices cannot violate human rights.

Example:

CAFO Application

2010 Spreading on a holiday weekend is a permit violation, but the complaint is closed and not transferred to DEQ.

2011

The same field, same holiday weekend spreading is not a violation, complaint is closed.

Expansions are being approved that violate GAAMPs.

Lynn Henning
CAFO Water Sentinel
Lynn.henning@sierraclub.org
517-605-7740

Rita Chapman
Clean Water Program Direction
517-484-2372

109 East Grand River Avenue • Lansing, Michigan 48906-4348
Phone: (517) 484-2372 • Email: michigan.chapter@sierraclub.org • Fax: (517) 484-3108
Web: <http://michigan.sierraclub.org>

Casteel, Heather (MDA)

From: kmelmoth [kdmelmoth@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2011 11:52 AM
To: Casteel, Heather (MDA)
Subject: Comment on Manure management GAAMPS

Comment on Manure Management GAAMPS:

Spray irrigation of liquid manure, (all methods, particularly big guns,) should be prohibited immediately. Numerous studies have shown that aerosolized liquid manure contains pathogens (bacteria, virus etc), fecal material, VOCs, particulate, and gases that are dangerous to human health. Exposure to pathogens can cause serious illness and infections such as pneumonia, bronchitis, MRSA, hepatitis, to name a just few diseases. With increasing antibiotic resistance, infections are more dangerous and difficult to treat and can be deadly.

Breathing fine manure droplets and fecal material from sprayed liquid manure puts the health of neighbors and especially children and the elderly at great risk. No other industry is allowed to throw dangerous contaminants in the air in the immediate vicinity of neighbors. Mechanically throwing liquid manure into the air especially on windy days goes beyond nuisance to being an unacceptable health problem for the community. Please prohibit these practices immediately.

Sincerely,
Kathy Melmoth, RN
Pittsford, MI

Casteel, Heather (MDA)

From: Whitman, Wayne (MDA)
Sent: Monday, October 17, 2011 1:29 PM
To: Casteel, Heather (MDA)
Subject: RE: Intensive Livestock Operations
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

Heather:

Let's include this as a comment on the Site Selection GAAMPS.

Thanks.

Wayne

From: Casteel, Heather (MDA)
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2011 11:46 AM
To: Whitman, Wayne (MDA); Mahoney, Stephen (MDA)
Subject: FW: Intensive Livestock Operations

I think this is an FYI at this point

Heather

From: Jerry Rohde [mailto:jerry@wheelertownship.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 15, 2011 11:24 AM
To: Casteel, Heather (MDA)
Cc: wheelertwp@ispmgt.com
Subject: Intensive Livestock Operations

Our Township Residents are very concerned about the expansion of the Intensive Livestock Operations. At this time we have within our boundries one average size Dairy operation and another large Dairy Operator that has recently purchaased 160 acres of land within our Township. My main concern is there are not enough regulations to keep them from expanding into Rural Residential areas. We are very concerned about the polution of our ground water, our streams and the oders that are present from these operations. As an example the one large Dairy Operator who purchased the 160 acres in our TWP put well over 200 turck loads of liquid manuer on that parcel this past spring. The smell did not last long as the liquid manure was worked into the soil but local residnts fear that in a few more applications of this magintude it will be getting into our drinking water. The other average size Dairy operation was allowed to be built to close to our local Village as in several weeks of the year has it produces oders that people complain about a lot. Also we have complaints about the flies that are present from this operation. I feel that by allowing the expansion of these facilities it will hurt any further Rural Residential or Business Development in our Township that is anywhere near these operations. I also feel it would be best for all if Intensive Livestock Operations were only allowed to develop in areas where there is little or no Residential Housing or Businesses. We in our Township need to be able to be able to set up our Zoning to keep these types of operations where there is little or no housing and not allow them to develop where they will hurt any further Residential or Business Development. I feel that the way they are regulated by GAAMPS they are pretty much allowed to go and develop wherever they want with little or no regard for local Residents or Township Zoning.

Best Regards

Jerry Rohde

Wheeler Township Supervisor

10/17/2011