

Robin Moore

This project MUST undergo an environmental review, first and foremost. I can not overstate the impact that CAFO's have on rural residents. Aesthetics and quality of life aside (who really cares about that anyway, right? House values, ability to hang laundry out, ability to take walks outside, all trivial), the impact that a facility like this has on ground and surface water is terrifying. In rural areas, we all know that the acres that they report available for manure distribution are a perfect-case scenario, and the larger the operation, with so much volume and the time it takes to get that volume of manure distributed, the more likely that the ground will be : 1. too wet to get onto which leads to concentration in dry (higher, sandier) acres and any concentration affects surface water 2. Frozen, which leads to run off and contamination of surface water. We have all seen this happen. 3. That not all of the acres will actually be available, that some of the acres will be too far, that concentration will happen.

That's just obvious contamination of surface water. Who pays for that? I haven't seen a tax or any real penalties or any responsibility on Riverview's part to pay for cleaning water.

What about ground water and aquifers - apparently this permit asks for 226 million gallons per year. That's over 2/3rds of what Morris MN is permitted - and how many people does that serve? How many people does Riverview serve? How is this massive CAFO going to affect anyone sharing that aquifer - with concentration of manure, which will undoubtedly happen, especially with larger and larger operations, there will be groundwater contamination. Is Riverview going to pay for RO systems for every rural household on the aquifer? What about volume? How many houses/businesses/towns are going to find their wells dry? Do you know? Probably not, the DNR barely knows this. Will Riverview pay for a thorough study?

This just isn't fair, there is nothing ok about Riverview, but there's even less ok about forgoing an the requirement for an environmental impact statement. No feedlot of whom this has been required has ever continued, because there is nothing environmentally sound about massive feedlots. Those operations were all a lot smaller than Riverview's proposal, how can it be permissible to forgo an Environmental Impact Statement? This sets frightening precedents for corporations (no, Riverview is not a family operation, it is a massive, for profit business that seeks to extract resources with no consideration for the environment or people who live near their operations) to turn our rural areas into "sacrifice zones", sacrificing water, resident flora and fauna, habitat, and live-ability in a huge radius around these areas.

How about economic impact - on dairies, on house values, on rural infrastructure - are you making Riverview fund a 3rd party economic impact assessment? How many small farms is this going to asphyxiate? How many independent farmers is this going to be the final straw for?

I feel like my rural community is becoming an industrial zone, and that's not how agriculture will survive, it's what it looks like before it dies, choking on it's own excess. There should be extra barriers, extra costs, extra diligence, extra taxes, extra requirements for any one business that seeks to impact an entire watershed. Not one single regulation less.