Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Sue Haake (dghaake@wwt.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 4:34 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Sue Haake
9750 30th St.
Colfax, WI 54730
dghaake@wwt.net
(715) 874-5259

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Kathleen Anderson (kathleen.tutt.anderson@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 4:47 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I feel strongly that any big business needs to be regulated and monitored for the welfare and safety for the public. These farms are no different, perhaps even more important because of the possible impact to the environment. Local citizens and government need a voice and protection!

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Anderson
149 E Prospect St
Port Washington, WI 53074
kathleen.tutt.anderson@gmail.com
(262) 355-5665

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Celeste Lozano (onanieo@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 4:47 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Celeste Lozano
1785 N Water St. Apt. 1434
Celeste, WI 53202
onanieo@gmail.com
(956) 292-5575

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Sue Costoff (hardwaresusan@sbcglobal.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 5:31 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I don?t for the life for me and Melinda became OK to be so indifferent to sadistic treatment sadistic cruel inhumane treatment of our Fellow Mortals but it should absolutely stop; the end does not justify the means!

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Sue Costoff
909 Hazel Ridge rd
Sue, WI 53121
hardwaresusan@sbcglobal.net
(262) 903-3518

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Jessica Riley (jriley5@new.rr.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 15, 2019 12:17 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Jessica Riley
1027 Rugby St
Oshkosh, WI 54902
jriley5@new.rr.com
(920) 203-3353

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Susan Davie (grandood@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 15, 2019 10:30 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

My home in Kewaunee Co. has not had drinkable water since the fields began to be fertilized with liquid manure from the CAFOs. I live on top of the Niagara Escarpment where the topsoil is very close to bedrock. These factory farms only benefit a few families, while ruining the water for many and contributing to the decline in the number of smaller family farms.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this

issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Susan Davie
E708 Co. Rd. X
Luxemburg, WI 54305
grandood@aol.com
(920) 432-1658

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Robin Chene (chenerobin@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 15, 2019 9:43 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

factory farms pose hazards to people and are inhumane for animals.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Robin Chene
530 W LAKESIDE ST
MADISON, WI 53715
chenerobin@yahoo.com
(608) 213-3821

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Miriah Marx (miriah.marx96@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 6:24 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Miriah Marx
3918 Northwestern Ave
Racine, WI 53405
miriah.marx96@gmail.com
(262) 676-8544

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Dee Costello (dougc262@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 3:16 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Dee Costello
W333S4205 Connemara Dr
Dousman, WI 53118
dougc262@aol.com
(262) 392-2701

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Leslie Roxanne Stanick (leslie.stanick@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 1:04 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I agree, animal raising should post bonds to ensure that local governments don?t end up cleaning up animal catastrophes, including deaths by fire, flooding, disease or other issue. The companies have to ensure they have enough cash flow to Care for their animals in emergency situations. They MYST have insurance to cover their losses.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Leslie Roxanne Stanick
2307 Newberry
Milwaukee, WI 53211
leslie.stanick@gmail.com
(604) 728-4471

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: ciel ishatova (ishatova@chartermi.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 11:37 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

ciel ishatova
4704 winnequah road
monona, WI 53716
ishatova@chartermi.net
(608) 221-4805

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Dean Butts (dbutts1257@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 10:43 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Dean Butts
195 W Randolph St
Rosholt, WI 54473
dbutts1257@gmail.com
(715) 451-2965

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Joanne Hesselink (sewwhat1@centurytel.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 10:41 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

There are already far too many people who have to drink bottled water because their water is polluted. How about the livestock, pets and poultry who are drinking the same polluted water? In some cases we may even be eating those animals, certainly not healthy either.
Those big CAFOS must stop that runoff into streams or our groundwater.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Joanne Hesselink
W2838 Eagle Road
Neshkoro, WI 54960
sewwhat1@centurytel.net
(920) 293-4455

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Kim Maedke (wweigel@mixcom.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 10:22 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

My sisters and I own the rural property we inherited in Kewaunee County. This property has been in our family for well over a 100 years. Some of the property that we used to own is touching some of our remaining property. This property is being sprayed with liquid manure from the CAFO farms. In the afternoons or early morning hours countless liquid manure trucks are carrying the manure to unknown places. The trucks come one by one with maybe 30 seconds in between. You can tell the land that has been sprayed by this manure as there is a whitish/gray tint to the soil. Gone are the days where one was always able to see cows grazing in the pasture. Now one sees these monstrous buildings that often look like the Amazon distribution center. These have no place in a bucolic countryside. Many wells have been contaminated in Kewaunee County. This was never a worry growing up and now we had to pay to have it inspected. Above all this practice disrespects the animals that are forced to live this way. There is no way this is a sustainable practice let alone a humane one.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would

create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Kim Maedke
4139 N Newhall St
Shorewood, WI 53211
wweigel@mixcom.com
(414) 429-9391

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: John Downs (jeddowns@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 9:53 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

When I practiced as an occupational and environmental medicine physician, I occasionally dealt with individuals with airway and odor irritant issues from H2S and mercaptans as well as mists and particulates. Property values, especially for rural non farmers plummet in the face of concentrated odors. the horse is already out of the barn when it comes to coliform and nitrate pollution. Laws need to be in place to not further degrade ground water and environmental quality. Yes CAFO's may be more efficient but they are displacing the independent family farmer for the sake of corporate or large family corporate entities. I especially support bonding as I look at CAFO's as an extractive industry. Historically, extractive industries have done their thing until things et financially tough and then they declare bankruptcy and clear out leaving Superfund sites, brownfields, and other detritus that society then has to deal with

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

John Downs
3768 Birch Trail
CROSS PLAINS, WI 53528
jeddowns@gmail.com
(608) 512-7177

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Gene and Mimi Wuest (mimiswuest@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 9:28 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

This is a real message from people who vote. We love the long history of protection of natural resources that Wisconsin has, and we are very concerned about the loss of regulations on air and water quality. Greed has had the upper hand in Wisconsin for too long now. Please help us return to planning for the long range health of land and people.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Gene and Mimi Wuest
E5468 Herritz Rd.
Reedsburg, WI 53959
mimiswuest@gmail.com
(608) 524-4833

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Kendall Banks (kendallctv@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 9:17 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am concerned for the state, my neighbors and my own family's health.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Kendall Banks
4073 Glidden Drive
Sturgeon Bay, WI 54235
kendallctv@aol.com
(920) 493-6627

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Karen Brown-Schaible (kbschaible@sbcglobal.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 9:05 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I know that local communities, such as Kewanee County, have had significant issues with water contamination from farm animals. If animals are going to be kept it HUGE herds, you need the equivalent of a sewage treatment plant. "Undoing" the environmental damage, once it is done, is a monumental task. It is much smarter to set common sense regulations to avoid contamination and keep our water supply safe.
Thank you for listening to my concerns.
Sincerely,
Karen Brown-Schaible

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Karen Brown-Schaible
2963 Lumber Lane
Green Bay, WI 54313
kbschaible@sbcglobal.net
(920) 362-6279

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Caitlin Berry (cmkberry@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 8:31 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Caitlin Berry
10949 w Wisconsin ave
Caitlin, WI 53226
cmkberry@gmail.com
(262) 993-9721

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: John Sathre (jsat54@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 8:04 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

John Sathre
3438 Spruce Street
Janesville, WI 53546
jsat54@hotmail.com
(608) 436-3387

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Julie Brown (juliefernbrown@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 8:03 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Julie Brown
N3926 Claire Road
Taylor, WI 54659
juliefernbrown@gmail.com
(608) 525-5888

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Kerri Piazza (kpiazza@charter.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 7:56 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Kerri Piazza
2606 Baumgartner Dr.
Kerri, WI 54603
kpiazza@charter.net
(608) 317-3652

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Daniel Marston (daniel.e.marston@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 2:35 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

The future of agriculture is NOT to be found in Industrialisation and "mass feeding" (of what products? from what gigantic company that is not interested in animals or people, but only profits?!)

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Daniel Marston
114 Hudson Street
Eau Claire, WI 54702
daniel.e.marston@gmail.com
(612) 618-5969

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: jackie thiry (jackiemthiry@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 9:50 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Water is one of our most precious and essential resources. We must protect it.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

jackie thiry
1600 Rustic Oaks Ct. #8
Green Bay, WI 54301
jackiemthiry@yahoo.com
(920) 435-5437

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Helgaleena Healingline (helgaleenas@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 8:33 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Helgaleena Healingline
112 Owen Road no. 6121
Monona, WI 53716
helgaleenas@yahoo.com
(608) 255-0504

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Ashley OKon (okona81@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 8:26 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Clean land and water is incredibly important, not only for myself but for my child! Please help to protect the natural beauty and healthy waters of WI

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Ashley OKon
536 Scott St
Ripon, WI 54971
okona81@yahoo.com
(920) 229-3580

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Mary Kirsch (dmkirsch@tds.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 8:16 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Our nephew runs a dairy farm and is very discouraged by all the problems that are being created for them by large corporate farming.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Mary Kirsch
224 Swiss Meadow Lane
Green Bay, WI 54302
dmkirsch@tds.net
(920) 406-8228

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Lynn Shoemaker (shoemakl@uww.edu) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 8:06 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am very worried about CAFOs and water. The regulations should guarantee that the water on land surrounding a CAFO will not be polluted. Neighbors should be able to have clean water.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Lynn Shoemaker
172 N. Esterly Ave.
Whitewater, WI 53190
shoemakl@uww.edu
(262) 473-5347

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Lisa Barrett (leezalu72@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 7:48 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Lisa Barrett
1810 West Hart Road, APT 8
Beloit, WI 53511
leezalu72@yahoo.com
(815) 516-9296

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Cheri Zeise-Schmidt (czschmidt@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 7:05 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Cheri Zeise-Schmidt
1521 Drewry Ln
Madison, WI 53704
czschmidt@hotmail.com
(608) 347-2659

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Elizabeth Keyes (ekeyes@sbcglobal.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 6:52 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I have been personally impacted by this issue. A few years ago my well was contaminated with manure and we had to dig a new well. The field adjacent to my property is owned by a CAFO and they spread more than the allowed amount just before a heavy rain. This happens often in the area where I live because they self regulate. I also checked to see if their permits were up to date and they weren't at the time. I have spoken with people from the DNR and they are just as distraught as I am about this issue and understand that it all comes down to legislation in the end. I have an autoimmune disease and at the time I was taking immunosuppressants which compromised my immune system during the exposure. When manure is spread in the area where I live the ammonia makes my asthma flare up as well. I know I am not the only one that has been affected in these negative ways. Please help.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Keyes
N6934 High Point Rd
Beaver Dam, WI 53916
ekeyes@sbcglobal.net
(920) 344-7572

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Gloria Krueger (gloria4304@att.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 6:50 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I lived not more than a mile away from a CAFO in Malone, WI. At that time neighbors signed petitions and went to hearings and to court but they were not successful in stopping the CAFO. The CAFO continued and finally they were pressured into putting in a manure digestor. Then there was a manure spill which went down a stream into Lake Winnebago, killing many fish and creating an algae problem in the lake. I have since moved but I know how much regulations are needed for factory farms. Please do all you can to pass stronger requirements on CAFOs. All people are affected when we don't have clean water and air and the soil is saturated with nitrogen from the manure spreading.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay

to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Gloria Krueger
1445 MacArthur Rd.
Madison, WI 53714
gloria4304@att.net
(608) 906-1090

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: David Hoffmann (daveho@charter.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 5:42 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

My parents had to drill a new well due to nitrate contamination from nearby intensive dairy operations. I agree with everything in the above message. Please do the right thing for your constituents and the environment. Thank you.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

David Hoffmann
w10857 oak st
new london, WI 54961
daveho@charter.net
(987) 654-3210

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Aleks Kosowicz (guerillawordfare@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 13, 2019 5:35 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

ATCP 51 revisions will help protect Wisconsinites from some the impacts of CAFOs on our land, water, and health. I support strong and more robust updates to the Livestock Siting Law, including increased inspection and stronger local requirements--but they could be even stronger. Replacing the previous system of determining how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is an improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact practices. Setbacks need to be much larger, neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified, and local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.
Operators should be required to adhere to stronger pollution plans by listing owned, rented and contracted acres (along with signed rental contracts) where they plan to spread manure; and facility expansions should require full review. Additionally, local governments should be allowed to secure financial assurance, like increased permitting fees with a bond as part of the process to ensure governments aren?t covering the costs and mess if CAFOs go bankrupt or something happens--and something ALWAYS happens.
Our people and natural resources are precious and deserve every protection possible from the negative impacts of these 'farms.'

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Aleks Kosowicz
12876 N. Balsam Road
Hayward, WI 54843
guerillawordfare@yahoo.com
(715) 462-4322

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Forrest Netzel (photonetz@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, August 16, 2019 12:15 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

We need stronger regulations to prevent factory farms from spreading excess manure and ruining aquifers and watersheds!

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Forrest Netzel
14255 W Maylore Dr
New Berlin, WI 53151
photonetz@aol.com
(262) 555-5555

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Diane Twardy (dianetwardy@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, August 16, 2019 8:56 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

how to keep animal waste from getting into rivers, underground well etc.
Factory farms are too secretive, more openness for communities

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Diane Twardy
524 terrace ave
burlington, WI 53105
dianetwardy@gmail.com
(262) 342-5158

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Joyce Radtke (fulfillment7@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, August 16, 2019 8:42 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I personally feel that CAFO's are not an asset to the state and that the milk they produce is tainted because of the sad and sorry conditions these animals are raised in.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Joyce Radtke
5469 S. 23rd St
Milwaukee 53221, WI 53221
fulfillment7@yahoo.com
(414) 510-6651

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Mary Junek (mjunek75@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 15, 2019 10:07 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am concerned about the animal abuse and environmental degradation inherent in a CAFO. It isn?t natural for cows to be crowded in feed lots. Also, waste accumulates rapidly from so many cows which compromises our clean air and water standards.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Mary Junek
S87W26990 National Ave
Mukwonago, WI 53149
mjunek75@gmail.com
(262) 363-4373

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Deborah Bascom (crazydeb40@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2019 11:17 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Deborah Bascom
2056 Ludington Ave
Wauwatosa, WI 53226
crazydeb40@yahoo.com
(414) 259-0203

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Karolyn Beebe (keedo70@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2019 10:34 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I strongly support small family farms and smaller operations that don't create excessive amounts of waste that overloads land, water , neighbors and communities.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Karolyn Beebe
220 Merry St
Madison, WI 53704
keedo70@gmail.com
(608) 246-0222

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Erika Voss (vvossem4@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 17, 2019 3:47 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I believe that the large factory farms make it difficult for the smaller Family Farms to survive. The proposed rules will benefit the smaller farms and the environment.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Erika Voss
2200 N 64th St
Wauwatosa, WI 53213
vvossem4@gmail.com
(414) 259-7808

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Suzy Clarkson Holstein (clarkson@wi.rr.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, August 16, 2019 4:02 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

As smaller farms continue to go out of business, the farm size here in the state has gotten larger. CAFOs have not been sufficiently regulated up to now, and we need to make these changes for the health and safety of all Wisconsinites. Thank you.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Suzy Clarkson Holstein
1605 East Menlo Boulevard
Shorewood, WI 53211
clarkson@wi.rr.com
(414) 332-2517

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Patricia Belongie (gofish001@sbcglobal.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2019 3:20 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Every person has the right to clean ans safe drinking water and I call on our legislature to make the news essay changes to the livestock facility rule revision ATCP 51.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Patricia Belongie
2834 Stoney Beach Street
Oshkosh, WI 54902
gofish001@sbcglobal.net
(920) 233-1719

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Morgan Clucas (mkcndc@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Monday, August 19, 2019 3:29 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I think it is paramount in the face of climate change and limited resources that we prioritize working with farmers to protect the environment and ensure the financial stability of local governments. This can be accomplished by allowing local governments to impose rules as they deem necessary, eliminating loopholes and exemptions from inspections, and creating a form of financial assurance to protect local governments as they protect the environment, people, and economy from CAFOs.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this

issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Morgan Clucas
403 E Johnson St. #3
Madison, WI 53703
mkcndc@gmail.com
(715) 321-0852

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Hannah Lee (casaelmilagro@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2019 1:43 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

In short, CAFOs must be better regulated to greatly lessen their destructive effects, and must be paid for by their owners, not by taxpayers.

The treatment of animals in these facilities must be closely monitored for abuse, neglect, and cruelty as well. Owners must understand that cruelty costs.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this

issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Hannah Lee
3834 Whitman Lane #312
Madison, WI 53704
casaelmilagro@gmail.com
(608) 588-7365

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Meg Siebert (megansiebert90@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2019 2:23 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

We need to continue to adapt our agriculture practices to a changing world. I support these adaptations that help factory farms continue to function while reducing their negative impact on the environment.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Meg Siebert
806 Whispering Pines Way
Fitchburg, WI 53713
megansiebert90@gmail.com
(785) 580-9634

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Tom Pyrek (tompyrek@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2019 4:20 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Factory farms should be subject to very strict requirements for space for the animals so they are not cramped together like slaves on a slave ship and the chance to be outdoors (out of a building and on grass) for at least 4 hours per day.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Tom Pyrek
221 22nd St. N
La Crosse, WI 54601
tompyrek@hotmail.com
(608) 784-7139

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Chase Cummings <ccummings@co.pepin.wi.us>
Sent: Friday, August 23, 2019 12:40 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: Pepin County Livestock Siting Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Board of Agricultural, Trade and Consumer Protection:

On behalf of the Pepin County Land Conservation & Planning/Extension Committee, please accept the following comments regarding the proposed Livestock Facility Siting (ATCP 51) rule revisions.

Currently, Pepin County has not adopted Livestock Facility Siting rules either through countywide zoning or licensing ordinance. However, three of our townships have adopted their own ordinances consistent with the Livestock Facility Siting Rules (ATCP 51). With that said, Pepin County is exploring its administrative and regulatory options to address an increase in private well water contamination of nitrates. As Pepin County learns more about the Livestock Facility Siting statutes and rules, it is apparent that a county's authority to address these resource concerns are limited to the authorities that the state legislature has granted to it. While we understand the intent of the Livestock Facility Siting Law was to provide uniform expectations for all parties involved for the siting of a livestock facility across the state, it is with frustration that Pepin County and other counties are not able to address their resource concerns in a way that is unique and needed for their communities.

Nitrate contamination of groundwater is not caused by only livestock facilities, however, it appears that the statutes and rules have limited a County's authority to regulate only livestock facilities of a certain size. By implementing the tools statutorily available to counties, it does not appear that we, as a county and as a state, have been successful preventing contamination of our resources. In several ways it is viewed as a failure of our systems.

We understand and sympathize with the current economic hardships of agriculture in our state and particularly with our livestock facilities in our county. It appears that the system is failing them as well. We understand the considerations needed to balance a healthy agricultural economy and healthy water resources that serve all citizens. However, as we navigate our options to address a dire need for groundwater quality improvements, we support the proposed rule changes that increase the best management practices for water quality protection including related Natural Resources Conservation Service technical standards, as well as evaluating existing manure storage facilities for leakages and failures. We also have implementation concerns regarding the impacts to the local municipalities. As we evaluate adoption of a licensing ordinance, it is evident the challenges that our county must face to implement such a rule. The limit on permit fees are not adequate to cover the costs of implementation and administration and should be defined by the local community based on anticipated staff costs by farm size. The challenges associated with determining if a farm's animal units have increased above 20% are also a concern. While we feel there would be benefits to adopting this rule into local ordinance, having the capacity to do so is difficult and for some of our townships, may be impossible.

As we decide whether or not to adopt a livestock facility licensing ordinance, having a law that provides tools for local units of government to adequately implement the necessary standards to support safe groundwater, we encourage you to consider these comments in finalizing this rule.

Again on behalf of the Pepin County Land Conservation & Planning /Extension Committee, we appreciate your service and for the opportunity to provide comment.

Sincerely,

Chase Cummings
Pepin County Land Conservation
& Planning Director
715-672-8665 ext. 5

Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in this communication may be confidential. It is intended only for the use of the recipient(s) named above, and may be legally privileged. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication, or any of its contents, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and destroy this communication. If you have any questions concerning this message, please notify the sender.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Adrianna Jereb (sunshinegirl0007@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Monday, August 26, 2019 3:26 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Adrianna Jereb
21802 Knollwood Rd.
Kendall, WI 54638
sunshinegirl0007@gmail.com
(608) 427-3986

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: David Mazurek (northwoodsdave@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 27, 2019 8:32 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

David Mazurek
2751 9 1/2 Street
Barronett, WI 54813
northwoodsdave@yahoo.com
(715) 822-8013

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Eva Kuzmanich (antique48@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2019 3:39 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

We live near the Pinnacle CAFO and speak from experience and not just in the abstract. So please seriously consider our above comments. The future of Wisconsin is at stake.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Eva Kuzmanich
W851 Lake View Cir
BRODHEAD, WI 53520
antique48@hotmail.com
(608) 897-8193

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Janet McConaughey (greenherblady@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2019 10:05 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Please give local government some power in regulation of these factory farms.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Janet McConaughey
N8144 Lasalle Circle
Oconmowoc, WI 53066
greenherblady@yahoo.com
(262) 567-5794

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: PJ Severson (pjseverson@charter.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, August 30, 2019 9:58 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I have been a WI resident my entire life. I?m now retired and intend to remain in WI. I am now retired from work as a nutrition and health educator and value the quality of our natural resources. My grandparents and husbands family farmed their entire lives in WI. The WI landscape and quality of the natural resources will be forever changed due to CFOs and their negative impact on these resources. THEY NEED MORE REGULATION minimally as Sierra Club members have outlined. In addition NO MORE CFOs should be allowed in our beautiful state. Kudos to Sierra members and others who voice their concerns.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

PJ Severson
3211 South 34 Street
La Crosse, WI 54601
pjseverson@charter.net
(608) 769-2842

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Sarah Cameron (swcameron@wisc.edu) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 6, 2019 9:26 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Sarah Cameron
521 W Main St
Madison, WI 53703
swcameron@wisc.edu
(608) 632-2643

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Cathie Kwasneski (cathiekwas@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 6, 2019 9:03 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Cathie Kwasneski
N1691 mt hope Rd
Brodhead, WI 53520
cathiekwas@yahoo.com
(608) 921-3706

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Madelyn Scheer (mschma@sbcglobal.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 7, 2019 2:55 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Any law that does not have adequate enforcement, process and inspection is not a law at all.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Madelyn Scheer
522 LUDINGTON AVE
MADISON, WI 53704
mschma@sbcglobal.net
(608) 249-0575

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Michael Wilde (mwilde222@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 7, 2019 5:39 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Michael Wilde
W267N5875 MORAINE DR
Lisbon, WI 53089
mwilde222@gmail.com
(262) 893-5644

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Staci Burkard (grinchpt@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 8, 2019 7:36 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I have lived in Wisconsin my whole life and the changes to WI farms is beyond sad and ridiculous. I do not buy food from these kinds of farms as the food is subpar quality and cruel production. We need to return to farming that produces quality food, is sustainable for our environment and respectful to the living creatures raised on the farms.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Staci Burkard
3069 Portarligton
Fitchburg, WI 53711
grinchpt@hotmail.com
(608) 467-6391

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Pam Fischer (pamf@new.rr.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2019 7:58 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I've lived in Wisconsin all my life, 66 years. I have always been proud of how we protected our natural resources, especially our water. Felt privileged and blessed to live in a state with so much clean water everywhere. It breaks my heart and angers me to know that so many of our lakes, streams, wetlands and rivers are now polluted or destroyed or threatened and that so many people now have tainted wells and lands. A big part of that picture is the rise and spread of CAFOs that have been mismanaged and poorly monitored by our legislators and delegated agencies to the extent we are now in crises. It's time we returned to the ways of comprehensive, conscientious stewardship of our lands and resources so our children and future generations can enjoy and benefit from a land of clean, clear waters just like I and all the other adults living here have. We shouldn't be robbing our children of a better future, we should be protecting and building a better future for them. And water - clean, clear healthy water - is a requirement for that future. I may not own or run a farm but I am a proud, caring, thankful lifetime citizen of this beautiful state and I care deeply about the damage CAFOs have done and continue to do. It's important to me that we change that and do a better job of managing large farming operations for the benefit and health of all citizens of this state.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is

being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Pam Fischer
1273 Marian Ln
Green Bay, WI 54304
pamf@new.rr.com
(920) 497-1330

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Carol Mickelsen (cmick018@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2019 1:48 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

--'The Time'!!-2-Create Protections'!!!-is:-'NOWWW'!!-!?!-)))-!!!--('Thank-UUU'!!!-!)))

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Carol Mickelsen
N8283 Kellom Rd. Lot 135
Beaver Dam,, WI 53916
cmick018@gmail.com
(920) 344-9648

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Aleks Kosowicz (guerillawordfare@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:30 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Our collective health is inextricable from the health of our natural resources. Our collective health is more important than individuals' profits. Please protect the public by establishing strong regulations on factory farms. Thank you.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Aleks Kosowicz
12876 N. Balsam Road
Hayward , WI 54843
guerillawordfare@yahoo.com
(715) 462-4322

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Peter Nordgren (pnordgre@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:29 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I support the proposed rule changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule. Wisconsin's water quality has been seriously compromised in Kewaunee County, the Centrl Sands, and other parts of the state. My own region, the Lake Superior Basin, has been at risk. Adopting these new rules moves us toward the kind of standard I expect in our state.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Peter Nordgren
22140 Old Highway 13
Cornucopia, WI 54827
pnordgre@yahoo.com
(715) 292-3484

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Jay Bradbury (bradburyj@sbcglobal.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:28 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Jay Bradbury
2046 Rutledge
Madison , WI 53704
bradburyj@sbcglobal.net
(608) 886-6256

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Everett Fuchs (sunfishbud@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:26 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally,.the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Everett Fuchs
1724 Laurel Avenue
Hudson, WI 54016
sunfishbud@yahoo.com
(715) 386-2858

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Sara Martinez (wicoulee@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:24 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Sara Martinez
E5866 WEBER RD
VIROQUA, WI 54665
wicoulee@yahoo.com
(608) 675-3766

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Lynn Monroe (pearl.honey@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:23 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

You just don't care about anything besides money, do you? What about people?

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Lynn Monroe
1128 Gilbert St.
Neenah, WI 54956
pearl.honey@yahoo.com
(828) 280-1984

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Lynn Monroe (pearl.honey@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:22 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Lynn Monroe
1128 Gilbert St.
Neenah, WI 54956
pearl.honey@yahoo.com
(828) 280-1984

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Patti Gmeiner (pattilanegmeiner@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:21 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Patti Gmeiner
1617 River Street
Niagara, WI 54151
pattilanegmeiner@aol.com
(715) 245-6338

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Mark Latiker (mark.d.latiker@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:21 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Mark Latiker
3530 E Tesch Ave Apt 4
Saint Francis, WI 53235
mark.d.latiker@gmail.com
(414) 690-1714

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Taran Green (tshep756@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:21 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Taran Green
1364 Pheasant Run
New Richmond, WI 54017
tshep756@hotmail.com
(612) 636-4024

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Diane Twardy (dianetwardy@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:03 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Cut back on factory farming, too many antibiotics, animal waste is a huge problem, people are cutting back on meat, to help with the climate.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Diane Twardy
524 Terrace Ave
Burlington, WI 53105
dianetwardy@gmail.com
(262) 342-5158

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Jeffrey Dix (jdix10@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:01 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Dix
4708 Stettin Dr
Wausau, WI 54401
jdix10@hotmail.com
(715) 845-5258

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Caleb Schuster (caleb.5@me.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:00 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Caleb Schuster
2876 Skyhawk Drive
Eau Claire , WI 54703
caleb.5@me.com
(715) 450-5178

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Sue Haake (dghaake@wwt.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 6:54 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Sue Haake
9750 30th St.
Colfax, WI 54730
dghaake@wwt.net
(715) 874-5259

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: mark pass (moishe18us@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 6:49 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Clean water, clean air and sustainable agriculture are requirements for a healthy future in Wisconsin!

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

mark pass
404 westminster drive
waukesha, WI 53186
moishe18us@yahoo.com
(262) 442-9905

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Steve Deibele (steve@deibele.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 6:36 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

CAFO livestock management comes with many societal costs that are usually not considered by the public. The large tracts of land, with monocropping, high manure concentrations, and required mechanical operations are very uninviting to wildlife of most sorts. With climate change in full swing, these massive operations will be very prone to weather stresses, with fewer means of adaptation due to their sizes. This leads to increased starvation risk of the public. These huge operations also do not support societal needs anywhere near as well as small, family-based farm operations. Protect our surface waters. Protect our drinking waters. Proactively protect our wildlife and surrounding nature. Protect the quality of the foods produced by our local farms.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Steve Deibele
19714 Reichardt Road
Kiel, WI 53042
steve@deibele.com
(920) 333-0056

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Laurie Woltman (pinecone@live.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 6:34 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

It matters to me because I support humane treatment of animals, protecting our environment and because it is OUR responsibility!

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Laurie Woltman
N8294 County Road QQ
Malone, WI 53049
pinecone@live.com
(920) 933-2464

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Randy OConnell (randyoconnell53ad@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 6:33 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Allowing CAFOs to have their way is another example of allowing corporations to ride roughshod over us all.

Besides putting the small, traditional farmer out of business, CAFOs also pollute our water sources while they enjoy personal gain.

Their claim of providing jobs in no way offsets the health compromising pollution they create. Tell me, what value do you place on compromised health and the compromising of personal property water wells ? I would be interested to know.

Lastly, go to the Menomonie, WI area and take a look at the water conditions in Lake Menomin and Tainter Lake. As we speak, they resemble pea soup. I don?t think this blue green algae possesses any redeeming qualities.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would

create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Randy OConnell
11245 N. Webster St.
Evansville, WI 53536
randyoconnell53ad@gmail.com
(414) 460-1214

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Nancy Gaedner (n86@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 6:29 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

This type farming is bad for everyone animals,air,water,humans. It?s only good for their wallet. It puts small farms out of business.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Nancy Gaedner
400 Mountain Bay
Shawano, WI 54166
n86@gmail.com
(602) 547-8730

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Robyn Mulhaney (looped273@icloud.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 6:12 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I support dismantling CAFO operations. As a former home owner and business owner in Kewaunee County who was forced to move when my health was affected by air quality related to livestock density and water quality, I advocate for

~Greater Property line and road setbacks from manure irrigation, manure storage and livestock barns ~ Management and training plans increasing transparency of practices ~ Better Odor management from lagoons and operation areas ~ Comprehensive Nutrient management which keeps pathogens on fields ~ Manure storage facilities which don't leak 500 gallons per acre per day ~ Runoff management that creates a fund for cleanups and larger fines

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Robyn Mulhaney
P.O. Box 243
Laona, WI 54541
looped273@icloud.com
(920) 901-1604

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Rand Friedenfels (friedrand7@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 6:06 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Keep the poop out of the pool!

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Rand Friedenfels
W8122 State Highway 64
MEDFORD, WI 54451
friedrand7@yahoo.com
(715) 785-7413

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Britton Saunders (aeroflotguy@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 5:59 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Britton Saunders
2975 South Wentworth Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53207
aeroflotguy@yahoo.com
(414) 628-7759

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Patricia Stefancic (ellonwee@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 5:55 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Patricia Stefancic
1655 Jennie St
Menasha, WI 54952
ellonwee@yahoo.com
(920) 840-8523

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: JUSTIN KNUTESEN (jay.ekay@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 5:51 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

JUSTIN KNUTESEN
3337 VINEYARD ST
EAU CLAIRE, WI 54703
jay.ekay@gmail.com
(715) 835-8405

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Lisa Bey (lbey77@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 5:32 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Lisa Bey
2848 Mary St
Stevens Point, WI 54481
lbey77@yahoo.com
(715) 252-8369

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: SARAH Bland (s3bland57@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 5:31 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

From fish kills to contaminated wells, CAFOs and other big-ag farming practices are destroying Wisconsin's environment and driving traditional family farms out of existence. These practices are bad for human health and wildlife and do not support a healthy food supply. Unregulated businesses of any kind are not sustainable. Please rein in factory farms by implementing reasonable restrictions on them.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

SARAH Bland
610 Toepfer Ave
Madison, WI 53711
s3bland57@gmail.com
(608) 233-0211

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: constance lorig (connie.lorig@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 5:02 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Factory farms must be held accountable. Strengthen rules protecting our land, air, water, and plant and animal natural resources.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

constance lorig
927 s 7th st
De Pere, WI 54115
connie.lorig@gmail.com
(920) 491-7513

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Ann Wroblewski (octo77777@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 4:58 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Ann Wroblewski
710 W. Historic Mitchell St
Milwaukee, WI 53204
octo77777@gmail.com
(414) 460-3757

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Lin Morgan (linwmorgan@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 4:10 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

My great grand babies need clean water to drink and clean land to run upon.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Lin Morgan
3914 Green Ave.
Madison, WI 53704
linwmorgan@gmail.com
(920) 251-2215

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: John Seckel (johnpseckel@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 3:02 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Factory farms need to be regulated and humane. I do not eat meat, but I know a lot of people who do eat it and will not stop. Animals, for their short lives, need to be treated with respect. People living in areas with these farms need to be protected from the pollution caused by these farms. We need full access to these farms to control how these animals are being treated. We need to know as the consumer. It is our right!

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

John Seckel
5064 County Rd N
Oconto, WI 54153
johnpseckel@hotmail.com
(920) 834-5759

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Jean-Francois Fauconnier (jffauconnier@mail.be) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 1:58 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Jean-Francois Fauconnier
1200 main streeet
Stevens Point, WI 54481
jffauconnier@mail.be
(247) 313-8013

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Jean Roach (jmroach@me.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 12:44 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Strengthening rules for factory farms matters to me because I value clean water. Water is life and there is a finite amount of water on earth. If we pollute the groundwater in any given area, it will take generations to restore it to usable drinking water. Rules to protect water are needed.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Jean Roach
845 Mekinak Pt Rd
Pelican Lake, WI 54463
jmroach@me.com
(309) 696-3597

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Mary Ulander (mulander@uwmalumni.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 12:41 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Please protect the rights and health of Wisconsin residents and protect the environment. Please raise animals in a healthy environment and eliminate mass use of antibiotics.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Mary Ulander
6206 North Bay Ridge Avenue
Milwaukee , WI 53217
mulander@uwmalumni.com
(414) 962-9534

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Kevin Kemps (hankemps@milwpc.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 12:29 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Soon water will be our most valuable resource. No matter how long or short your legislative term is, jeopardizing such a resource is not an acceptable risk. We did fine for years without factory farms liquid waste. Smaller farms can handle solid waste, it's time for factory farms to do the same if they want to stay in business. We expect houseguests to respect our home, let's expect business to respect our natural environment. And respect other business like tourism in all it's forms, and to respect neighbors and their property values. I don't allow my compost pile to stink or put my stinky garbage next to my neighbors front door. I don't know of any benefit from Factory Farms that outweighs the damage they are doing to our state. Kevin in Neenah 54956

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Kevin Kemps
615 Monroe St
Neenah, WI 54956
hankemps@milwpc.com
(920) 725-1640

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Mary Junek (Mjunek75@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 12:14 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

CAFOs are everything that is wrong with farming. The animals are treated very poorly. They are considered more like a crop than individual, feeling creatures. I remember visits to my father?s cousin?s farm and how each cow had a name and was treated as an individual. I believe that compassionate care should be factored into any farming operation involving animals.
CAFOs also wreak havoc on the soil, water and air in there vicinities, which happens to be a wide area due to manure runoff into close water bodies. There is no easy way to manage such large amounts of waste, and the people close by can not live with the poisoned groundwater and stench of these huge operations.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Mary Junek
S87W26990 National Ave
Mukwonago , WI 53149
Mjunek75@gmail.com
(262) 363-4373

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Glen Popple (gpopple@wi.rr.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 11:43 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Glen Popple
8010 Thistle Ct
Waterford, WI 53185
gpopple@wi.rr.com
(262) 706-3139

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Barbara Hines (barbarabhines@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 11:26 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I would like stronger and more robust standards to protect our livestock and farming in Wisconsin Thank You, Barbara Hines

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Barbara Hines
1911 N. Morrison St.
Appleton, WI 54911
barbarabhines@yahoo.com
(920) 733-1045

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Lori Grass (im1grass@sbcglobal.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 11:24 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Factory farms are not the future. The animal abuse is horrific and the impact to the environment is devastating. Please keep strong rules and regulations in place to minimize the impact to the environment and our water. Thank you.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Lori Grass
1832 1st Ave Unit A
Grafton, WI 53024
im1grass@sbcglobal.net
(262) 375-8227

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Marlene Sund645 (mesund@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 11:14 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Marlene Sund645
644 Teena st
Sparta , WI 54656
mesund@yahoo.com
(608) 269-6115

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Beverly Ann Conroy (beverlyannconroy@icloud.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 11:09 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

This issue matters to me because CAFOs are very unsanitary and unhealthy for the animals , the consumers, and the people who live near them. There is nothing good about them and they should not be allowed to exist!!!

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Beverly Ann Conroy
2980 Gibraltar Road
Fish Creek , WI 54212
beverlyannconroy@icloud.com
(708) 383-6112

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Bonnie Butts (bnnbutts@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 11:09 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

our land water and health yes I would say that's important

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Butts
195 W Randolph St
Rosholt, WI 54473
bnnbutts@gmail.com
(715) 451-2896

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Cheri Koehler (cheri123@frontier.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 11:07 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I want safe food and the animals should be treated with respect.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Cheri Koehler
801 Oak St
Shawano, WI 54166
cheri123@frontier.com
(715) 526-6829

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Barbara Nicholson (nichoba38@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 11:02 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

CAFO could and very probably would poison our land, ground water and environment not for WI

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Barbara Nicholson
115 Maple Court #201
Mount Horeb , WI 53572
nichoba38@gmail.com
(608) 556-0701

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Sandra Serazio (sandyrs2000@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 11:01 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Sandra Serazio
N1772 Hawks Nest Rd
Keshena, WI 54135
sandyrs2000@yahoo.com
(414) 861-4070

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Charlotte Serazio (charann2000@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 11:00 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Serazio
175 N 66th St
Milwaukee, WI 53213
charann2000@yahoo.com
(414) 861-4080

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Deborah Huntington (deb.wisco60@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 10:48 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

This is important because people need clean air and clean water to be able to survive in good health. And unfortunately the size of these factory farms is so huge it puts these qualities at risk. We must remain strict and rules must be followed for these situations to work for both parties. People are not gonna want these farms around at all if they don?t cooperate and fulfill their responsibilities.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Deborah Huntington
PO Box 293
Radisson, WI 54867
deb.wisco60@gmail.com
(715) 945-3366

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Bridget Panzer (nabra@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 10:45 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Support family farms

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Bridget Panzer
N5749 Riverside dr
Shawano , WI 54166
nabra@yahoo.com
(715) 524-7291

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Lawrence Logue (lawrencescott504@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 10:43 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Logue
2910 Cave of the Mounds Road
Blue Mounds, WI 53517
lawrencescott504@gmail.com
(760) 212-6442

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Edward Burgess (edvulpine@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 10:36 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

We cannot continue these wasteful, harmful means of food production. Factory farms are a detriment to the land and their runoff impacts the health of neighboring communities. We depend on healthy ecosystems and clean drinking water so we need to curtail factory farms

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Edward Burgess
1501 rose street
Lacrosse , WI 54603
edvulpine@gmail.com
(608) 790-1464

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: BRIAN PIERCE (mrhunterbarry@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 10:30 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

BRIAN PIERCE
2752 WOODRUFF CT
GREEN BAY, WI 54311
mrhunterbarry@yahoo.com
(920) 469-1765

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: BRIAN PIERCE (mrhunterbarry@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 10:29 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

BRIAN PIERCE
2752 WOODRUFF CT
GREEN BAY, WI 54311
mrhunterbarry@yahoo.com
(920) 469-1765

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Randi Hoffmann (randi.hoffmann@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 10:27 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Randi Hoffmann
95 Rubina Lane #12
Fond du Lac, WI 54935
randi.hoffmann@yahoo.com
(920) 251-8117

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: LARRY MEISGEIER (mil7mei@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 10:21 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

LARRY MEISGEIER
1560 N. PROSPECT AVE.
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202
mil7mei@hotmail.com
(414) 273-1987

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Paula Plasky (paulaplasky@att.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 10:16 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Paula Plasky
11790 W Chapman Ave
Greenfield, WI 53228
paulaplasky@att.net
(414) 427-1980

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Judi McNamara (judi.mcnamRA@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 10:12 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Please support the proposed changes to the Livestock Siting Rule. It will help our environment.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Judi McNamara
23515 North Shore
Kansasville, WI 53139
judi.mcnamRA@gmail.com
(262) 946-1331

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Judith Thayer (djthayer8@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 10:11 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

The biggest problem for CAFOs besides the smell is the lack of good waste methods. Too often the waste ends up in the ground water or streams because it is not stored or applied correctly. Rules need to be tightened so that these problems don't occur. If it means smaller CAFOs so be it. We only have one earth and limited potable water.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Judith Thayer
8220 Harwood Ave
Wauwatosa, WI 53213
djthayer8@gmail.com
(414) 727-3888

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Patricia Orthwein (orthweinp@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 10:04 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

The nearby CAFO may or may not be impacting my water but I do see that manure is being trucked to every field within less than 1/2 mile of our home. The spreading seems to be outside of the parameters set by the state. Our nitrate levels have increased to the point of needing a reverse osmosis system for drinking water. I also use the filtered water for cooking. I am a good steward of my property yet due to the carelessness of others, my property value is decreased and I must bear the costs of water filtration. Please consider the additional issues listed.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this

issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Patricia Orthwein
3670 Isaacson Road
Scandinavia, WI 54977
orthweinp@hotmail.com
(715) 252-1598

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Dee Costello (dougc262@aol) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 10:03 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Clean water is our gold to a good life. Factory farms are polluters of the environment and promote unhealthy meat. The future is organic livestock management.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Dee Costello
W333S4205 Connemara Dr
Dousman, WI 53118
dougc262@aol
(262) 392-2701

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Mark M Giese (m.mk@juno.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 10:02 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Mark M Giese
1520 Bryn Mawr Ave
Racine, WI 53403
m.mk@juno.com
(262) 637-1503

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Keith Johnson (earthsayge@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 10:02 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Our greatest problem with Factory Farms is their use of the Liquid Manure System. It contaminates the air (STINKS) and the ground water (neighbors' wells) and waterways and lakes where is causes toxic algae growth. The only acceptable alternative is to Compost the manure. Composting has been very successful where it has been used, and the equipment for mechanization is readily available. We need to make liquid manure illegal, and require all CAFOs to Compost.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Keith Johnson
340 N Minnesota St Apt 108
Muscoda, WI 53573
earthsayge@yahoo.com
(608) 537-2497

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Chris Casper (casper4427@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 10:00 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Factory farms on animal torture camps. The animals are living under constant stress, filth and abuse. No one should be eating meat from animals raised in that way. The waste is concentrated in pools that pose a risk to our aquifers, especially in areas of karst topography. The smell from CAFOs can gag you from 1/2 a mile away. Wisconsin does not want or need such filth in our state. Keep them out.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Chris Casper
1600 Sherman Ave
Stevens Point, WI 54481
casper4427@gmail.com
(715) 498-9669

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Eric Howe (eric.howe.wi@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:57 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Eric Howe
2 Lansdale Ln
RACINE, WI 53402
eric.howe.wi@gmail.com
(262) 498-3355

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Kathleen Buyarski (kbuyarski@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:56 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

We previously resided in southern door county. When the mega farmers spread their liquid manure it was vile and I believe unsafe for breathing and we lived miles from where they were spreading. Plus these farms are located way too close to Lake Michigan. We need to protect our natural resources especially the Great Lakes. And just as bad is the contamination of our ground Water.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Buyarski
16666 W Sumerland Ct
New Berlin, WI 53151
kbuyarski@gmail.com
(262) 505-5029

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Sue Twiggs (setwiggs@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:54 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

there is a strong need for more regulation for the CAFO's throughout WI.I encourage you to come up with standards for disposing manure. the rivers and streams of WI need to be protected.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Sue Twiggs
1711 Woodsview Drive
Marshfield, WI 54449
setwiggs@gmail.com
(715) 650-1008

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Laura Buska (lauraannbuska@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:54 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

As a firm advocate for environmental and animal rights, and as a solely plant based eater, I firmly support stronger restrictions in CAFOs and large animal operations as it is the largest cause of human created climate change which is wreaking havoc on local, national and global scales. I refuse to purchase animal made products and find the idea of allowing them to pollute abominable.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Laura Buska
4805 64th ave
Kenosha, WI 53144
lauraannbuska@gmail.com
(262) 358-3394

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: jackie thiry (jackiemthiry@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:53 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

We must protect one of our most vital resources- water. The proposed changes will keep the playing field level for all the CAFO organizations.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

jackie thiry
1600 rustic oaks ct #8
green bay, WI 54301
jackiemthiry@yahoo.com
(920) 435-5437

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Karen Lied (karen.lied@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:50 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Please consider carefully the impact of CAFOs on our land, water, health and livestock.. in my opinion they are neither good for people or animals. I am a public health nurse and urge legislation that promotes smaller farms and protects the environment.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Karen Lied
N49 W27870
Pewaukee, WI 53072
karen.lied@gmail.com
(262) 352-3546

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Lynn Shoemaker (shoemakl@uww.edu) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:49 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Lynn Shoemaker
172 N Esterly Ave
Whitewater, WI 53190
shoemakl@uww.edu
(262) 473-5347

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Nancy Melin (nancyjmelin@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:46 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

There are many health reasons I strongly urge you to strengthen rules and oversight of large scale cow and pig farms. Manure leakage into ground water is inevitable and unacceptable. The stress on the animals causes increased cortisol and other stress hormones to be in high levels in the meat, which we then ingest. It is unhealthy for us. Large animal farms smell bad and reduce neighboring home values. Small locally owned, family farms better serve the needs of the community.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this

issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Nancy Melin
2670 7th St South,
La crosse, WI 54601
nancyjmelin@gmail.com
(217) 621-7702

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Melissa Mosher (animallovermam@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:45 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Every living being should be treated with respect regardless of what we USE it for. Yes USE. That?s what us humans do... we use things to our advantage with no mercy and it?s disgusting. It?s time for a change.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Melissa Mosher
615 Freiburger Ave
Antigo , WI 54409
animallovermam@gmail.com
(715) 610-8089

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: J Schieffer (jameshe43@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:41 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Factory Farms must properly dispose of their waste products without damaging the surrounding environment.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

J Schieffer
2520 Cedar
Burlington, WI 53105
jameshe43@gmail.com
(262) 763-9465

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Michael Forster (michaeljohnforster@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:37 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

We need to keep CAFOs and all potential polluters away from our drinking water.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Michael Forster
1438 E Pauline St
Appleton, WI 54911
michaeljohnforster@yahoo.com
(920) 205-7934

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Richard Blattnig (rdbbv@icloud.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:37 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Save family farms and don?t turn Wisconsin into a crap hole. Literally. In the long run environmental piggishness -pun intended -damages our water supply.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Richard Blattnig
2961 S Clement Ave
Milwaukee , WI 53207
rdbbv@icloud.com
(414) 481-9447

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: C A Netwall (chernetwall@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2019 9:36 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

This issues matters to me because it is Un-American for big companies to silence individual about issues that will destroy their backyard. We the People in Wisconsin live here because we do not want your greedy interests that are in business only to ruin Wisconsin for current and future generation. Leave us alone.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

C A Netwall
1770 Holiday Dr
Centuria, WI 54824
chernetwall@gmail.com
(715) 501-0077

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Margaret Timmerman (burrhollow@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:13 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Our neighbor runs a CAFO on property about a mile and a half from us. When he had 1200 cows we seldom smelled his operation. Now that he has 5,000 cows the smell is constant. Not only that, the 24/7 lights on in his gigantic barn mar our view of the night sky, and even at this distance we hear his equipment (especially sisters backing up) throughout the day and night. We also worry about manure contamination of the groundwater and the several small, local streams that wind throughout the fields he spreads manure on. Because soil can vary so much from one part of the state to another, I think it is imperative that the soil type be taken into account when drawing up siting plans. A "one size fits all" plan is not adequate to protect the groundwater we all rely on. Finally, t believe that a wider radius of neighbors deserves to be notified when CAFO applications are first submitted, so that they have a chance to be involved early in the process.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Margaret Timmerman
32834 County Highway TB
Lone Rock, WI 53556
burrhollow@yahoo.com
(608) 444-2598

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: LuAnne Washburn (luluwashbu@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:14 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

LuAnne Washburn
719 N 119th Street
Wauwatosa, WI 53226
luluwashbu@hotmail.com
(414) 324-6586

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Donald Gleason (donaldglsn@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:24 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am against factory farming. I can't list all the possible damage it does, but here are a few.

It is a inhumane way to treat animals.

The concentrated use of antibiotics can produce antibiotic resistant bacteria that can cross over to affect humans. Residual antibiotics in meat is harmful

Feed production methods kill the natural composition of the soil.
Farm fields are bare for long periods of the year supporting no life and sustain heavy erosion. Healthy soil is a system and requires interaction from microbes and insects. Healthy soil holds and purifies water. The soil loses it ability to store carbon when the natural system is destroyed.

Concentrated animals create dead areas that erode, stink and pollute.

The chemicals used to produce feed are poisonous and kill beneficial insects and animals.
Chemicals used to produce feed are in our water, air and us.

Corporate farming is highly subsidized and discourages small produces that produce healthy food.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10

year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Donald Gleason
2046 Hwy 64
New Richmond, WI 54017
donaldglsn@gmail.com
(715) 246-4834

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Ellen Sarns (esarns@att.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:25 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I live in Suamico Wi. Have for 40 years. This summer west winds brought us something new. Strong manure odor. Turns out someone is using the raw liquid manure on a rented farm field in Pulaski. I support property rights and quality of life rights for anyone affected by this practice as well. We have no CFOS here. Just the awful liquid manure.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Ellen Sarns
824 Riverside Street
Suamico, WI 54173
esarns@att.net
(920) 401-7770

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Judi La Fleur (ladysmith1012@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:25 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Please consider the greater good of all Wisconsin residents. As one of the increasing numbers, I suffer from auto-immune issues and more frequent down days (as many as weeks of missed work). Our food, water, and air quality have been damned by big industry and mass production and it's affecting our wellness. It's time to address the causes in declining quality of life in Wisconsin.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Judi La Fleur
1192 Willow Wood Ln
Grafton, WI 53024
ladysmith1012@yahoo.com
(262) 388-4432

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Steve Lindstrom (lindys1265@att.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:26 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

We need clean water.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Steve Lindstrom
4541 s pine ave
Milwaukee, WI 53207
lindys1265@att.net
(414) 481-0063

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Jean See (blueskyhealing@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:28 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

The impact of the 3,000 cows facility and now they are going to increase to another 3,000.....has impacted the water quality and water pressure. is it fair for "big" business to have 14 wells!!?????? and take in billions of gallons water for one business? NO! all of the manure is more than the can process and return to the land instead much turns into run off in to the river here.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Jean See
N5880 Maple Ave
Shawano, WI 54166
blueskyhealing@yahoo.com
(715) 777-3232

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: GERRI FRIEDBERG (13gwf13@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:34 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

CAFO's ARE DANGEROUS FOR PEOPLE and ANIMALS' HEALTH!
TIGHTEN REGULATIONS OR BE SUED TO THE HILT!

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

GERRI FRIEDBERG
7548 Bluff Pass
Egg Harbor, WI 54209
13gwf13@gmail.com
(920) 421-1788

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Dara Unglaube (Dolso406@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:36 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Dara Unglaube
513 14th ave w
Ashland, WI 54806
Dolso406@hotmail.com
(715) 292-8691

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: William Goell (wmgoell@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:36 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

William Goell
s28w35390 Spring House Ct
Oconomowoc, WI 53066
wmgoell@aol.com
(262) 555-1234

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Soren Warland (soren.warland@att.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:40 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

The issue of CAFOs and pollution is both a property rights issue and an environmental justice issue. It is unacceptable that the most vulnerable groups in society bear the burden of CAFO pollution. These monstrous facilities are hidden from the eye of the public, so many people in Wisconsin are simply unaware of the terrible burden borne by those living in the vicinity of CAFOs. These residents must deal with effects on their health such as respiratory illnesses, and are also at risk of exposure to antibiotic resistant bacteria. Furthermore, they must deal with the decreased property prices and economic difficulties that come with living next to an industrial animal agriculture operation. It is a crime that Wisconsin legislators have allowed this to continue for so long. I view some of the ATCP rule revisions as positive, but these are only the first step in achieving justice for all people in Wisconsin and not burdening our most vulnerable residents to serious pollution.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Soren Warland
1815 University Avenue
Madison, WI 53726
soren.warland@att.net
(630) 487-7608

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Anna Pepelnjak (anna.pepelnjak@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:42 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I live near Pewaukee County, where much of the groundwater is polluted. We MUST stop this, as our children and grandchildren will be the ones to pay the price.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Anna Pepelnjak
6050 Governors Woods Trl
Sturgeon Bay , WI 54235
anna.pepelnjak@gmail.com
(414) 217-4331

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Christina Stemwell (stemfam@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:56 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Christina Stemwell
3472 E Koenig Ave
St. Francis , WI 53235
stemfam@yahoo.com
(555) 555-5555

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: John Brooks (jbrooks4@wisc.edu) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:04 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Because I have lived in Wisconsin for my entire life, I remember fishing for trout in Northern Wisconsin before the waters were polluted with animal wastes. I now live in Southern Wisconsin where the trout streams routinely have fish die-offs from too much manure being spread on fields and eventually getting washed into the streams. I want to live where the water is clean enough for the various insects and animals that require clean water, including humans!

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

John Brooks
PO BOX 158
Cross Plains, WI 53528
jbrooks4@wisc.edu
(608) 798-3578

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Norda Gromoll (gromoll@nnex.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:14 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Norda Gromoll
1717 Watersmeet Lake Road
Eagle River, WI 54521
gromoll@nnex.net
(715) 479-6195

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Aimee Ogden (aimees.facebook@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:15 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

The health of Wisconsin residents and the land on which we live needs to be protected from underregulated CAFOs. The financial burden of ensuring these health and safety rules also needs to be offloaded from small local governments.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Aimee Ogden
6501 Piedmont Rd
Madison, WI 53711
aimees.facebook@gmail.com
(608) 770-2042

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Elizabeth MacKelvie (litsi@att.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:17 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Nothing is more important than keeping our environment, our lands, and our people healthy. This is a stab at that.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth MacKelvie
1954 Palisades Dr
Appleton, WI 54915
litsi@att.net
(920) 954-0998

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Susan Manor (smanor50@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:27 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

What happened to respecting our neighbors? Getting along and thinking of others and saving the earth for the future.....that is what we are put here to do. God wants us to care for each other and the earth of which we are "stewards". The earth does belong to us!

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Susan Manor
1134 Glenn Pl
Eau Claire, WI 54703
smanor50@gmail.com
(715) 514-4691

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Erin Spoehr (erinjs1122@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:29 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Erin Spoehr
W5424 Red Clover Trl
Appleton, WI 54915
erinjs1122@hotmail.com
(414) 303-1392

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Sylvia Cornelius (oneodatreehugger@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:32 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Confined feeding operation have too much manure and pollute the land. Rotational grazing is better option!

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Cornelius
N6393 County Road E
De Pere , WI 54115
oneodatreehugger@yahoo.com
(920) 869-4570

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Thomas Sherman (tomsherman906@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:34 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

according to who animal husbandry which involves i beileve if not billions hundreds of millions of animals if allowed to exist in the future that alone can destroy the earth. so there should be a national policy to get rid of meat production. so i don't care if rules put them out of business. on top of that these cafes are polluting our water supply to boot.////these animals use about 80% of our antibiotics making them useless for human use which means most major medical operations can't be performed. deaths caused by this will be equal to that of cancer.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this

issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Thomas Sherman
4856 N. Santa Monica Blvd
Milwaukee, WI 53217
tomsherman906@yahoo.com
(414) 491-8553

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Lester Miller (lesmiller3@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:35 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Lester Miller
3143 W Villa Dr
Franklin, WI 53132
lesmiller3@aol.com
(571) 344-1928

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Cheryl Posner (cheryl.posner@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:39 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

My hometown of Wausau is preparing to build a new, costly water treatment plant. This step represents an enormous investment in providing clean, safe drinking water for the 38,000+ residents of our city. As you know, Wausau is in the rural, north central part of Wisconsin, and is surrounded by farmland. Please help our new water treatment plant do its job to keep our drinking water clean and safe, and make sure that millions of our local taxpayer dollars are not wasted. Also, what of our more rural neighbors in Marathon County who depend on water from their private wells? Don?t they deserve clean drinking water and uncontaminated soil? Do all you can to protect all of us from the potential pollution of CAFOs!

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Posner
919 Pinewood Ln
Wausau, WI 54403
cheryl.posner@yahoo.com
(949) 573-3021

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Deb Johnson (djhjjohn@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:46 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

As retired dairy farmers, having had a herd of 38 cows and farming about 200 acres, my husband and I understand the need for farms to be environmentally safe in terms of the ratio of animals to farmable acres. Factory farm animal waste cannot be dealt with safely. Containment will never work. There is too much waste, huge volumes of waste that cannot be managed safely on small acreages.
The inevitable result is always going to be broken and leaking storage facilities and overflow manure volumes that cannot be handled and spread safely over limited acreage. Seepage and leaching of animal waste into the groundwater will always be the result if there are too many animals living in one small area.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Deb Johnson
1755 30th Ave
Rice Lake, WI 54868
djhjjohn@hotmail.com
(715) 651-0983

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Betty Rygiewicz (rygiewiczbetty@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:53 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I want to protect our water supply. Without clean and safe water we will get sick and die.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Betty Rygiewicz
800 Prairie Run
Sun Prairie, WI 53590
rygiewiczbetty@gmail.com
(608) 843-4660

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: joseph mcilheran (joe.mcilheran@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:57 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

joseph mcilheran
264 Henry St
BURLINGTON, WI 53105
joe.mcilheran@gmail.com
(262) 989-2753

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Dorothy P. Geissal (gtwo68@sbcglobal.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:59 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Animals in large concentrations, are dangerous in too many ways. Should disease strike, the contamination to the site and disposal of unhealthy animals poses numerous health problems which can transmigrate to human health problems. Of equal importance is the damage to natural resources. Each cow drinks what amounts to a bath tub full of water daily. They also excrete in like amounts. Thousands of penned animals in a static location overwhelm the environments ability to absorb this generation of waste. Which sets the whole operation open to disease. Not of least concern is fresh water depletion in the aquifer and contamination of local ground water for local population. When I pass larger animal operations in southern wisconsin, the smell is noticeable winter or summer. This is also a burden for nearby homeowners.
All of the above problems are troubling, but most note worthy is the possibility disease and environmental damage.. Factory farms are not a responsible consideration for wis.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would

create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Dorothy P. Geissal
1010 Bonnie Brae Lane
Lake Geneva, WI 53147
gtwo68@sbcglobal.net
(262) 248-2615

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Matthew Urch (urchm@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 9:03 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

ATCP 51 is in serious need of revision. Factory Farms exploit the pre-emption of local control to pollute and damage rural neighborhoods - including groundwater resources. It is time for them to be scrutinized.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Matthew Urch
E5866 Weber Road
Viroqua, WI 54665
urchm@yahoo.com
(608) 675-3766

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Catherine Brandstetter (cathyleeb@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 9:07 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

The Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) has proposed revisions to the current Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule. These changes can help protect our land, water and health. Please support these changes.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Catherine Brandstetter
8942 41st Ave
Kenosha, WI 53142
cathyleeb@aol.com
(555) 555-5555

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Terry Margherita (terry.margherita@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 9:04 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Offal and waste from these factory farms can detrimentally affect people, other animals and the environment. Their location and the practice itself need to be tightly monitored for health and safety standards, as well as for the treatment of those animals being raised there.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Terry Margherita
628 Jordan Circle
Colgate, WI 53017
terry.margherita@gmail.com
(262) 628-2764

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Ruby Dow (remdow@ymail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 9:09 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

As a retired public health professional I am concerned about the potential for groundwater pollution from CAFOs. Nitrate levels and bacteria contamination of our groundwater is increasing. The rules for CAFOs need to address these issues.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Ruby Dow
W3008 49th St
Mauston, WI 53948
remdow@ymail.com
(608) 847-2398

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Yvonne Besyk (ybwblue@comcast.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 9:12 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I support several proposed changes as stated below and advocate for stronger and more robust standards to help protect Wisconsin residents from the dangers of CAFOs

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Besyk
8818 Camp Lake Rd
Salem, WI 53168
ybwblue@comcast.net
(708) 217-3519

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Caitlin Berry (cmkberry@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 9:30 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Caitlin Berry
10949 e Wisconsin ave
Wauwatosa , WI 53226
cmkberry@gmail.com
(262) 993-9721

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Elizabeth Davy (esd@lce.biz) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 9:31 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

My family has farmed for generations. Common sense regulations MATTER - to both farmers and WI residents (note that I did NOT mention corporations). It is imperative that ALL of us protect our water, land, and other natural resources for future generations. We must have fair and science based laws and regulations! Do not put corporate interests above farmers and residents.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Davy
688 Summer Creek Rd
Oconomowoc, WI 53066
esd@lce.biz
(262) 569-9331

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Delene Hanson (delenehanson@sbcglobal.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 9:31 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Delene Hanson
10203 W Ridge Rd
Hales Corners, WI 53130
delenehanson@sbcglobal.net
(414) 425-4608

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Margaret Fsy (fayma53072@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 9:34 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Wisconsin farming industry is moving from former family farms to large scale operations. Legislation and rules must keep up to protect our water, land and public resources .

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Margaret Fsy
PO Box 32
Oconomowoc, WI 53066
fayma53072@hotmail.com
(262) 893-9375

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Kate Barbour (kbarbour@wi.rr.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 9:45 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Three years ago, A large CAFO located 20 minutes from our residential Lake Village in SE Wisconsin dumped 600 truckloads of manure on two farm Fields right next to subdivisions and between two lakes. The manure was supposed to be injected into the ground but was instead a big mess of manure on top of the fields making it impossible for the residents to be outside their homes due to stench and flies for weeks. The CAFO is producing so much manure that they have to Truck it twenty miles away? And subject even more of our state to the environmental hazard that these CAFOS cause!? This is wrong! We need to limit in any way possible the power of these large farms that are putting Our health at risk as well as taking over And contributing to the demise of small farmers who farm sustainably. Please take action now

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Kate Barbour
3700 N Hickory Ln
Oconomowoc, WI 53066
kbarbour@wi.rr.com
(262) 337-0039

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Monica O'Brien (monzarose08@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 9:54 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Monica O'Brien
5110 Holiday Dr.
Madison, WI 53711
monzarose08@gmail.com
(608) 271-2808

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Paul Nasvik (paul@milestones-online.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 9:48 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Paul Nasvik
235 Monroe St. N.
Hudson, WI 54016
paul@milestones-online.com
(715) 381-9660

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Will Baurecht (wbaurecht@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 9:47 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I just returned from Austria where they have no CAFOs but a national tradition of small farms, including dairy farms, and support of "buy local." With Republican support CAFOs have killed the Wisconsin tradition of small farms, as well as polluted local wells and are a threat to lakes and streams. When are you going to start to protect the people of Wisconsin and our tourism?

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Will Baurecht
5457 North Bay Ridge Avenue
Whitefish Bay, WI 53217
wbaurecht@gmail.com
(414) 881-7518

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Caryl Sewell (lyrac@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 10:03 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

This maters to me because I care deeply about the destructive effect CAFO?s are having on farmers and the environment.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Caryl Sewell
17760 Gebhardt Rd
Brookfield , WI 53045
lyrac@aol.com
(262) 784-8768

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Michael Conner (broosterc@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 10:05 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Last year I drove through much of inland central California, past many CAFO's. I have never seen more inhumane animal environments, it was absolutely horrid, and the stench was almost unbearable.
Some were dairies - destroys the TV ad credibility of "happy cows". Some were slaughter houses. All were devoid of ground cover. The light colored cows' legs and bellies were stained red from urine splatter. In one slaughter field a dead cow laid legs-up, visibly bloated like it was ready to explode, while it's living counterparts were packed in the same field. Absolutely DISGUSTING.
There is no way that operations like this should be allowed to do business. Both for the sake of humane treatment of the animals, and not submitting neighbors to the abhorrent stench these factories generate.
Visit one of these yourself and you will agree.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Michael Conner
S64 W31279 Valley Lane
Mukwonago, WI 53149
broosterc@aol.com
(262) 392-9876

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Cliford Manwiller (cman@amerytel.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 10:35 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Factory farms make profits for corporations at the expense of the general population. Laws that prevent legal action against CAPO's prevents operation of market checks and balances. If the corporations were held responsible for all costs related to CAPO operations, the profit margin would be slim if not eliminated.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Cliford Manwiller
1644 60th St
Turtle Lake, WI 54889
cman@amerytel.net
(715) 554-0184

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Debby Roegner (mdroegner@juno.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 10:24 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I care very deeply about animals, and they deserve to be treated humanely, with dignity and respect.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Debby Roegner
5726 Debbie Ln
West Bend, WI 53095
mdroegner@juno.com
(262) 685-7493

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Steven Sheldon (scienceisgoodforyou@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 10:23 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

This matters to me because CAFOs are changing the character of rural life in Wisconsin, and not for the better. They are posing a threat to our clean water, and they are imposing damage to rural roads.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Steven Sheldon
W690 Co Rd E
Neshkoro , WI 54960
scienceisgoodforyou@hotmail.com
(920) 293-4382

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: stanLEY rosenstiel (mrstanmr@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 10:11 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

stanLEY rosenstiel
7843 32ND AVE
kenosha, WI 53142
mrstanmr@yahoo.com
(262) 694-2206

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Denise Bell (banditbobo4@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 10:10 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Denise Bell
4223 29th Ave
Kenosha, WI 53140
banditbobo4@yahoo.com
(262) 654-7726

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Russell DOUGHERTY (OUGHERTY@GMAIL.COM) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 10:45 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

My concern about cafo coming into Polk and Burnett county Wi. is a real threat to our environment and personal life. I'm not against the dairy industry but 26,000 pig factory is .Proposed pig factory is one mile from our house.Property value has has dropped 25%.
Please consider this proposed Moratorium . Thank You

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Russell DOUGHERTY
2322 243RD AVE
CUSHING, WI 54006
OUGHERTY@GMAIL.COM
(715) 648-5570

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Linda Hartwich (l_hartwich@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 10:48 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

We don't need factory farms to begin with. Allowing them is a BIG smelly mistake! Too many animals in a small area is not good for the environment OR the animals. I won't buy meat from these operations.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Linda Hartwich
688 Glover Road
River Falls, WI 54022
l_hartwich@hotmail.com
(715) 426-0432

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Deb Martin (debmartin04@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 10:51 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Please protect Wisconsin residents' water quality and stop these mega farms from more pollution for the sake of our children and future generations. Thank you.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Deb Martin
164 Wyldewood Dr
Oshkosh, WI 54904
debmartin04@gmail.com
(815) 540-5902

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Harold Rivard (haroldr@frontier.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 10:56 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

large farms are producing so much manure that it is polluting the water supply

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Harold Rivard
812 150th Av
New Richmond, WI 54017
haroldr@frontier.com
(715) 246-5291

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Gloria Jeanne Anderson (cookieanderson1@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 11:01 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

It is scary to think of all the animal waste getting into our drinking water.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Gloria Jeanne Anderson
138 W Van Norman
Milwaukee , WI 53207
cookieanderson1@aol.com
(414) 481-9213

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Erika Voss (vossem4@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 11:16 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Erika Voss
2200 N 64th St
Wauwatosa, WI 53213
vossem4@gmail.com
(414) 259-7808

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Michael Howden (mjhowden@att.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 11:28 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Michael Howden
42877 W. Highland Blvd
Milwaukee, WI 53208
mjhowden@att.net
(414) 342-5284

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Ruth Battaglia (rbattaglia@csasisters.org) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 11:31 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Factory Farms have a great potential to protect or to pollute our land, water, and health. As a resident of Fond du Lac I have become aware of the agricultural run-off that is compromising Lake Winnebago. If Factory Farms do not comply voluntarily with protective measures, then strong rules must be passed and enforced.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Ruth Battaglia
320 County Rd K
Fond du Lac, WI 54937
rbattaglia@csasisters.org
(920) 907-2315

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Julie Hale (hales5@hughes.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 11:32 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Living near one the smell is horrible. They tear up the roads with their huge equipment and trucks. They are a hazard to the water quality. Liquid manure causes many more problems than the bedded manure of the small family farm. Support the small family farm not CAFO!

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Julie Hale
PO Box 73
Juda , WI 53550
hales5@hughes.net
(608) 934-5598

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Roland Hoffman (rjhoffman21@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 11:40 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Roland Hoffman
13436 W Marquette Dr
New Berlin, WI 53151
rjhoffman21@gmail.com
(262) 391-1935

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Gayle Davis (hummmnbrd@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 12:17 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

aside from the inhumane treatment of animals in factory-farmed facilities, there is the issue of how damaging factory-farms are to our environment - locals no longer have access to clean water, clean air, etc - secondly (thirdly, really), every factory-farm that is constructed drives more and more of our family farmers out of business - just a bad bad idea all the way around - please do not support the coming of large factory-farms -

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Gayle Davis
N1503 Putnam Dr
Owen, WI 54460
hummmnbrd@gmail.com
(715) 229-2022

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Michael O'Loughlin (olough@sbcglobal.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 12:20 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

We need to protect the availability of clean water. Stronger standards to control how and where large farming operations are located will help limit water contamination via runoff.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Michael O'Loughlin
504 Bluebird Lane
Green Bay, WI 54303
olough@sbcglobal.net
(317) 257-7266

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Dennis Roscetti (djroscetti@sbcglobal.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 12:21 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

As a person with farm ?roots? I am very concerned about the number of small farm closures and bankruptcy cases in the past several years. Concentrated farm operations only put more pressure on small family farms.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Dennis Roscetti
W298N1889 Lost Tree Court
Pewaukee, WI 53072
djroscetti@sbcglobal.net
(414) 736-2034

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: JoAnn Haasler (jhaasler@mac.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 12:23 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

JoAnn Haasler
3222 N. Weil Street
Milwaukee, WI 53212
jhaasler@mac.com
(414) 690-8631

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Marnie Hersrud (marniehersrud@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 12:24 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Please listen to the people of Wisconsin who are negatively impacted by CAFOs- our rural wells are being assaulted by the lack of oversite, as well as other environmental issues. Please vote to increase livestock siting rules.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Marnie Hersrud
1511 Frederic St
Eau Claire , WI 54701
marniehersrud@gmail.com
(715) 271-0407

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Jean Brooks (jeanbrooks1@mac.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 12:50 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

We need the beauty of the small farms dotting our community. We should not have to tolerate the pollution, the odor, the ugliness, and the water destruction of the factory farm.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Jean Brooks
1113 ELSIE STREET
FORT ATKINSON, WI 53538
jeanbrooks1@mac.com
(414) 559-7886

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Sue Schneidler (SFSchneidler@AOL.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 12:57 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Our government officials need to protect the water and small farms in Wisconsin. These large farms are ruining the drinking water, streams, and lakes and forcing small family farms to close. Donations to political parties should not be a factor in deciding what is right for our state. Listen to what the people want. Private businesses should not take precedence over the health and well-being of the citizens of Wisconsin.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Sue Schneidler
35926 Ravinia Dr.
Oconomowoc, WI 53066
SFSchneidler@AOL.com
(262) 567-0456

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: C Laforge (gosolar@cheqneet.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 1:48 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

C Laforge
77480 Evergreen road
Port Wing, WI 54865
gosolar@cheqneet.net
(715) 774-3374

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Sue Lawn (slawn1952@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 1:51 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I live downwind from a CAFO. I physically feel sick with headaches and stomachaches. Some days it is hard to breathe.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Sue Lawn
W7130 1848 Settlement Ln.
Plymouth , WI 53073
slawn1952@gmail.com
(920) 254-5117

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Donald Clauser (dancndlite@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 1:54 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Donald Clauser
890 Pilgrim Pkwy
Elm Grove, WI 53122
dancndlite@yahoo.com
(262) 786-0201

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Bruce Krawisz (brucekra@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 1:54 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

During floods or heavy rainstorms, manure from factory farms could contaminate wells and lakes that supply drinking water.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Bruce Krawisz
1600 N Hills Dr.
Marshfield, WI 54449
brucekra@hotmail.com
(715) 387-2598

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Ruthe Bowen (rutheannb@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 2:18 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Ruthe Bowen
802 E State St Apt 201
Milwaukee, WI 53202
rutheannb@gmail.com
(414) 208-9748

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Deb Martin (debmartin04@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 10:51 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Please protect Wisconsin residents' water quality and stop these mega farms from more pollution for the sake of our children and future generations. Thank you.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Deb Martin
164 Wyldewood Dr
Oshkosh, WI 54904
debmartin04@gmail.com
(815) 540-5902

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Thomas Peronto (faithful@wctc.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 2:51 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

In addition to all the environmental problems these CAFOs cause they also are responsible for putting small family farms out of business by lowering milk prices that don't cover the cost of milk production on smaller farm operations.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Thomas Peronto
3021 69th St. S.
Wisconsin Rapids, WI 54494
faithful@wctc.net
(715) 421-3365

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Suzanne Moynihan (smoynihan@ssndcp.org) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 2:54 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

As an environmentalist, it is almost unbelievable to me to see how the landscape I knew as a child from Sheboygan is being deteriorated with unhealthy dairy farms producing tons of waste which pollute surrounding farms. There's a moral order here which needs to take into account the damage being done to the animals themselves as well as surrounding farms and to the land, the water and eventually our health. These large farms need to be regulated so I therefore support the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this

issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Moynihan
4121 W Martin Dr Apt 103
Milwaukee, WI 53208
smoynihan@ssndcp.org
(262) 226-9195

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Michael Anderson (mikeand1999@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 2:57 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Land stewardship with justice and equity is extremely important to a well functioning society. When taking care of the land is only done by large mega corporate interests who are only accountable to the profits of shareholders then it follows that only the wealthy will benefit from their control over the vast majority of the land. This is unfair, unwise and unsustainable and it must end. Start giving fair economic subsidies and support to small family organic farmers now!! Stop giving corporate welfare to huge Monsanto-fueled mega farms ! Start giving incentive for young people to consider running their own profitable family farm operations ! Start subsidizing regenerative agriculture, organic farming methods and devote massive public relations, resources and research to these concepts. Most young families I know want to buy organic but find their options are very limited and very expensive. It?s high time to create a level and safe, non-toxic playing field. Thank you.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would

create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Michael Anderson
617 Sheldon St
Madison , WI 53711
mikeand1999@gmail.com
(608) 231-2674

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Margaret McGuire (kashycat@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 3:05 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I support STRONG factory farm rules.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Margaret McGuire
2530 n. 96th Street
Wauwatosa, WI 53226
kashycat@yahoo.com
(414) 453-0953

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Corita Forster (coritaforster@att.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 3:24 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Extremely high numbers of cattle in enclosed spaces is inhumane to the cattle, besides being an environmental nuisance.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Corita Forster
W4241 Forster Rd
Durand, WI 54736
coritaforster@att.net
(715) 672-3672

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Janice Sieber (sieberjk@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 3:26 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Janice Sieber
1854 Ruby Ln
Eau Claire, WI 54703
sieberjk@gmail.com
(715) 895-8021

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Robin Langenbach (robinrgl@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 3:37 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Robin Langenbach
2028 E Rusk Ave
Milwaukee, WI 53207
robinrgl@hotmail.com
(414) 588-9145

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Erica Franklin (ef724@litewire.net) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 4:09 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Erica Franklin
11604 N. Franklin Rd
Stoughton, WI 53589
ef724@litewire.net
(608) 206-6746

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Fred Bamber (fbamber@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 4:29 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

You need to guard the environment....good laws make good citizens.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Fred Bamber
3211 Durand Ave
Racine, WI 53405
fbamber@gmail.com
(617) 549-7979

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: diane daniel (enomis4@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 4:32 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Destroying our water sources are the beginning of the end of human existence. Please educate yourself as to the dangers of CAFO and do the right thing.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

diane daniel
P O Box 281
Baileys Harbor, WI 54202
enomis4@yahoo.com
(920) 559-0082

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Lorrie Ogren (lorrie_o@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 4:43 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Lorrie Ogren
4403 Spring St
Mt Pleasant, WI 53405
lorrie_o@yahoo.com
(505) 795-0468

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Nora Eiesland (noradave@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 5:46 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Not only do CAFOs hurt small farmers they are ruining our land air and water;.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Nora Eiesland
127 280th St
Osceola, WI 54020
noradave@gmail.com
(715) 294-3335

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Bruce Krawisz (brucekra@hotmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 6:37 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Bruce Krawisz
1600 N Hills Avenue
Marshfield, WI 54449
brucekra@hotmail.com
(715) 973-0058

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Forrest Netzel (photonetz@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:01 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Protect Wisconsin residents from the cascading impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water and health.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Forrest Netzel
14255 W Maylore Dr
New Berlin, WI 53151
photonetz@aol.com
(262) 555-5555

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Dave Fields (dfieldsc@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 7:35 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I care about clean water and a healthy environment. Rules and regulations for factory farms should be strengthened. We often think only in the short term. Consider the health of your children and grandchildren. I don't want my groundwater fouled by a corporate farm.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can

leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Dave Fields
N1129 Miller Ave
Neillsville, WI 54456
dfieldsc@yahoo.com
(715) 743-3718

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Harold Jones (haj1232@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:04 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

CAFO's destroy the environment,
Ground water and Family Farms.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Harold Jones
1232 Johnson Street
Onalaska , WI 54650
haj1232@yahoo.com
(608) 386-8230

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Donna Gasbarro (gr8danez3@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:33 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Some people see farm animals as nothing more than food.
I see them as friends. And I hate that they are murdered to feed gluttonous people.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Donna Gasbarro
1205 S Douglas st
Appleton , WI 54914
gr8danez3@yahoo.com
(920) 202-4333

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Evangelist kathleen froode (kunce4@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:34 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I propose changes to the Facility Sitting Law.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Evangelist kathleen froode
6828 middle rd unit 6
Racine, WI 53402
kunce4@yahoo.com
(262) 456-0681

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Geralyn Leannah (gleannah57@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 8:49 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Geralyn Leannah
522 Grant Ave
Sheboygan, WI 53081
gleannah57@yahoo.com
(920) 254-6713

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Rebecca Billey (rebeccabillety@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 9:59 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

These major operations need to be held accountable. Only strong straight forward legislation will achieve this. Thank you!

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Billey
147S. Ludington street
Columbus, WI 53925
rebeccabillety@gmail.com
(386) 288-0934

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Patricia Nadreau (patsavon2@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2019 10:13 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Patricia Nadreau
24191 Dial Avenue
Tomah, WI 54660
patsavon2@gmail.com
(608) 372-3174

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Jane Maya Shippy (jshippy@uwsp.edu) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2019 2:08 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Jane Maya Shippy
517 Fieldcrest Ave
Stevens Point, WI 54481
jshippy@uwsp.edu
(715) 344-2939

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: G Allen Daily (gadaily@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2019 5:49 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

G Allen Daily
2200 N Commerce St Apt 302
Milwaukee, WI 53212
gadaily@gmail.com
(414) 208-4234

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Vicky Schettl (vschettl@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2019 7:45 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

This matter is important to me for a number of reasons. The first is the health and welfare of animals and the second is the maintenance of the environment. Please protect our animals and our lands. There is only one earth!

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Vicky Schettl
N4099 blackhawk rd
Pine river, WI 54965
vschettl@gmail.com
(920) 450-7780

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Rebecca Regan (RebeccaRN04@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2019 8:22 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Concentrated animal feeding operations are a crime. If you visited one of these (if that were even allowed) you?d swear off eating meat. This is not who we are. ??

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Regan
8260 N Gray Log Ln
Fox Point, WI 53217
RebeccaRN04@aol.com
(414) 793-4069

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Joan Riedle (riedlejoan@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2019 8:53 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

Water in SW Wisconsin is being adversely affected by runoff from corporate farms. Thank you for your efforts to lessen the damage caused by CAFOs.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Joan Riedle
1020 Eastman St
Platteville, WI 53818
riedlejoan@gmail.com
(608) 778-5461

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Kia Conrad (kiaconrad@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2019 1:15 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Kia Conrad
3013 Fairview St.
Madison, WI 53704
kiaconrad@aol.com
(608) 249-0189

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Dana LaFontsee (dana.lafontsee@outlook.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2019 5:04 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Dana LaFontsee
5228 Buena Park Road
Waterford, WI 53185
dana.lafontsee@outlook.com
(262) 888-0231

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Charles Zarnoth (cjzarnothapc@gmail.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2019 7:22 PM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I and most of my family live in Wisconsin. I strongly believe in protecting what we have and in making it better now and for in the future for our families.

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Charles Zarnoth
N3166 Mill Rd
New Holstein, WI 53061
cjzarnothapc@gmail.com
(920) 849-2658

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.

Heaton-Amrhein, Jennifer A - DATCP

From: Sandra Serazio (sandyrs2000@yahoo.com) Sent You a Personal Message <automail@knowwho.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 14, 2019 1:52 AM
To: DATCP Livestock Siting Comments
Subject: ATCP 51: Livestock Facility Siting Administrative Rule Revision Comments

Categories: Green Category

Dear Trade and Consumer Protection,

I am writing to voice my support for some of the proposed changes to the Livestock Facility Siting Rule and to urge you to consider the following recommendations to help protect Wisconsin residents from the known impacts of concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) on our land, water, and health.

The proposed shift to a greater use of setbacks will be a major improvement to the current odor scoring system in protecting the property rights and quality of life for landowners neighboring CAFO operations. Though the rule has some important improvements, they need to be stronger. Replacing the previous system of odor scoring with designated setbacks to determine how far a manure storage facility or barn needs to be from neighboring properties is a big improvement, but there are still some outlets in the proposed rule, including more lenient setbacks if an operation complies with weaker, inexact odor control practices. Additionally, the setbacks need to be much larger and neighbors within two miles of the facilities should be notified. Finally, local governments need to be allowed to require additional setbacks if they deem necessary.

I also support the ability for local governments to impose additional manure spreading restrictions consistent with applicable performance standards and prohibitions in ch. NR 151. Additionally, changes to the rule that only facilities 10 year or older need to be inspected will prove beneficial, as we know there have been storage facilities that have leaked within 30 days of installation. I urge you to make sure that these provisions stay in the rule.

While I do support the above adaptations to the current rule, I?m urging you to add stronger and more robust standards for CAFO operations to protect Wisconsin residents from their potential dangers. For example, the abbreviated review process for facilities expanding by less than 20-30% creates a dangerous loophole that could allow for much bigger, gradual expansion of facilities. It?s unfair to not require all facilities, new and expansions, to have to be reviewed.

Another area of concern stems from facility operators not being required to list the properties where they intend to spread their manure. Dedicated citizen groups have reviewed nutrient management plans only to discover manure is being spread in areas where landowners are not aware and did not grant permission. Adding this requirement would create added protection for Wisconsin landowners and would ensure that management plans will be implemented. Permittees should be required to show signed contracts for land for manure spreading for land they are renting.

Wisconsin residents are not the only ones at risk, local governments often end up paying the price for CAFO operations. The current permit fee of $1,000 only scrapes the surface of the potential thousands that local governments could pay to review permits. Green County paying $40,000 to review a single application reflects a disappointing example of this issue. Additionally, the current rule does not allow local governments to secure financial security, like a bond,, which can leave local governments to clean up the mess in cases of bankruptcy. Local governments should be allowed to require this if they see fit.

Thank you for your time and attention, I look forward to hearing back from you on this important message.

Sincerely,

Sandra Serazio
N1772 Hawks Nest Rd
Keshena, WI 54135
sandyrs2000@yahoo.com
(414) 861-4070

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. Please contact Lillian Miller at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500 for more information.