

CAFO Moratorium Study Committee
COMMUNITY DIALOGUE
Report



September 24, 2020

Presented to CAFO Study Committee during 9am Meeting on 9/24/20

Jessica Jane Spayde, Community Development Educator, Extension Crawford County



Extension
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON
CRAWFORD COUNTY

Overview

- Promoted / Invited via Facebook, Radio, Press Releases, Emails
- Meeting was September 1st, 2020, 6:00 - 7:30 pm, via Zoom. People could participate via computer, smartphone, tablet, or cell/landline telephone.
- During the meeting:
 - We had 11 Facilitators who moderated Breakout room discussions
 - We had 7 breakout sessions, with between 5-8 people in each room.
 - Prompts for the discussion sessions:
 - A. What do you feel about health, safety, and welfare issues around CAFOs in general?
 - B. What other areas do you want the CAFO Study Committee to look into?
 - Participants: 43 people attended and shared their thoughts and concerns
 - Facilitators took extensive notes of the discussions, so we have a good record of the conversation.
- Additional Follow up Comments: Received 20 Survey responses, and 8 Emails

This report categorizes and summarizes the comments and concerns mentioned during the Community Dialogue.

Thanks to all the local residents who spent time discussing and listening to each other about this important issue. Thanks to the 11 Extension Colleagues from across the state who volunteered their time to help Crawford County have this important conversation.

RESULTS

The Study Committee Should **Examine Existing Research & Regulations**

1. Manure Management

- a. Storing Manure -
 - i. Safety and risk management
 - ii. Efficacy of Clay linings
- b. Hauling Manure -
 - i. Safety and risk management
 - ii. Issues with Drag Hoses and liquid manure in irrigation systems
 - iii. SPEAKERS TO INVITE:
 1. Conservation Warden Shawna Stringham
 2. Dr. Eric Carson in Geological Natural History completed a soil map in Richland and Crawford counties and the study group should have him make a presentation to them and have a more refined understanding where our soils are too shallow.
- c. Spreading Manure - safety and risk management
 - i. SPEAKERS TO INVITE:
 1. Dr. Carson
- d. Examine Spill Histories of similar CAFOs

2. What have other towns, villages, counties, states done?

- a. Iowa
- b. Kewaunee County
- c. Bayfield
- d. And others

3. Driftless Soils

- a. SPEAKERS TO INVITE:
 - i. Dr. Carson

4. Public Health and Safety

- a. Diseases spread associated with CAFOs (African Swine Fever, Zoonotic emergence of coronavirus and flu strains)

5. Economic Impacts of CAFOs

- a. Job impact
 - i. Job losses due to health issues around CAFOs
 - ii. Any job gains due to CAFO?
- b. Tax Base impacts
 - i. Property values and tax base decreases
 - ii. Decrease Population
- c. Public Spending impacts
 - i. Increased health costs
 - ii. Decrease tourism dollars
 - iii. Rural Community Economic Degradation
 - iv. Increased Road wear and tear repair
- d. Loss of family farms
- e. Monetize all of the public assets at risk with a CAFO.
- f. What is economic value that a CAFO adds to a county? Cost-benefit analysis for other landowners.

6. Driftless Area Water Study (DAWS)

- a. Complete this study and utilize to make recommendations to the county board

7. Existing Regulations

- a. Wisconsin Livestock Siting Law Regulatory Takings
- b. Food Safety Act violations related to biosecurity and known pathogens
- c. WI DNR - protecting endangered resources?
- d. Construction and engineering proposals - based on old data - not relevant with increased extreme weather events, i.e., flooding.
- e. Do permits ever get revoked, renewed?
- f. Many more comments & questions!

8. Legal Issues

- a. Who has liability when resources are polluted?
- b. What will county board do when resources are polluted?
- c. What ability does the county have to continue the moratorium or regulate CAFOs?
- d. What are the legal avenues for those who oppose.
- e. Who will pay for any damages caused
- f. In response to a County Regulation or Moratorium:
 - i. More discussion and information should have been covered on the legal concerns during the Dialogue or a future Dialogue because litigation seems likely
 - ii. How likely is the Hog Industry to take legal action as stated by certain members of Crawford County government committees if the Moratorium is extended for a full year?
 - iii. What will the cost (not just monetary) be of litigation for all involved?
- g. Liability to County Board For non-response to concerns around CAFOs
 - i. including environmental litigation to protect air and water resources.

9. Study Existing CAFO in Crawford County

- a. Any health and water issues?
- b. Expenses to town/village/county?
- c. Property tax rates?
- d. What monitoring has been done?
- e. Who owns (rented or owner-run?)
- f. Map of fields where manure is spread
- g. Cost to residents for water testing and mitigation so far
- h. Impact on new residents and potential land buyers

The Study Committee Should Respond to Questions for Study Committee

1. What is the value of clean air and clean water to county residents who live, farm, raise their families, and run businesses in the county? What loss in the county's net position would result from damage to these assets?
2. What kind of bonding would serve to make county residents whole in the event that our natural assets, held in public trust equally for all of us to enjoy, were damaged through the economic activity of only one of the residents of the county for whom these assets are held in trust?
3. Using the current and proposed Roth Feeder Pigs CAFO as the most proximate and relevant example, what economic value does the existence or future existence of these facilities contribute to the county's economy?

The Study Committee Should Respond to **Requests for the Study Committee**

Make explicit the role of government in protecting the public trust and public health.

- *What kind of bonding would serve to make county residents whole in the event that our natural assets, held in public trust equally for all of us to enjoy, were damaged through the economic activity of only one of the residents of the county for whom these assets are held in trust?*
- ***Demonstrate what benefit a CAFO has to all residents of the county.**
 - *Most important thing. CAFOs represent danger. No recourse open to citizens if issues arise. Nothing in statutes to stop CAFOs. DNR has no teeth. Judiciary does nothing. No benefit to citizens.*
 - *Economics - benefits vs costs to people of county.*
- *always consider the health of the members of the community over any sort of economic gain*

Make explicit the value, definition, and limitations of “property rights”

- *“Often people who support this type of enterprise sight property rights and freedom, but do not see that their project destroys the lives and livelihoods of dozens of families all around them.”*
- *“Roth wants to do a major expansion using land that he just recently acquired meanwhile many residents that have owned their land and homes for years will be negatively affected. How does this happen? Right To Farm does not mean Right To Harm.”*
- *Raising hogs is a living in farm country*
- *Protect business opportunities, however, what is communally owned? Do we own the air and water on our property? We collectively own the air and groundwater.*
- *The limits of private property rights?*

Each study committee member needs to make their ideas known.

- *Would like to hear a response of the Forum and next steps ideas from each study committee member*

The study committee needs to work on coming to an agreement

- *Come to some sort of agreement*
- *Crucial to know if things could be ruined if approved*
- *Consider other avenues for agriculture*
- *Consider the farmer is not interested in ruining the land forever, if they know the science indicates harm they probably will not pursue it further*
- *Engage directly with Mr Roth*
 - *I expect Mr. Roth will be taking certain precautions to mitigate any of the committee's environmental concerns. Mr. Roth is probably an expert in this field of large hog operations. Whereas the committee & Co Bd. are not experts, however are trying to make the right decision for the future of Crawford Co. Hopefully Roth will be given a list of all concerns and have ample time to address them.*

Engage with the public

- a need for more Community Dialogue
- Make the public more aware of the facts

Extend the Moratorium to further study this issue

- *We ask a 1 year Moratorium 'Extension' be approved, so the Work Group can finish their critical task of examining Health, Safety and Welfare risks, and how an influx of CAFOs into Crawford County's sensitive leaky karst geology will likely impact residents lives in short and long-term.*
- *Extend the moratorium. Something this important to our future can not be rushed until all the questions are answered and facts presented.*
- *Extend the moratorium for a year to gather further information, especially with pandemic delays*
- *We need to extend the CAFO moratorium one year so that we have the groundwater data to make decisions.*
- *I think they should extend the moratorium as well.*
- *The moratorium must be extended to the end of the year. COVID has disrupted the process and we don't have the information necessary to make a decision.*
- *Extend the moratorium to allow more time for the study and to have groundwater data.*

The Study Committee Should Incorporate these Recommendations for the County Board

Consider requirements and regulations that:

- Promote sustainable farming practices
- Promote small and family farms (century farms)
- Promote local control
- Protect public health
- Protect public safety
- Protect water (drinking, ground, surface)
- Protect landowners (especially landowners who are NOT polluting)
- Protect Air Quality
- Protect Neighbors of large farmers from noxious odors, noise, pests.
- Protect property values
- Protect public infrastructure: roads
- Still others!!

The Study Committee Should Respond to **Other Concerns**

The study committee & County Board is not doing their job.

There were many comments on the study committee and the county board members. The sentiment expressed was that the study committee and the county board are not doing what they should to study this issue and make a good decision.

- a. *"The lack of County Board Members attendance and even the committee chairs lack of attending the public forum tells me they do not really care and are just going through the motions, at least that is the way it seems. That makes me sad as it appears that they are not truly looking into what is best, based on research and facts, for the residents of Crawford County."*
- b. *"I heard questions from others such as where are the elected Government officials and those who support CAFOs in the Community Dialogue?"*
- c. *"The county board needs to realize that if they were living in close proximity to a CAFO they would be more motivated to see how this affects the health, welfare and safety of the community."*
- d. *"Voices in the community may be heard, but the county supervisors may not care to heed."*
- e. *"People need to be heard now and not later when complaining about the decision."*
- f. *"I feel the committee and Co. Bd. needs to learn about the potential water/ground water contamination and determine if they a willing to take the risk of potential long term contamination."*
- g. *"I'm concerned that the county board is going to drop the ball. These are tough issues, the committee has tough issues to understand. I hope the county will give the committee more time to do a thorough job."*
- h. *"I would like to see a commitment from the county officials that they will take this seriously and that there is an expectation that they review the study very carefully and act very carefully consistent with the study."*
- i. *"I have a concern that there is at least one member of the study group who doesn't seem to have the community's best interest at heart. I read all of the reports in the local papers, and one committee member seems to be quoted often, but seems to always be arguing for fast-track permitting, and doesn't seem to have conservation issues as her priority. Shouldn't land and water conservation be the primary goal of the study committee, and therefore the primary focus of each of the members?"*
- j. *"If the members of the committee are not serious about this, what kind of actions can citizens take?"*
- k. *"Concerns about the elected officials' commitment to the seriousness of this issue."*
- l. *"Commitment from elected officials to take the study seriously."*