



Report Date: August 27, 2025

File: AG149487

Report Number: 248718

Kevin Carson
125 Sugar Lake Rd, Lumby, BC

Dear Kevin Carson,

Re: Non-compliance Advisory Letter

On July 21, 2025, the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Strategy (Ministry) Environmental Protection Officer Rebecca Benham (Ministry Staff) conducted an on-site inspection of KT Ranches, also known as Carson Farm (KT Ranches) agricultural operation located at 125 Sugar Lake Road, Lumby, BC (Facility). The inspection was conducted in response to a complaint regarding the Facility's management of manure and to verify compliance with the Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (COPAEM). Present during the inspection was Kevin Carson (Owner, KT Ranches). Supplemental information for the inspection was provided by the Owner via email.

This Advisory, the alleged violations and the circumstances to which it refers will form part of the compliance history of Kevin Carson, and will be taken into account in the event of future non-compliance.

Please note that this authorization is considered to be out of compliance until such a time as it can be confirmed to meet the authorization requirements.

Inspection Details:

The inspection assessed the period between May 27, 2024, and August 15, 2025 (Inspection Period) and included a review of the following documents:

- "RE: 2025-07-14 Information Gathering and Inspection [Carson Farms]" email provided by KT Ranches, received by the Ministry on August 15, 2025 (Nutrient Information Response Email);
- "Preliminary Nutrient Management Plan" provided by Forage Based Solutions, sent by KT Ranches, received by the Ministry on August 15, 2025 (2025 Nutrient Management Plan) ; and
- "RE: 2025-07-14 Information Gathering and Inspection [Carson Farms]" email provided by KT Ranches, received by the Ministry on July 20, 2025 (Information Response Email).

Compliance Assessment

Below are the requirements that were assessed for compliance during this inspection, as well as the associated details/findings and any actions required.

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

2 (2.1)(c): Subject to subsection (4), rearing or keeping livestock, poultry or insects, or growing and harvesting agricultural products, is an agricultural operation for the purposes of this code if done for one or more of the following purposes:(c) for use as breeding stock or to produce seedlings or flowers;

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry staff that during the Inspection Period the Facility kept up to approximately 730 head of cattle, for the purpose of breed stock. Therefore, KT Ranches is considered an agricultural operation for the purposes of COPAEM.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

17(1)(a): A person who, for the purposes of an agricultural operation, performs an activity described in column 1 of the following table must ensure a setback of at least the distances, in m, set out opposite the activity in columns 2 to 4: Item 1a; Column 1 Activity - Storing agricultural by-products or nutrient sources other than agricultural by-products using (a) a permanent storage structure, on-ground under-pen storage or temporary field storage of less than 2 weeks; Column 2 Drinking water source (m) - 30; Column 3 Watercourse, other than a drinking water source (m) - 15; Column 4 Property boundary (m) - 4.5.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that the Facility stores agricultural by-products. The Owner then confirmed the location of the drinking water wells on-site and the property boundary location. Ministry staff observed the areas for the storage of agricultural by-products, nutrient sources, wood residue storage and confirmed they were outside the setback distances listed in Columns 2, 3, and 4 of section 17(1) of COPAEM. Ministry Staff accessed the online BC Groundwater Well database and the online iMAP watercourse map layer and confirmed the groundwater wells and watercourses were outside the setback distances listed in Columns 2, 3, and 4 of section 17(1) of COPAEM.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

17(5): A person who, for the purposes of an agricultural operation, performs an activity described in column 1 of the following table must ensure a setback of at least the distances, in m, set out opposite the activity in columns 2 to 4: Item 5; Column 1 Activity - Applying nutrient sources, other than wood residue or irrigation water, to land; Column 2 Drinking water source (m) - 30, from a well or diversion point, 3 in any other case or if commercial fertilizer is used; Column 3 Watercourse, other than a drinking water source (m) - 1.5, if commercial fertilizer or sub-surface injection is used, 3, in any other case; Column 4 Property boundary (m) - Not on the property boundary.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that commercial fertilizers are applied to land on-site. The Owner then confirmed the location of the drinking water wells on-site and the property boundary location. Ministry staff observed the areas where commercial fertilizer is applied and confirmed they were outside the setback distances listed in Columns 2, 3, and 4 of section 17(5) of COPAEM. Ministry Staff accessed the online BC Groundwater Well database and the online iMAP watercourse map layer and confirmed the groundwater wells and watercourses were outside the setback distances listed in Columns 2, 3, and 4 of section 17(5) of COPAEM.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

17(6)(b): A person who, for the purposes of an agricultural operation, performs an activity described in column 1 of the following table must ensure a setback of at least the distances, in m, set out opposite the activity in columns 2 to 4: Item 6; Column 1 Activity - Rearing of keeping livestock or poultry using a confined livestock area or a confined poultry area having (b) greater than or equal to 10 animal units in which animals are fed; Column 2 Drinking water source (m) - 30; Column 3 Watercourse, other than a drinking water source (m) - 30; Column 4 Property boundary (m) - 1.5.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that the Facility keeps livestock using a confined livestock area. Ministry staff observed the confined livestock areas and confirmed they were outside the setback distances listed in Columns 2, 3, and 4 of section 17(6)(b) of COPAEM. Ministry Staff accessed the online BC Groundwater Well database and the online iMAP watercourse map layer and confirmed the groundwater wells and watercourses were outside the setback distances listed in Columns 2, 3, and 4 of section 17(6)(b) of COPAEM.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

17(8)(b): A person who, for the purposes of an agricultural operation, performs an activity described in column 1 of the following table must ensure a setback of at least the distances, in m, set out opposite the activity in columns 2 to 4: Item 8; Column 1 Activity - Dealing with mortalities or processing wastes using (b) an outdoor agricultural composting pile or a burial pile; Column 2 Drinking water source (m) - 30; Column 3 Watercourse, other than a drinking water source (m) - 30; Column 4 Property boundary (m) - 4.5.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that the Facility meets the required minimum setback distances when dealing with mortalities using a burial pit. Ministry Staff observed the burial pits "SF 1, SF 2 and SF 3" and confirmed that the burial piles were outside the setback distances listed in Columns 2, 3, and 4 of section 17(8)(b) of COPAEM. Ministry Staff accessed the online BC Groundwater Well database and the online iMAP watercourse map layer and confirmed the groundwater wells and watercourses were outside the setback distances listed in Columns 2, 3, and 4 of section 17(8)(b) of COPAEM.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

27 (1)(b): A person must not apply nutrient sources to land (b) during strong, divergent windy conditions, unless the nutrient sources are applied (i) below the soil surface, or (ii) under a crop canopy having a height of at least 8 cm,

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that nutrient application to land did not occur during the on-site inspection; therefore, compliance with the requirements of subsection 27(1) were not determined during the Inspection Period.

Compliance:

Not Determined

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

27 (4): A person must prepare a risk assessment, in writing and in the form and manner required by a director, (a)for each field to which nutrient sources are to be applied, and (b)considering the special circumstances of the high-precipitation area and any high-risk conditions.

Details/Findings:

The Facility is located in Cherryville, BC. Ministry staff accessed the online BC Application Risk Management (ARM) Tool database, which does not list Cherryville as an area of BC that requires a risk assessment be prepared prior to nutrient application. Therefore, compliance with the requirements of this subsection were not applicable during the Inspection Period.

Compliance:

Not Applicable

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

30: A person who carries out an agricultural operation, whether in a high-risk area or not, must do all of the following: (a) monitor the agricultural operation for impending high-risk conditions; (b) assess the effectiveness of existing measures and controls to prevent contaminated runoff, leachate and solids from entering a drinking water source or watercourse, or crossing a property boundary; (c) if existing measures or controls are inadequate, take corrective action before high-risk conditions materialize.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that KT Ranches monitor the agricultural operation and assess the effectiveness of existing measures and controls to prevent contaminated runoff, leachate and solids from entering a drinking water source or watercourse, or crossing a property boundary from impending high-risk conditions. Ministry Staff also observed that the Facility moved existing confined livestock areas to prevent contaminated runoff, leachate and solids from entering a watercourse and crossing a property boundary.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

32 (1)(a): A person may store and use solid agricultural by-products for the purposes of an agricultural operation only as follows:(a) solid agricultural by-products that are produced on the person's agricultural land base may be stored on that agricultural land base;

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that stored solid agricultural by-products (manure, soiled animal bedding) which are produced from the Facility and stored on their own agricultural land base.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

32 (1)(c): A person may store and use solid agricultural by-products for the purposes of an agricultural operation only as follows:(c) solid agricultural by-products may be stored only in a permanent storage structure or as temporary field storage;

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that solid agricultural by-products (manure, soiled animal bedding) are stored on-site. In the Information Response Email, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that solid agricultural by-products are stored using temporary field storage however, as the solid agricultural by-products were only stored in a temporary field storage for approximately one month and had been removed, Ministry staff did not observe this during the on-site inspection.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:**Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)**

32 (2)(a): A person may carry out an agricultural composting process using solid agricultural by-products for the purposes of an agricultural operation only as follows: (a) solid agricultural by-products that are produced on the person's agricultural land base may be used in an agricultural composting process carried out on that agricultural land base;

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, Ministry Staff observed that the Facility does not carry out an agricultural composting process on-site. Therefore, compliance with the requirement of this subsection was not applicable during the Inspection Period.

Compliance:

Not Applicable

Requirement Description:**Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)**

33 (1)(a): A person may store liquid manure only as follows: (a) liquid manure may be stored on a person's agricultural land base only if the liquid manure is subsequently used in agricultural operations carried out on the agricultural land base on which the liquid manure was produced or stored

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, Ministry Staff observed that the Facility does not store liquid manure. Therefore, compliance with the requirement of this subsection was not applicable during the Inspection Period.

Compliance:

Not Applicable

Requirement Description:**Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)**

34: A person who stores agricultural by-products must ensure all of the following: (a) that any leachate generated during storage is (i) collected or contained, and (ii) not discharged directly to land or water; (b) that runoff is diverted away from the storage structure or storage area; (c) that the storage structure or storage area is maintained so as to prevent contaminated runoff, leachate, wastewater and solids from escaping; (d) if contaminated runoff, leachate, wastewater or solids escape from storage, they do not enter a watercourse, cross a property boundary, or go below the water table; (e) that air contaminants from stored agricultural by-products do not cross a property boundary; (f) that agricultural by-products are stored in a manner that will deter the attraction of, and access by, domestic pets, wildlife and vectors.

Details/Findings:

The definition of "agricultural by-product" under COPAEM includes manure and soiled animal beddings. During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that there is no leachate generated during storage and contaminated runoff, leachate, wastewater or solids are not discharged directly to land or water, do not enter a watercourse or cross a property boundary. Ministry Staff did not observe agricultural by-products being stored, therefore compliance with this section could not be determined during the Inspection Period.

Compliance:

Not Determined

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

37 (1): A person who uses temporary field storage to store solid agricultural by-products must ensure all of the following: (a) that field storage is not located (i) in any area in which there is standing water or water-saturated soil, or (ii) on any low-lying area of a field prone to annual seasonal flooding, during the flood season or when flooding is imminent; (b) that field storage is monitored at least once each week to ensure compliance with this code; (c) that, before the end of the growing period, but no later than 7 months after storage begins, all field-stored solid agricultural by-products are (i) used, (ii) moved to a permanent storage structure, if storage is allowed under section 32 (a) or (b) [allowable storage and use of solid agricultural by-products], or (iii) transported away from the agricultural land base; (d) that vegetation is grown on the storage location after the field-stored solid agricultural by-products are used, moved or transported in accordance with paragraph (c), either in the current or next growing season; (e) that, if field storage is for a period of more than 2 weeks, temporary field storage does not occur in the same location again for at least 3 years.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry staff that the Facility uses a temporary field storage to store solid agricultural by-products during the Inspection Period. Ministry staff did not observe temporary field storage storing solid agricultural by-products as previously identified in subsection 32(1) (c). Therefore, compliance with the requirements of this subsection were not determined during the Inspection Period.

Compliance:

Not Determined

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

37 (2): A person who uses temporary field storage must keep a record of all of the following: (a) the type and source of the materials being stored and the date that storage began; (b) the location of the temporary field storage; (c) the weekly results of monitoring conducted under subsection (1) (b).

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry staff that the Facility uses a temporary field storage to store solid agricultural by-products during the Inspection Period and provided information on the type and source of materials, the date the storage began, the location of the temporary field storage. The Owner informed Ministry Staff that week monitoring was conducted for the length of time the temporary field storage was used, this was also confirmed in the Information Response Email, however the Owner did not provide records to the Ministry when requested. Therefore compliance with this section is not determined.

Compliance:

Not Determined

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

45: A person may do one or both of the following, but only if the wood residue is subsequently used in agricultural operations: (a) bring wood residue onto the person's agricultural land base; (b) store wood residue on the person's agricultural land base (i) in a permanent storage structure, or (ii) as temporary field storage for a period of no more than 12 months.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, Ministry Staff observed wood residue being stored as temporary field storage. The Owner informed Ministry Staff that wood residue is used in the agricultural operation within 12 months.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

46: A person who stores wood residue or applies wood residue to land must ensure all of the following: (a) that storage is not located, or wood residue is not applied to land, (i) in any area in which there is standing water or water-saturated soil, or (ii) on any low-lying area of a field prone to annual seasonal flooding, during the flood season or when flooding is imminent; (b) that wood residue, contaminated runoff, leachate, solids and dust do not enter a watercourse, cross a property boundary or go below the water table; (c) in the case of storage, (i) that leachate does not escape from the storage, and (ii) that runoff is diverted away from the storage.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, Ministry Staff observed wood residue being stored as temporary field storage. The Owner informed Ministry Staff that wood residue is used for animal bedding for the confined livestock areas. Ministry Staff did not observe runoff or leachate being produced from the storage of wood residue and is not located in a low-lying area prone to flooding or an area in which there is standing water or water-saturated soil.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

47 (2): Unless it would contravene subsection (1) (a) to (d), a person may use wood residue for the following purposes: (a) as plant mulch or for horticultural bedding; (b) as soil conditioner or ground cover; (c) as a component of growing media; (d) as a component of compost; (e) in confined livestock areas or confined poultry areas, or in areas where livestock and poultry are exercised; (f) as animal bedding; (g) to create an access way on an agricultural land base; (h) as fuel for wood-fired boilers.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that wood residue is used in confined livestock areas.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

49 (1): A person must not apply nutrient sources to land (a) on which there is standing water or water-saturated soil, (b) on ground in which the top 5 cm of soil is frozen so as to be impenetrable to manually-operated equipment, (c) on a field having at least 5 cm of ice or snow over at least 50 percent of its area, or (d) at a rate of application, under meteorological, topographical or soil conditions, or in a manner, that may cause nutrient sources or contaminated runoff, leachate or solids to enter a watercourse, cross a property boundary or go below the water table.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that nutrient application to land did not occur during the on-site inspection. Therefore, compliance with the requirements of this subsection were not determined during the Inspection Period.

Compliance:

Not Determined

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

51 (1): A person who applies nutrient sources to land must ensure all of the following: (a) that nutrient sources and leachate produced by nutrient sources do not escape during transportation or piping; (b) that nutrient sources are not discharged or applied directly into a watercourse, across a property boundary or below the seasonal high water table; (c) that drift from nutrient sources sprayed onto land does not enter a watercourse, cross a property boundary or go below the seasonal high water table; (d) that the total amount of available nitrogen in the soil, if applicable, and from all nutrient sources applied in one year of application, is equal to or less than the amount of nitrogen needed for optimum crop growth and yield.

Details/Findings:

In the Nutrient Information Response Email, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that nutrient sources are applied to land. The Owner informed Ministry Staff that nutrient sources are applied to land in accordance with this subsection; however, nutrient application to land did not occur during the on-site inspection. Therefore, compliance with the requirements of 51(1) (b) and (c) were not determined during the Inspection Period. The Owner informed Ministry Staff, in the Information Response Email, that the "nutrient levels are put on at a minimum" and use less nitrogen than needed for optimum crop growth and yield, however Ministry Staff could not determine compliance with subsection 51(1)(d).

Compliance:

Not Determined

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

52 (1): A person who applies nutrient sources to a crop but not to land must ensure all of the following: (a) that nutrient sources and leachate produced by nutrient sources do not escape during transportation or piping; (b) that, in the case of nutrient sources applied to crops in containers, (i) nutrient sources are not discharged or applied directly into a watercourse, across a property boundary or below the water table, and (ii) contaminated runoff, leachate, solids or drift from sprayed nutrient sources does not enter a watercourse, cross a property boundary or go below the water table; (i) nutrient sources are not discharged or applied directly into a watercourse, across a property boundary or below the water table, and (ii) contaminated runoff, leachate, solids or drift from sprayed nutrient sources does not enter a watercourse, cross a property boundary or go below the water table; (c) that the total amount of available nitrogen from all nutrient sources applied in one year of application is equal to or less than the amount of nitrogen needed for optimum crop growth and yield.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that nutrients were applied directly to crops during the Inspection Period. In the Nutrient Information Response Email, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that nutrient sources are

applied to land in accordance with this subsection; however, nutrient application to land did not occur during the on-site inspection. Therefore, compliance with the requirements of this subsection were not determined during the Inspection Period.

Compliance:

Not Determined

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

52 (2): A person who applies nutrient sources to a crop hut not to land must make and keep records of all of the following in respect of each crop to which nutrient sources are applied: (a) the crop nutrient requirements; (b) the calculated nutrient application rate; (c) whether the nutrient sources were solids or liquids and the type of nutrient sources applied.

Details/Findings:

In an email dated August 15, 2025, the Owner provided the Nutrient Management Plan which included records of (a) the crop nutrient requirements, (b) the calculated nutrient application rate and (c) the type of nutrient sources applied. The Owner informed Ministry Staff in the Nutrient Information Response Email that the nutrient sources applied were solids and applied in accordance with the 2025 Nutrient Management Plan.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

53 (1): Subject to subsection (2), a person who applies nutrient sources to land must have the soil in each field tested as follows: (a) if the result of a nitrate test for the field is 100 kg N/ha or more, a nitrate test must be conducted again for that field the following year; (b) if paragraph (a) does not apply, a nitrate test must be conducted at least once every 3 years; (c) a phosphorus test must be conducted at least once every 3 years.

Details/Findings:

In an email dated August 15, 2025, the Owner provided Ministry staff with the Nutrient Management Plan, which contain the nitrate and phosphorus soil test results conducted in 2024. Ministry Staff converted the nitrate soil test results from ppm to kg N/ha and determined that five of the 2024 nitrate soil test results were 100 kg N/ha or more. In the Nutrient Information Response Email, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that the Facility will be conducting soil field tests this year (2025) for nitrate.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:**Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)**

54: A nitrate test must be conducted in accordance with one of the following: (a) a post-harvest nitrate test that measures the amount of nitrate-nitrogen left in soil and not used by the most recently harvested crop must be conducted (i) using a representative sample, and (ii) after the last harvest of the growing season but before the autumn rains typically begin; (b) a test equivalent to a post-harvest nitrate test that will produce results representative of the amount of nitrate-nitrogen left in soil and not used by the most recently harvested crop.

Details/Findings:

Ministry Staff reviewed the Nutrient Management Plan, which contained the nitrate-nitrogen soil test results conducted in 2024. Compliance with the 2025 post-harvest nitrate tests was not determined as the Fall harvest has not been completed.

Compliance:

Not Determined

Requirement Description:**Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)**

55 (1): A phosphorus test must (a) measure the amount of available phosphorus in soil, and (b) be conducted using a representative sample.

Details/Findings:

Ministry Staff reviewed the Nutrient Management Plan, which contained the phosphorus soil test results conducted in 2024.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:**Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)**

55 (2): If phosphorus test results are obtained using a method other than that commonly referred to as the "Kelowna method", the results must be converted to a value that is equivalent to the results that would have been obtained if the Kelowna method had been used.

Details/Findings:

In an email dated August 15, 2025, the Owner provided Ministry staff with the 2025 Nutrient Management Plan, which contained the phosphorus soil test results conducted in 2024. KT Ranches uses A&L Canada Laboratories Inc, which report the phosphorus soil test results in the Bray 1 and Mehlich 3 form, and has not converted the results to the "Kelowna method".

Compliance:

Out

Actions to be taken:

KT Ranches must provide phosphorus test results in a value that is equivalent to results that would have been obtained if the Kelowna method had been used.

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

56 (b): Subject to section 58 [exemptions or modifications to nutrient management plans], a person who applies nutrient sources to a field that is part of an agricultural operation having an agricultural land base totalling 5 ha or more must have a nutrient management plan if either of the following circumstances apply: (b) the field is located in a phosphorus-affected area and the result of a phosphorus test for the field is 200 ppm or more.

Details/Findings:

As previously determined, the Owner applies nutrient sources to the land, is an agricultural operation, has a land base over 5 ha and the Facility is located in a phosphorus-affected area. The 2025 Nutrient Management Plan included the phosphorus soil test results conducted in 2024 which confirmed that the phosphorous test of the Ashton Cook Reels field was above the 200ppm threshold, therefore a nutrient management plan is required. The Owner provided Ministry Staff with the 2025 Nutrient Management Plan.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

57 (1): A nutrient management plan must be prepared (a) by a qualified professional who has successfully completed a course in nutrient management planning, offered in British Columbia and approved by a director, if a result referred to in section 53 (1) is (i) 150 kg N/ha or more, for a nitrate test, or (ii) 300 ppm or more, for a phosphorus test, and (b) by an experienced person, in any other case.

Details/Findings:

Ministry Staff reviewed the 2025 Nutrient Management Plan and confirmed it was prepared by Jessica Washstock PAg. Ministry Staff reviewed the BC governments website and Jessica Washstock is listed as a qualified professional.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

57 (3): A person who prepares a nutrient management plan must sign and date the completed plan.

Details/Findings:

Ministry Staff reviewed the 2025 Nutrient Management Plan and confirmed this was signed and dated August 13, 2025.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:**Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)**

59 (1): A person who must have a nutrient management plan must do all of the following: (a) if the plan is prepared by a qualified professional, notify a director, in the form and manner required by the director, that a plan has been made or revised; (b) implement the plan; (c) keep a copy of the plan, the information on which it is based, including information from records made under section 51 (2) [general requirements for applications to land], and of any changes made to the plan, and make and keep records to demonstrate compliance with the plan.

Details/Findings:

The 2025 Nutrient Management Plan was prepared by a qualified professional and has been revised as of August 13, 2025. The Owner informed Ministry Staff that the Facility has implemented the plan and keeps a copy of the plan along with information on which it is based.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:**Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)**

59 (2): A person who must have a nutrient management plan prepared must do the following: (a) review the plan at least once each year; (b) if no significant change has been made to the person's agricultural operation within the year, make any necessary changes identified by the review.

Details/Findings:

Ministry Staff reviewed the 2025 Nutrient Management Plan, which had been reviewed and necessary changes were made during the Inspection Period.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:**Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)**

59 (3): On making any significant change to the person's agricultural operations, a person who must have a nutrient management plan prepared must have a qualified professional or experienced person, as applicable under and in compliance with section 57 [preparation of nutrient management plan], (a) review the plan and make any necessary changes identified by the review, and (b) sign and date the plan on completing the review and any changes.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that there were no significant changes to the Facility's agricultural operations during the Inspection Period. Therefore, compliance with the requirements of this subsection were not applicable during the Inspection Period. The Owner informed Ministry Staff that KT Ranches decommissioned confined livestock areas on the west access to the Facility within the Inspection Period; however, this does not constitute a significant change to the agricultural operation.

Compliance:

Not Applicable

Requirement Description:**Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)**

59 (4): A nutrient management plan expires 5 years after the later of the dates referred to in section 57 (3) and subsection 3 (b) of this section.

Details/Findings:

The 2025 Nutrient Management Plan is dated August 13, 2025; therefore the 2025 Nutrient Management Plan is up-to-date.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:**Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)**

62: A person responsible for a confined livestock area or confined poultry area must ensure all of the following: (a) that livestock and poultry do not have direct access to a drinking water source or watercourse; (b) that contaminated runoff, leachate, solids and air contaminants do not enter a watercourse, cross a property boundary or go below the water table; (c) that the accumulation of manure, animal bedding and feed within the area is managed so as to prevent contaminated runoff, leachate and solids from escaping; (d) that if contaminated runoff, leachate or solids escape from the area, they are (i) collected and contained, and (ii) not discharged directly to land or water.

Details/Findings:

COPAEM defines "confined livestock area" as "an outdoor area, other than a grazing area, seasonal feeding area or temporary holding area, where livestock are confined by structures or topography". During the on-site inspection, Ministry Staff observed the cattle were confined to an outdoor pen structure, and do not have direct access to a drinking water course or watercourse. Ministry Staff observed that the accumulation of manure, animal bedding and feed is managed to prevent runoff, leachate, and solids from escaping. During the on-site inspection, Ministry Staff also observed that runoff, leachate, and solids did not escape the area and were not discharged to directly to land or water.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:**Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)**

63 (1): A person responsible for a feedlot must ensure both of the following: (a) that the self-sealing layer that forms under the feedlot is maintained so as to prevent leachate from entering groundwater; (b) that runoff is diverted away from the feedlot.

Details/Findings:

COPAEM defines "feedlot" means a confined livestock area in which livestock are (a) confined solely for the purpose of growing or finishing, and (b) fed other than by grazing". During the on-site inspection, Ministry Staff observed that there were confined livestock areas that would meet the definition of feedlots on the agricultural land base; however, these area were not in operation when conducting the on-site inspection. Therefore, compliance with the requirements of this subsection were not applicable during the Inspection Period.

Compliance:

Not Applicable

Requirement Description:**Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)**

63 (2): A person responsible for a feedlot that will no longer be used must decommission the feedlot by removing the manure pack that accumulated over the self-sealing layer and cleaning out the pens in a manner that (a) prevents leachate from entering groundwater or a watercourse, and (b) allows nutrients from the manure to be stored and applied to land in accordance with this code.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, Ministry Staff observed a clear area which was previously used as a feedlot for growing cattle had been decommissioned. The Owner informed Ministry Staff, in the Information Response Email, that the manure pack had been removed from the decommissioned feedlot and stored using a temporary field storage until applied to land in accordance with COPAEM. During the on-site inspection, the Owner also informed Ministry Staff that leachate did not enter groundwater or a watercourse.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:**Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)**

64 (1): A person responsible for a grazing area, seasonal feeding area or temporary holding area in which livestock or poultry have direct access to a watercourse must ensure that effective controls are in place to minimize (a) trampling and erosion of soil into the watercourse, and (b) contaminated runoff, leachate and solids entering the watercourse.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, Ministry Staff observed the Facility's grazing area. The livestock do not have direct access to a watercourse in the grazing area. The Owner informed Ministry Staff that a fence had been built to prevent the access to the watercourse. Therefore, KT Ranches has ensured effective controls to minimize the (a) trampling and erosion of soil into the watercourse and (b) contaminated runoff, leachate and solids from entering the watercourse.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:**Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)**

64 (2): A person responsible for a grazing area must move livestock (a) from areas that are flooded or where flooding is imminent, and (b) during the flood season from areas that are prone to annual seasonal flooding.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that the grazing areas are not in areas that are flooded or where flooding is imminent or prone to seasonal flooding, during the Inspection Period. Therefore, compliance with the requirements in this subsection were not applicable during the Inspection Period.

Compliance:

Not Applicable

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

65: A person who keeps 5 or more animal units must make and keep records of all of the following: (a) the total number of animals; (b) the total amount of manure, including bedding mixed with the manure, collected annually, expressed in m³, and divided according to the type of animal the manure is from and whether the manure is liquid or solid; (c) the amount of manure, expressed in m³, managed by (i) distribution in accordance with section 43 [distribution of manure or agricultural compost], or (ii) application as fertilizer or a soil conditioner in accordance with Division 4 [Nutrient Application and Management] of Part 6.

Details/Findings:

Ministry Staff reviewed the Information Response Email which contained the total number of animals, amount of manure in "loads", not in cubic meters and the month the manure was distributed as fertilizer on the Facility's agricultural land base. The Facility only keeps cattle for breeding purpose; therefore, the type of animal and state of manure would be consistent. KT Ranches provided records which adhere to this section, the amounts of manure were not expressed in m³.

Compliance:

Out

Actions to be taken:

KT Ranches must record the amount of manure, collected annually and distributed, and ensure this is expressed in m³.

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

68: A person who carries out an activity to which this Division applies must ensure all of the following: (a) that mortalities are not disposed of into, and are prevented from entering, a watercourse; (b) that, if a mortality enters a watercourse, the owner of the mortality removes that mortality immediately; (c) that processing waste does not enter a watercourse; (d) that contaminated runoff, leachate, solids and air contaminants from the activity do not enter a watercourse, cross a property boundary or go below the seasonal high water table; (e) that odours and particulate matter from the activity are minimized; (f) that the activity will be carried out in a manner that will deter the attraction of, and access by, domestic pets, wildlife and vectors.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry Staff (a) that mortalities are not disposed of into or (b) in a manner that would allow mortalities to enter a watercourse, (c) that processing waste does not enter a watercourse, (d) that contaminated runoff, leachate, solids and air contaminants do not enter a watercourse, cross a property boundary or go below the seasonal high water table. The Owner informed Ministry Staff (e) that mortalities are buried on the Facility's agricultural land base and covered immediately to minimize odours and particulate matter and (f) to deter the attraction of domestic pets, wildlife and vectors.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

74 (1): A person who buries mortalities, solid waste or semi-solid waste must ensure all of the following: (a) that no more than 2.5 tonnes are buried in a single burial pit; (b) that burial pits are not located (i) closer than 60 m apart, unless each pit has been unused for at least 10 years. (ii) in or over soil that has a saturated hydraulic conductivity of more than 10-3 cm/s, commonly referred to as coarse-textured soil, (iii) in, or in the vicinity of, unstable soils that might cause the buried materials to escape the burial pit, (iv) in any area in which there is standing water or water-saturated soil, (v) in any low-lying area of a field prone to annual seasonal flooding, or (vi) in a field within a 200-year flood plain; (c) that there is a vertical distance of at least 1.5 m from the bottom of the pit to either the bedrock or the seasonal high water table; (d) that buried materials are covered immediately after burial with at least 0.6 m of soil.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that KT Ranches buries mortalities in accordance with Section 74(1). In the Information Response Email, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that a) in each burial pit, only a maximum of 2.5 tonnes are buried. b) burial pits have only been used for six years and are located 60 m apart. The burial pit is located 8 km from the last burial pit. The Owner advised that the burial pits are located on clay and that KT Ranches did not observe any water escaping the pits. The Information Email stated that there are no unstable banks or soil. KT Ranches does not locate burial pits where water accumulates on water-saturated soil or in low-lying areas prone to annual seasonal flooding. On August 18, 2025, Ministry Staff reviewed British Columbia's floodplain map, which determined that the burial pits were not located in a 200-year floodplain. c) Ministry Staff could not determine if the burial pits were a vertical distance of at least 1.5 m from the bottom of the pit to bedrock or the seasonal high water table. The Owner informed Ministry Staff that d) the buried materials are covered by at least 1 m of soil immediately. KT Ranches is in compliance with subsections 74 (1) (a), (b) and (d), however for subsection 74 (1) (c) compliance could not be determined during the Inspection Period.

Compliance:

Not Determined

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

74 (2): A person who closes a burial pit must ensure that the pit is covered with at least 1 m of soil that is compacted and mounded in a manner that will (a) minimize the percolation of precipitation into the pit, (b) divert runoff away from the pit, and (c) deter the attraction of, and access by, domestic pets, wildlife and vectors.

Details/Findings:

During the on-site inspection, the Owner informed Ministry Staff that the buried materials are covered by at least 1 m of soil immediately, the Information Response Email also stated that the pit is layered with dirt to deter the attraction of and access by domestic pets, wildlife and vectors.

Compliance:

In

Requirement Description:

Environmental Management Act, Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA)

74 (3): A person who buries mortalities, solid waste or semi-solid waste must make and keep records of all of the following in respect of each burial pit: (a) the location of the pit; (b) the type and amount, expressed in tonnes, of materials buried; (c) the date the pit is closed, if applicable.

Details/Findings:

Ministry Staff reviewed the Information Response Email which contained the type and amount, in tonnes, of mortalities buried and the dates the three burial pits were closed. The Burial Pit Location Map, provided by the Owner shows the locations of the three burial pits that were in operation during the Inspection Period.

Compliance:

In

Compliance History:

2024-07-24 IR 225523 Warning Codes and Regs: Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA) 17(6)(b); 30; 62; 65; 74 (3); 79

2021-02-23 IR 154936 Advisory: Code of Practice for Agricultural Environmental Management (EMA) 37 (2)

The Ministry of Environment Compliance and Enforcement Policy and Procedure (C&E Policy) prescribes common requirements and procedures for all Ministry staff to ensure consistent and risk-based assessment and response to non-compliance. Using the Non-Compliance Decision Matrix, the compliance determination for this inspection has been assessed as **Level 1, Category B, Advisory**.

More information about Environmental Compliance, the Non-Compliance Decision Matrix, and reporting and data submission requirements can be found at the links below:

General compliance information:

www.gov.bc.ca/environmentalcompliance

Non-Compliance Decision Matrix information:

www.gov.bc.ca/environment/how-compliance-is-assessed

Reporting and data submission requirements (to be sent to EnvAuthorizationsReporting@gov.bc.ca):

<https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/environment/waste-management/waste-discharge-authorization/comply>

Please be advised that this inspection report may be published on the provincial government website within 7 days.

Below are attachments related to this inspection.

If you have any questions about this letter, please contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

Rebecca Benham

Attachments:

- 1) Photo 1. Wood chip storage area outside the setback distances listed in section 17.
- 2) Photo 2. Observed confined livestock areas outside the setback distances listed in section 17.
- 3) Photo 3. Observed decommission feedlot observed west of the Facility.
- 4) Photo 4. Decommissioned feedlot observed west of the Facility.

Deliver via:

Email: Fax: Mail:
Registered Mail: Hand Delivery:

**Ministry of Environment
and Climate Change
Strategy**

Compliance and
Environmental
Enforcement Branch

Mailing Address:
1259 Dalhousie Dr
Kamloops BC V2C 5Z5

Telephone: 250 371 6200
Facsimile: 250 371 6234
Website: www.gov.bc.ca/env

DISCLAIMER:

Please note that sections of the permit, regulation or code of practice referenced in this inspection record are for guidance and are not the official version. Please refer to the original permit, regulation or code of practice.

To see the most up to date version of the regulations and codes of practices please visit

<http://www.bclaws.ca>

If you require a copy of the original permit, please contact the inspector noted on this inspection record.

It is also important to note that this inspection record does not necessarily reflect each requirement or condition of the authorization therefore compliance is noted only for the requirements or conditions listed in the inspection record.



Photo 1. Wood chip storage area outside the setback distances listed in section 17.



Photo 2. Observed confined livestock areas outside the setback distances listed in section 17.



Photo 3. Observed decommission feedlot observed west of the Facility.



Photo 4. Decommissioned feedlot observed west of the Facility.