

NO 3 - REQUEST FOR REVIEW: LA23050 / Ivy Ridge Colony

Filed By:

Bev Olsen

Deadline for RFRs:

February 11, 2025

Date RFR received:

February 11, 2025

Status of Party as per Decision Summary:

Directly Affected Party

Request for Board Review (RFR) of an Approval Officer CFO Application Decision

Instructions

- Eligibility.** Only those parties listed as “directly affected” in the approval officer’s CFO application decision or those parties requesting reconsideration of their status (see page 2, section #3), are eligible to request a Board review (RFR).
- Jurisdiction.** The Board’s jurisdiction in Alberta to review a decision by an approval officer is set out in sections 20(5), 22(4), and 23(3) of the [Agricultural Operation Practices Act](#) (AOPA).
- Deadline.** The NRCB must receive an RFR by the deadline specified in the approval officer’s decision cover letter. The AOPA Administrative Procedures Regulation does not allow consideration of time extension requests or late submissions.
- Public Documents.** RFRs and attachments are public documents.
- Submission.** Submit this form and any attachments by email to Laura Friend, Manager of Board Reviews at laura.friend@nrcb.ca. Contact her at 403-297-8269 for assistance.

1. Confined Feeding Operation (CFO) Application Details

NRCB Application No.	LA23050
Name of Owner/Operator or Operation	Hutterian Brethren of Ivy Ridge
Type of application (if known)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Registration <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization
Location (legal land description)	NE 30-14-26-W4
Municipality	Willow Creek

2. Status Declaration

I hereby request a Board review of the approval officer’s decision:
(You must check one)

- I am the owner/operator
- I represent the owner/operator
- I represent the municipality
- I am listed as a directly affected party in the approval officer’s decision
- I am **not** listed as a directly affected party in the approval officer’s decision and therefore I am requesting my status be reconsidered (see page 2, section #3)

3. Request for Reconsideration by Board of “Not” Directly Affected Status

Instructions. Only those parties **not** listed as directly affected in the approval officer’s decision are to complete this section.

- The Board can only consider RFRs submitted by "directly affected" parties. Those parties not listed as directly affected in the approval officer’s decision must first request the Board to reconsider their status. If the Board grants a party “directly affected” status, it will then consider their RFR.
- Upon receipt of a CFO application, the approval officer sends a notification letter to the “affected” parties. Affected parties are owners or occupants of land residing within a designated distance from the applied-for CFO. Operators and the municipalities located within the designated distance always have “directly affected” status.
- An affected party must apply for “directly affected” status by providing a written response to the approval officer’s notification letter by the deadline specified. The Board cannot reconsider the status of a party unless they had first responded to the approval officer.
- The approval officer determines the "directly affected" parties to the application based on the responses received and includes this determination in their decision.

My grounds for requesting a reconsideration of my “not” directly affected status are:

4. Request for a Board Review (RFR)

All parties or their representative must complete this section. If you need more space, include an attachment.

- Approval officers must ensure that a CFO application meets the Alberta legislative requirements before they approve it. Conversely, approval officers must deny an application if the requirements are not met. (Sections 20 and 22 of the [Agricultural Operation Practices Act](#) (AOPA)).
- If you believe the **approval officer failed to adequately address an issue** (or issues), state the issue(s) and provide your reasoning below.
- The issue(s) must have been in front of the approval officer at the time they made the CFO application decision; the Board will not consider any new issues.
- Include how the decision affects you, such as any damage or bias you believe would occur to you because of the approval officer's decision.

My grounds for requesting a Board review of the approval officer's decision are:

Please see attached letter

5. Board Action Requested

If the Board grants a review of the approval officer's decision (either an approval, denial, cancellation, amendment, or deemed permit), only the "directly affected" parties are eligible to participate (see section #3). A review will be in the form of either a hearing or a written review.

If the Board grants a review, I would like it to:

- Reverse the approval officer's decision
- Amend or vary the approval officer's decision

If the Board decides to grant a review on a permitted decision, it may decide to amend or vary the permit terms and/or conditions.

Are there any new conditions, or amendments to existing conditions, that you would like the Board to consider?

Please see attached letter

6. Contact Information of Person Submitting the RFR

Name Beverly Olsen
Street/Box Address [REDACTED]
Town/City/Postal Code Stavely AB
Legal Land Description NE 30-14-26-W4
Telephone Number [REDACTED]
Email Address [REDACTED]
Date February 11, 2025

7. Contact Information of Legal Counsel or Representative (if applicable)

Name
Address
Telephone Number
Email Address

Laura Friend, Manager of Board Reviews
Natural Resources Conservation Board
Email: laura.friend@nrcb.ca

Subject: Request for Board Review – **Approval LA23050**

Dear Ms. Friend,

I am writing to formally request a review of the approval decision for Application LA23050, which permits the expansion of the confined feeding operation (CFO) by the Hutterian Brethren of Ivy Ridge near Stavely, Alberta. As a directly affected party residing on NE 30-14-26-W4, I strongly oppose this decision due to the significant environmental, economic, and social impacts it will have on our community.

1. Directly Affected Status and Prejudice

My family and I live within close proximity to the approved CFO and will experience direct and detrimental consequences from its operation. Specifically, the increase in truck traffic, odor, noise, and risk of water contamination will have lasting negative effects on our property value, health, and quality of life. Additionally, the economic sustainability of our local farming community is at risk as this industrial-scale operation threatens small-scale family farms.

2. Environmental Concerns

Large-scale CFOs are known to contribute to groundwater depletion and contamination. The decision package confirms that the site is located in an area with potential artesian flow conditions, yet no groundwater monitoring is required. This omission disregards the importance of protecting our shared water sources. My family has personally faced water shortages in past drought years, and adding a high-water-demand CFO will only exacerbate this issue. The lack of assurance on long-term water availability is deeply concerning.

Additionally, runoff from manure storage and animal waste poses a significant threat to our region's fragile ecosystems, including wetlands and riparian areas. The NRCB's approval relies on the applicant's promise to construct containment berms, but this method does not provide a reliable long-term solution for preventing contamination. Given the scale of this operation, stricter environmental safeguards should be in place.

3. Economic and Social Impacts

The approval of this CFO does not align with the long-term economic and social interests of our community. Our local Stavely Elementary School is already struggling with declining enrollment, leading to the loss of a teaching position and increased classroom sizes. The Hutterian Brethren of Ivy Ridge will not contribute to our school system or the local economy in meaningful ways, as colony-based operations typically maintain their own self-sustaining systems. This will lead to further depopulation as families leave the area due to declining educational opportunities and reduced quality of life.

Furthermore, the increase in heavy truck traffic will cause road degradation, increased maintenance costs for the municipality, and heightened safety risks for local residents. The NRCB's approval does not address how these additional costs will be covered, nor does it provide mitigation strategies for road safety concerns.

4. Insufficient Consideration of Local Input

The NRCB received over 700 responses opposing this application, yet it determined that only 16 individuals met the directly affected party criteria. This narrow interpretation dismisses the collective voice of the community, which has expressed overwhelming concern about the long-term consequences of this project. The decision does not adequately consider how this CFO will disrupt our rural way of life, nor does it demonstrate a fair balance between agricultural development and community well-being.

I respectfully request the NRCB to overturn this decision.

Given the magnitude of this CFO's impact, it is crucial that the NRCB reconsiders its decision to protect the environmental, economic, and social integrity of our community. I urge the Board to take these concerns into serious consideration and provide a resolution that prioritizes long-term sustainability over short-term industrial expansion.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Bev Olsen
NE 30-14-26-W4
Stavelly, AB