

NO 4 - REQUEST FOR REVIEW: BA25008 / Amin Valji

Filed By:

Jay and Natasha Vold

Deadline for RFRs:

September 8, 2025

Date RFR received:

September 8, 2025

Status of Party as per Decision Summary:

**Not** Directly Affected Parties

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

---

### Instructions

1. **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).
2. **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).
3. **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.
4. **Public Documents.** RFRs and attachments are public documents.
5. **Submission.** Submit this form and any attachments by email to Laura Friend, Manager of Board Reviews at [laura.friend@nrcb.ca](mailto:laura.friend@nrcb.ca). Contact her at 403-297-8269 for assistance.

### 1. Confined Feeding Operation (CFO) Application Details

NRCB Application No.	BA25008
Name of Owner/Operator or Operation	Jay and Natasha Vold (Sparks)
Type of application ( <i>if known</i> )	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval <input type="checkbox"/> Registration <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization
Location ( <i>legal land description</i> )	p1n SE 6-55-26
Municipality	Sturgeon County

### 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:**

Our property is downstream and Down Wind (prevailing) from the proposed CFO. If approved, we would be affected in multiple ways.

Odors and Nuisances – Being down wind and with the applicant ’ s history of ignoring regulation and with no real check and balance way for the NRCB to stay confident that the applicant will obey regulation we feel our concern over Odor causing us to have a decreased quality of life (also affecting land value) is a real concern.

On the decision summary the response from the applicant did not in any way address odor concerns, they only addressed noise and fly population.

Surface Water – the contamination of River Que Barre is a huge concern. One side of our property is bordered by the river. In the decision letter it is stated that the River is 20m lower than the CFO location but 975m away and therefore meets criteria. What about rainfall when spreading manure? What about snow melting? Surface water from the site WILL make its way to the river. We are downstream, and this will affect us.

Manure Application – How often will the NRCB be determining that all regulations are being met? What is the setback from the River? This is a HUGE concern over Odor and air quality that the NRCB does not seem to be fully addressing or committing to monitor other than “ record upon request ” . Again being down wind and downstream this is a very real issue for us.

Property Value – The decision letter states that the NRCB do not take into consideration the affect the approval/CFO will have on area Property Value, HOWEVER this is a potentially life changing affect for us and area residences that the NRCB has chosen to not take their concerns into consideration.

#### 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:**

In response to the Decision of BA25008.

We strongly disagree and object to the decision made to grant approval to the above noted Decision and request a board review.

We do not agree with many of the points brought up in the decision.

The LARGE amount of area residences that object to the permit shows that the residences in the area are very against this permit and the NRCB does not seem to be taking ANY of the residences concerns seriously. Sturgeon County and Alexander First Nation have also shown their objection. As per the decision letter there were ZERO letters of support from within the radius, yet the NRCB has chosen to grant the permit, showing complete disregard for all area residents and their quality of life.

Our property is downstream and Down Wind (prevailing) from the proposed CFO. If approved, we would be affected in multiple ways.

Odors and Nuisances – Being down wind and with the applicant's history of ignoring regulation and with no real check and balance way for the NRCB to stay confident that the applicant will obey regulation we feel our concern over Odor causing us to have a decreased quality of life (also affecting land value) is a real concern.

On the decision summary the response from the applicant did not in any way address odor concerns, they only addressed noise and fly population.

Surface Water – the contamination of River Que Barre is a huge concern. One side of our property is bordered by the river. In the decision letter it is stated that the River is 20m lower than the CFO location but 975m away and therefore meets criteria. What about rainfall when spreading manure? What about snow melting? Surface water from the site WILL make its way to the river. We are downstream, and this will affect us.

Manure Application – How often will the NRCB be determining that all regulations are being met? What is the setback from the River? This is a HUGE concern over Odor and air quality that the NRCB does not seem to be fully addressing or committing to monitor other than “record upon request”. Again being down wind and downstream this is a very real issue for us.

Property Value – The decision letter states that the NRCB do not take into consideration the affect the approval/CFO will have on area Property Value, HOWEVER this is a potentially life changing affect for us and area residences that the NRCB has chosen to not take their concerns into consideration.

## 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?**

## 6. Contact Information of Person Submitting the RFR

Name Jay and Natasha Vold \_\_\_\_\_

Street/Box Address \_\_\_\_\_

Town/City/Postal Code Sturgeon County \_\_\_\_\_

Legal Land Description ptn SE 6-55-26 \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number \_\_\_\_\_

Email Address \_\_\_\_\_

Date Sept 8, 2025 \_\_\_\_\_

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number \_\_\_\_\_

Email Address \_\_\_\_\_