

From: [Robinson, Kelly](mailto:Robinson_Kelly)
To: ["ragec@att.net"](mailto:ragec@att.net)
Cc: [Deardoff, Amy](mailto:Deardoff_Amy)
Subject: C&H Reg. 5 Draft Permit Comments and Questions
Date: Thursday, May 11, 2017 9:24:35 AM

Dear Mr. Quick,

Thank you for taking the time to reach out to ADEQ regarding the status of the response to comments pertaining to C&H Hog Farms, Permit Number 5264-W. ADEQ staff is currently reviewing all submitted comments. According to Arkansas Pollution Control and Ecology Commission Regulation 8, "[t]he Director's final decision shall include a response to each issue raised in any public comments received during the public comment period, if any." Once ADEQ finalizes the review process for all comments, the complete response to comments and final permitting decision will be provided simultaneously to those who submitted comments.

Kindest regards,

Kelly Robinson

Public Information Officer
5301 Northshore Drive
North Little Rock, AR 72118

501-682-0916

From: Ray Quick [<mailto:ragec@att.net>]
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2017 2:32 PM
To: Solaimanian, Jamal; Blanz, Bob; Osborne, Caleb; Robinson, Kelly
Subject: RE: C&H Reg. 5 Draft Permit Comments and Questions

Mr. Solaimanian,

This is a follow-up to my email of yesterday which has not had a response. For additional clarification, **we want all technical questions and comments that have been submitted by qualified professionals to be individually addressed** by the Department for the referenced draft permit. Most of the technical questions and comments that have been submitted are from extremely qualified professionals. These scientific/qualified professionals are taxpayers that help pay ADEQ's salaries, BCRET's and funded the C&H Integrity Investigation.

As you are aware, the Department reviews consultant's reports and issues NOD's, questions and gives consultants a time frame to respond. Therefore, the Department needs to answer all the technical questions and comments that have been submitted by scientific/qualified professionals for the referenced permit. Otherwise, this could be viewed as a "double standard".

I use to work at ADEQ and I'm very aware of the workload that many of the technical staff have at ADEQ. This workload is far from 100%. Therefore, I suggest enlisting the assistance from technical staff from other Divisions if you feel the Water Quality Division is overwhelmed by the referenced comments/questions which are mainly non technical from very concerned citizens across the United States that do not want the first designated National River in America to be impacted by the CAFO. As you are aware, ADEQ has admitted making a "mistake" by issuing the initial Reg. 6 permit to the

referenced facility. Does ADEQ want to make another "mistake" by not individually answering questions and comments from scientific/qualified professionals for the referenced draft permit ?

As requested yesterday, *please verify* that ADEQ is going to respond to each and everyone of the technical questions and comments that have been submitted by scientific/qualified professionals for the referenced draft permit.

I will be unavailable the next two weeks, but I "should" be able to check my emails.

Sincerely,

Ray A. Quick, P.G.