From: Marks, Teresa
Sent: Tuesday, March 25, 2014 9:45 AM
To: Bailey, John
Subject: FW: Comments re: C&H modification ARG59001 AFIN 51-00164 C & H Farm.

From: Ginny Masullo [mailto:masullo.ginny1@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 22, 2014 3:30 PM
To: Marks, Teresa
Subject: Fwd: Comments re: C&H modification ARG59001 AFIN 51-00164 C & H Farm.

Dear Ms. Marks, I have tried posting the statement that is below and attached on ADEQ comments but it keeps bouncing back. Please forward to ADEQ comments.

Thank-you Ginny Masullo

From: **Ginny Masullo** <<u>masullo.ginny1@gmail.com</u>> Subject: Comments re: C&H modification ARG59001 AFIN 51-00164 C & H Farm.

Comments re: C&H Hog Farms, Inc., Nutrient Management Plan Modification; ARG59001 AFIN 51-00164 C & H Farm

Please post on your website

From : Ginny Masullo 1837 Rupple Road Fayetteville Ar. 72704 masullo.ginny1@gmail.com 479-530-0280 To: Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality Re: Permit ARG590001 Modification C&H Farms For public comment

I oppose ADEQ's decision to consider a modification of the C&H Hog Farms, Inc. CAFO permit *for a number of reasons:*  1) Field 7 of C&H is one that Andrew Sharley of the University of Arkansas study publically stated is not available to U of A and will not be monitored for any environmental harm related to the farm. Field 7 is next to Big Creek and is in close proximity to the Mt Judea K-12 School. Because field 7 is in the floodplain of Big Creek and because of the proximity of field 7 to the Mt Judea school it should be included in the study. According to the Memorandum of Agreement ADEQ has the responsibility to "Assist the University with obtaining access to conduct the study..." Furthermore the Governor Bebee was quoted in August 15, 2013 Democrat Gazette article, "State Funded Independent Monitoring Of Hog Farm Doesn't Need Landowner Permission," Governor Beebe stated that after researching the question his office concluded that the state has the authority to do so with or without landowner's permission.

2) Additionally, it is my understanding that field 7 is already high in phosphorus and that the tanker truck will apply waste from the pond which will be higher in phosphorus. This combined with field 7 being in the floodplain of Big Creek is unacceptable.

3)The C & H request for permit modification included the submission of a revised NOI which included a nutrient management plan With the exception of a couple of pages, the revised NOI is identical to the original NOI. Both the original and revised NOI contain information known to be inaccurate including misidentification of the spray fields and

misinformation in the spray field leases. Prior to the submission of the revised NOI, C & H owners were made aware of these inaccuracies yet they knowingly submitted a substantially unchanged, and still inaccurate, revised NOI.

I respectfully request that ADEQ deny the requested permit modification until a correct and complete revised NOI is done and made available for public comment.

4) Field 7 is close to to the Mt Judea school and community (within 250 feet of the school grounds and within 1100 feet of the school buildings and within 300 to 400 feet of at least two residences). There are known and well documented health risks associated within several miles of

swine CAFOs. Chronic exposure to swine waste particularly among children and the elderly is well documented. See references at the end of this letter. ADEQ should require that a comprehensive air quality monitoring station be permanently installed at the Mt Judea school. This station should monitor for ammonia, hydrogen sulfide, airborne particulates and other components of swine waste known to be hazardous to human health. Results of air monitoring should be made regularly available to the public.

The Mt Judea school principal should be notified in advance of any field applications so that appropriate measures can be taken to minimize exposure of students and staff. I request that ADEQ deny the requested permit modification until these conditions have been met. 4) I understand that the ADEQ now has the underground studies of the University of Arkansas water study team headed by Andrew Sharpley. This type of study should have been conducted apriori to approving a permit to operate. Clearly this information reveals features that show the existence of underground features that would allow rapid underground flow in the floodplain of Big Creek which again is field 7 one of the proposed fields in this modification.

5) While the ADEQ maintains that they have acted within the full letter of the law, that remains debatable and therefore consideration of a modification of an already faulty permit is unacceptable. That the ADEQ acted in the best interests of the environment and health of Arkansans is also debatable. I believe it is the intent of Arkansas statutes, the federal Clean Water Act and the mission of the ADEQ to act in the best interests of the environment and the people of Arkansas.I do not believe that the ADEQ advised the permittee thoroughly of the risks involved in such an operation in karst terrain near a National River .

With that in mind, the operations of this CAFO and any others in the Extraordinary Resource Waters of Arkansas, especially those in karst terrain, pose threats to the Buffalo River Watershed and to the health and livelihood of the people who live in the surrounding area/s. Rather than consider this modification, it would be in the best interest of Arkansans, to reopen this permit in its entirety and severely tighten the

regulations that ADEQ claims they only administer. The ADEQ needs to fulfill their mission of protecting the air and water quality of Arkansas by assuming the responsibility for admitting they have erred in allowing such an operation to operate in the Buffalo River "s sensitive karst terrain and watershed.

Sincerely,

Ginny Masullo

Comments March 24