

**From:** [Johnnie Chamberlin](#)  
**To:** [Water Draft Permit Comments](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Comments on C & H Hog Farm NOI  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 25, 2014 4:46:18 PM

---

To Whom It May Concern:

It appears that the modified portion of the permit references Field 5 and methods of application to be used on that field. Field #5, as mapped and described in the permit, is not actually a permitted application field. The modification makes no mention of moving Field #5 or updating its location. For this reason, the modification should be rejected.

-Johnnie Chamberlin

On Tue, Feb 25, 2014 at 4:25 PM, Johnnie Chamberlin  
<[johnnie.chamberlin@gmail.com](mailto:johnnie.chamberlin@gmail.com)> wrote:

To Whom It May Concern:

The C&H Hog Farm NOI makes no mention of relocating Field 5. Given that documents from UA Extension included in this NOI state that nearly all fields are at, or above optimum, P levels already, it seems quite likely that this plan doesn't adequately protect nearby waterways from nutrient runoff, especially if the same amount of waste will be applied to a smaller area (not including the Field #5 as described in their original flawed permit application). It is for this reason that I encourage you to reject this proposed modification. With or without this modification, ADEQ has failed to protect Big Creek, the Buffalo National River and many of Arkansas' other waterways from excessive nutrient inputs by granting heavily flawed permits like this one (see 303d list). Remember, your job is "to protect and enhance the water quality of the State of Arkansas". Granting this modification (and the general permit) is doing the opposite.

-Johnnie Chamberlin