

From: [wen_norton](#)
To: [Water Draft Permit Comments](#)
Subject: C&H Hog Farm General Permit ARG590000
Date: Friday, April 17, 2015 5:03:07 PM

1. I am one of the residents that is directly effected by the spraying of untreated sewage as well as others in a community where many residents rely on wells for drinking water. The recent dye tracing studies have confirmed the flow pathways from C&H hog factory to our land. Now raw sewage has been introduced into our karst topography and we know that our springs and wells are directly connected to the underground flow paths. Isn't ADEQ responsible for protecting us from polluters and not just encouraging these detrimental actions?
2. Since the recent federal court ruling requires a reworking of the "cursory and flawed" Environmental Assessment of C&H, how is it possible that ADEQ is able to approve this or any other permit modification when in recognition and approval of this modification request, ADEQ is saying that C&H can illegally continue its pollution of the Buffalo River Watershed, in the face of the court ruling, the scientific research, and public concerns.
3. How do you find it legal and acceptable to allow this activity to effect our children at the consolidated public school that is in close proximity to spray fields?
4. ADEQ allows errors, omissions, etc in the NMP. Please require correction and deny all modifications until an accurate and correct version is submitted.
5. No modifications to the permit should be allowed until the numerous mapping and land ownership errors have been corrected so that waste applications may be identified. How is it possible that ADEQ can report what quantity and where and this untreated sewage is ending up?
6. Since the entire permitting process was flawed and did not allow for public input, why is it that we are being asked to comment on narrow modification and are being forced to ignore the impact this facility is having on our community? Will ADEQ be responsible threat it poses to

the economics of the region.

7. Scientific monitoring of water quality in Big Creek where it enters the Buffalo National River has indicated periods when E. coli levels are elevated and dissolved oxygen is low. Isn't it true that the ponds at C & H are allowed by your permit to seep and leak a specified amount? What is the current volume of leakage and where does it go? What is the volume of run-off from fields during our heavy rain events?

Wendel Norton

Cave Creek Studio
870-434-5119
870-448-7500 mobile

From: wen norton <wennorton@yahoo.com>
To: "Water-Draft-Permit-Comment@adeq.state.ar.us" <Water-Draft-Permit-Comment@adeq.state.ar.us>
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2015 3:03 PM
Subject: C&H Hog Farm General Permit ARG590000

Public Comments:
C&H Hog Farm General Permit ARG590000

I understand that this modification would allow C&H to use a tanker truck to dispose of waste from pond #2. Currently they are only allowed to use a sprinkler system (which they do not have operational) for pond 2 and a tanker truck on pond #1.

1. I am one of the residents that is directly effected by the spraying of untreated sewage as well as others in a community where many residents rely on wells for drinking water. The recent dye tracing studies have confirmed the flow pathways from C&H hog factory to our land.

Now raw sewage has been introduced into our karst topography and we know that our springs and wells are directly connected to the underground flow paths. Isn't ADEQ responsible for protecting us from polluters and not just encouraging these detrimental actions?

2. Since the recent federal court ruling requires a reworking of the "cursory and flawed" Environmental Assessment of C&H, how is it possible that ADEQ is able to approve this or any other permit modification when in recognition and approval of this modification request, ADEQ is saying that C&H can illegally continue its pollution of the Buffalo River Watershed, in the face of the court ruling, the scientific research, and public concerns.

3. How do you find it legal and acceptable to allow this activity to effect our children at the consolidated public school that is in close proximity to spray fields?

4. ADEQ allows errors, omissions, etc in the NMP. Please require correction and deny all modifications until an accurate and correct version is submitted.

5. No modifications to the permit should be allowed until the numerous mapping and land ownership errors have been corrected so that waste applications may be identified. How is it possible that ADEQ knows what quantity and where and this untreated sewage is ending up?

6. Since the entire permitting process was flawed and did not allow for public input, why is it that we are being asked to comment on narrow modification and are being forced to ignore the impact this facility is having on our community? and the threat it poses to the economics of the region.

7. Scientific monitoring of water quality in Big Creek where it enters the Buffalo National River has indicated periods when E. coli levels are elevated and dissolved oxygen is low. Isn't it true that the ponds at C and H are allowed by your permit to seep and leak a specified amount? What is this volume and where does it go? What is the volume of run-off from fields during our heavy rain events?

