

From: Leo Sutterfield [mailto:lnlsutt@mvtel.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2014 1:04 PM
To: Szenher, Doug; Reg-Comment
Subject: Reg 5 and reg 6

Doug Szenher

Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality

Public Outreach and Assistance Division

5301 Northshore Drive

North Little Rock, AR 72118

I attended the hearing in Harrison last night and went prepared to be in opposition to the proposed changes in Reg 5 and Reg 6. I still am opposed to the changes because I believe there is a lack of evidence to support the further restriction of medium and large swine operations in the Buffalo watershed. I believe the proposed changes are the result of well meaning people with an "agenda" and are based on emotion and not on reality. I would not be surprised if it were necessary at some time in the future to curtail the further development of this type of operation, but lacking evidence would preclude taking action at this time, in my opinion.

As a matter of fact, I am more opposed to Reg 8 which allows groups with an "agenda" or "cause" to cause the APCEC to have to waste time considering rules that have already been made and are based on sound scientific evidence. Imagine if you will, a group that would have you curtail the apiary industry because of their belief of a health risk from bee stings. Or imagine a group that would have you curtail the production of rice, Arkansas' number one crop because they believed too much water was wasted in the production of rice. I could cite more examples, but you get the point. You must base you decisions

on sound science and not on emotion, no matter how strong those emotions are or how many people feel that way.

Once again, I oppose the proposed changes to Reg 5 and Reg 6 and feel you should not make those changes at this time. Give science and nature a chance to prove or disprove the necessity of these limitations and then decide.

Thanks for your consideration,

Leo C Sutterfield, Jr

8808 Hanover Rd

Mountain View, AR 72560

870-269-3717

lnsutt@mvtel.net