

Robinson, Kelly

From: Ginny Masullo <masullo.ginny1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2018 3:18 PM
To: Reg-Comment
Subject: Regulation 37 Comment

Ginny Masullo

1837 Ruppel Road

Fayetteville Arkansas

While in theory nutrient trading might further pollution control/ reduction, this current proposal is lacking guidelines for ascertaining the efficacy of such a program.

- The EPA recommends measuring reductions but this Arkansas regulation does not appear to have the numeric standards for doing so.
- Given the lack of any specific way to measure if nutrient trading is actually reducing the pollutant load, Extraordinary Resource Waters, should be excluded from this proposal which is experimental at best.
- This proposal allows trades between entities in differing watersheds. Trades should be within watersheds for proper evaluation of effect.
- There needs to be an enforceable provision that the actual, instream nutrient concentrations and loads be reduced or that they even be maintained at current levels.
- There needs to be a well defined minimum trade ratio
- The proposal states this will cost nothing to the State. However this is an entirely new program which would require staff and training, i. e. resources, and therefore will cost the State. These costs need to be defined.
- What if a nutrient trading project is not fulfilling its proposal? A clear and quick mechanism to revoke a nutrient trading project needs to be established.