

**Stakeholder Meeting #1A, June 22, 2020, 9AM-11AM**  
**Questions and Comments on CPP & AIM**

1. **[Question] Can you clarify when the initial comments on the CPP are needed?**
  - Bryan Leamons (DEQ): From the stakeholder group, you may comment any time now.
  - Colby Ungerank (DEQ): [CPP-antideg-comments@adeq.state.ar.us](mailto:CPP-antideg-comments@adeq.state.ar.us)
  - Bryan Leamons (DEQ): The email was made available for comment, which may be submitted now but we will also open a formal period which will provide the end of the comment period.
2. **[Question] Bryan Leamons (DEQ): Will the formal public comment period be a 30-day period?**
  - Bob Blanz (DEQ): We're planning on it being 30 days.
  - Bryan Leamons (DEQ): That [public comment period] is not open yet but we have not announced it yet; we will accept comments, and these will be recorded from anyone who submits to the email [[CPP-antideg-comments@adeq.state.ar.us](mailto:CPP-antideg-comments@adeq.state.ar.us)].
3. **[Question] Ellen Carpenter: During the initial CPP renewal phase of this iteration back in 2016 when DEQ invited interested stakeholders to help with the initial draft (two permittees, four consultants, and the director of AEF); and later on when getting to the Antidegradation portion and invitations for review were extended to a few more people, only three stakeholders were listed but more were involved in the process. During this process, we submitted comments but I'm not sure if those comments are publicly available at this point. I know it sounds like you have changed the Antidegradation Implementation policy based on conversations with Missouri, but can all of us in this group get access to those comments so we can see what went before?**
  - Bryan Leamons (DEQ): That's all public record; we can make those available either on the website and dedicate a location on our CPP/Antideg page; if not there, we can certainly provide them in some form.
4. **[Comment] Ellen Carpenter: This is a lot of technical information, so there might be a lot to digest. I'm betting there might be a need for a few more meetings than the two you have currently scheduled.**
  - Bryan Leamons (DEQ): For the Antideg portion, is that what you're referring?
  - Ellen Carpenter: I think for both of them. The CPP is a very technical document.
5. **[Question] Ellen Carpenter: As comments are submitted for these documents, will we all be able to see each other's comments? It would be helpful to have that available.**
  - Bryan Leamons (DEQ): I would have to check with Jake [Harper] on how we log incoming comments. I just don't know how fast we can process those and get them on the webpage, but they'll certainly be available. At some point no doubt. I don't know what we can commit to.
6. **[Question] Is there a redline version of the CPP available for review?**
  - Bryan Leamons (DEQ): It would be difficult to provide because we've reorganized it so much. It'd be hard to even follow the changes and in the way we've formatted it now. But the next meeting this afternoon should cover much more details.

**7. [Question] How often can we expect the AIM to be updated?**

- Bryan Leamons (DEQ): Most states that have had an AIM have not updated them except maybe one time as CFR changes were made in 2015; some of the ones before 2015 were updated to bring in those CFR changes. Based on other states, it's a good task to make the changes. But due to the fact that the rules had not changed until 2015, it [updates] weren't really needed. [AIM] might need a few tweaks in the beginning if the rules don't change but, in theory, not expected to be updated nearly as often as the CPP—which must be updated based on new or emerging technologies, or different methods for sampling, different facility designs that are new and unexpected, etc., versus solely through procedures.

**8. [Comment] Suggestion for the July 7<sup>th</sup> meeting to be held in the morning only, because there is an EPA webinar starting at 1PM (to 3PM, Central Time) with the states and tribes about the revisions to the Clean Water Act.**

- Bryan Leamons (DEQ): It's been difficult to schedule these meetings due to conflicts like this, but we'll certainly consider that comment.

**9. [Comment] Suggestion for a 60-day public comment period, 30 days for two technical documents may not be enough.**

- Bryan Leamons (DEQ): As we speak and go through these meetings now, we're accepting comments on the email even though we haven't opened the formal 30-day period. So that should provide some additional time. I'll talk with Dr. Blanz and others about that and address that at a later time.

**10. [Question] In terms of the timeline, will DEQ wait to move forward with the triennial review of Reg. 2 until after the CPP and the AIM are approved by EPA?**

- Bob Blanz (DEQ): We don't plan to wait; Reg. 2 will move forward as planned.

**11. [Comment] EPA was not invited to the initial workgroup for AIM but did review AIM and provided comments directly. Looks like most of the comments were incorporated.**

- [EPA provided link with initial comments on AIM to Colby Ungerank that can be shared with the stakeholder group.]
- [There was a link that was shared with the 2018 comments workgroup.]

**12. [Comment] Colene Gaston (Beaver Water District): On official public comment period—these are complicated and significant documents, and will probably be revised, but the 30-day comment period seems too short especially since the public has not been involved yet; should have at least a 60-day official public comment period.**

- Bryan Leamons (DEQ): I hear you, we will consider it.

**13. [Question] Ellen Carpenter: Whenever the final draft of the CPP is published, will the public comments submitted during the formal public comment period be provided to EPA for their review?**

- Bryan Leamons (DEQ): If EPA wants them, they can certainly have them.
- Russell Nelson (EPA): We will look at public comments that are provided.

**14. [Question] Ellen Carpenter: Will the initial EPA comments on AIM be accessible to the public? How can I get those?**

- Russell Nelson (EPA): EPA's comments are public record, so anyone can have access who asks for them. You can just email me and I'll send them to you; DEQ can also publish these on their website.
  - [Russell's email: [nelson.russell@epa.gov](mailto:nelson.russell@epa.gov)]
- Russell Nelson (EPA): The Antideg regulation specifies the opportunity for public input but does not necessarily specify how frequently or any duration.

**15. [Comment] Teresa Turk (Buffalo River Watershed Alliance): Seconds the 60-day public comment period.**

**16. [Comment] Teresa Turk (Buffalo River Watershed Alliance): Would like to see all these documents/comments located in one place on the DEQ website.**

- Bryan Leamons (DEQ): We do already have a webpage that we'll be populating as they become available [<http://www.adeg.state.ar.us/water/cpp/>].
- Carrie McWilliams (DEQ): We will be updating this page as comments and info becomes available.

**17. [Question] If the list of stakeholders will not be available immediately, can the list be provided to the participants?**

- Zach Carroll (DEQ): should be made available on the website, published on Friday, June 19.
- [This list is now available:  
[http://www.adeg.state.ar.us/water/cpp/pdfs/Stakeholder\\_List.pdf](http://www.adeg.state.ar.us/water/cpp/pdfs/Stakeholder_List.pdf)]

**18. [Question] Colene Gaston (Beaver Water District): Can just the link to the Zoom meeting be sent via email?**

- Carrie McWilliams (DEQ): The link is available on CPP/Antideg webpage.