

From: [Nan Johnson](#)
To: [WaterbodyComments](#)
Subject: Fwd: Buffalo National River re: 303(d) list
Date: Sunday, August 12, 2018 9:03:32 AM

Opps. sorry we forgot to include our full names and address we our comments below on Buffalo River re:303(d) list,

Nan and Dave Johnson-Spencer
628 CR 3402 Eureka Springs, AR 72632 479-244-7756

Thank you.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Nan Johnson** <nan.n.johnson@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Aug 12, 2018 at 9:01 AM
Subject: Buffalo National River re: 303(d) list
To: WaterbodyComments@adeq.state.ar.us

We are deeply upset by the increasing problems on the Buffalo River. In the interest of the most effective remedy for the impairment of the Buffalo National River and its tributary, Big Creek, We propose that they be placed on the category 5 list, not the 4b list.

This change will allow for priority investigation, monitoring and direct remedy. Since category 5 sets TMDLs (Total Maximum Daily Loads) on impairments, addressing these waterbodies in category 5 ensures that Arkansas will be able to meet the goals for clean water set by the EPA and expected by the citizens of not just Arkansas but the USA, since a NATIONAL RIVER.

If the BRWMP is the “alternative plan in place” per 303d’s Category 4b, it will fail to address Big Creek, as Big Creek was excluded from the six streams prioritized for implementation of BMPs, making it very unlikely that financial incentives will be provided for landowners in the Big Creek sub-watershed.

Plus, the BRWMP specifically does NOT address permitted facilities, and it’s safe to assume that the single largest confined animal feeding facility (CAFO) in the Big Creek sub-watershed is a major contributor to impairment. Further, adopting BMPs under the BRWMP is strictly voluntary and non-enforceable. Only by moving Big Creek to Category 5 can the impairment sources be confirmed (through TMDLs) and properly and promptly corrected through enforcement action if necessary, things not possible in Category 4b.