Subject: C&H Hog Farms EA of August 2015 comment for record

Please accept for record my response to the subject EA.

1. This EA is a small improvement over the original in that public notice was a timely page 3 ad in the Arkansas Democrat Gazette.

2. This EA was supported with historic facts, encyclopedic citing of rules and regulations, and some data from Big Creek Research Extension Team (BCRET) reports which were not available for the court overturned version.

However, upon cursory inspection it is easy to see this version is replete with errors, omissions and incredible conclusions:

A. Pond stage change due to leakage of 5,000 gallons per day per acre is 0.184 inches, not 0.0013 inches as reported. The difference is a factor 144 (the square inches in a square foot) indicating an erroneous use of a conversion factor in the calculation.

As correctly stated in the EA, C&H is required to report any pond leakage to ADEQ. 0.0013 inches is about 56% the diameter of a human hair, perhaps too small to be measured by C&H. However, the correct calculated amount is 0.184 inches which is definitely detectable and certainly must be reported. Data in the BCRET report of August 2015 clearly points to the occurrence of such unreported leakage.

B. 2.1.4 of the EA states a permit modification is submitted to install pond liners 60mm thick. You may want to check on that as 60mm is 2.36 INCHES thick! Perhaps you mean 60 mils or 0.060 inches thick?

C. Page 56 of BCRET report of July 2015 reports Nitrate-N levels at Big Creek locations above and downstream of the C&H Hog Farm that are nearly always higher downstream than upstream. Obviously Nitrates are entering Big Creek between these locations.

D. Page 57 of BCRET report of July 2015 Total Coliform levels at Big Creek locations above and downstream of the C&H Hog Farm that are nearly always higher downstream than upstream. Obviously E. Coli are entering Big Creek between these locations.

E. Pages 32 thru 35 of BCRET report of July 2015 report the over 300 feet deep house water well for the farm operation from which water is being drawn for human consumption (the factory operators themselves?) and factory operations has levels of E. Coli rendering the water unfit for consumption without treatment.
F. The karst geology underlying the facility and manure application fields is well documented by reported findings of BCRET, Dr. John Van Brahana and assistants, as well as geology maps long available from the State of Arkansas. It also noteworthy that Dry Creek Watershed is southwest of Mt. Judea, between Big Creek and Left Fork per map on page 14 of BCRET report of August 2015. The consultants that drafted this EA may not get it, but any Ozark native knows “Dry” as in Dry Creek means karst has conduits to the water table and losing streams both of which carry surface water whether contaminated with fecal material or not directly to the water table.

Beyond any doubt this contaminated water table is shared with any other wells tapping it, thus endangering not only the present users but also potential users who may be unaware of the threat, as well as user of Buffalo National River.

G. Page 57 of the EA implies Best Management Practices are required, but they are not. For example, BMPs such as pond liners and caps are listed in the ADEQ permit application but have not been installed. Please read the ADEQ permit application carefully to see that many BMPs are suggested, but not one is required among the suggestions that do not pertain to the mandatory Nutrient Management Plan.

H. Endangered and threatened species including the Northern Long-eared bat, Gray bat, Indiana bat, Rabbits-foot mussel and Snuffbox mussel are known occupants of the affected habitat, yet there is no data or discussion in depth supporting the claim that there is no significant impact.

I. Health effects on humans are likewise summarily dismissed as having no significant impact while there is clinical data showing significant public health dangers to the factory workers and the community in such environments in other areas.

J. Alternatives are not duly discussed, documented, or adequately presented.

In summary, this draft does not support the finding of “no significant impact”. Quite the contrary, a finding of VERY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT is strongly supported.

Therefore, I object to and reject the finding of NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT as arbitrary, conclusory and inconsistent with established facts available to the public and most certainly to the authors of the draft EA.

It is obvious that irreparable harm to tourism of Buffalo National River is occurring as these established facts become common knowledge, and that is a highly significant deleterious impact to the economy of the region and the State of Arkansas.

Considering that the contaminated house well water at C&H is shared other people tapping the same aquifer, it is unconscionable to conclude “no significant impact”. The fact is there is very significant impact already after just two years of operation.

Considering the rising E. Coli and nutrient counts in the water table and surface streams, the rising concentration of Phosphorous in the fields, the willingness of C&H now to protect themselves and the
community from odors and leakage from the storage ponds, the impact from operation is already significant; it is getting worse; it is impacting Buffalo River as well as Big Creek NOW. It is absurd to conclude there will be “no significant impact”.

The original EA was rejected by the courts for obvious reasons which are emulated in more subtle fashion in the present version. It is beyond comprehension that FSA and SBA would proffer yet another EA, now well dressed with such very scientific facts, but so strangely illogically concluded.

Because of the incompetence this EA so amply demonstrates, I respectfully demand an Environmental Impact Statement be prepared.
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