Court USB production (August 28, 2026) · thread T54

Can Mount Pleasant be held liable for violations by Pilgrim's Chicken.

1 message(s), 2026-02-05 · 2026-02-05. Public copy: personal contact details and excluded-subject material boxed.

1. 2026-02-05 00:56 [resident complainant] · 0 att.

From:	[resident complainant] < [resident complainant] >
To:	"chinton@mpcity.org" <chinton@mpcity.org>; "Dcorbell@mpcity.org" <Dcorbell@mpcity.org>; "jhageman@mpcity.org" <jhageman@mpcity.org>; "kredfearn@mpcity.org" <kredfearn@mpcity.org>; "Melanie.knight@mpcity.org" <Melanie.knight@mpcity.org>; "wlyon@mpcity.org" <wlyon@mpcity.org>
Cc:	
Date:	2026-02-05 00:56:25+00:00
Subject:	**Can Mount Pleasant be held liable for violations by Pilgrim's Chicken.**
Attachments:	—
USB file:	Can Mount Pleasant be held liable for violations by Pilgrim's Chicken.msg (+5 identical copies)

Report This Email

Martha Beene

The city can do something about it. They provide Pilgrim's the Southwest WWTP on a 50 year lease agreement. This allows them to have leverage in the business relationship. The whole reason the city is racing to assist Pilgrim's add their own plant next to the city's on 127 is because the city can technically be held liable for all of the EPA violations that have occurred in the last several years at that site. The lease states the city has the ability to provide guidance and direction. Tracy Craig signed as a legal representative in the latest technical package. The problem is the city opts not to enforce these rules and regulations then blames it on the state agencies, but in reality the city's home rule status places the enforcement responsibility on the city, not the state. Here is the link to the PDF: **https://www.tceq.texas.gov/.../wq0003017000...**

Can Mount Pleasant be held liable for the Permit Violations by Pilgrims Chicken?