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2A. 经济影响

1. 谁将受到经济上影响？州：a) 具体的公共和/或私人实体受到该法规的影响，说明每个类别是否是正向的或负向的经济影响；b) 提供影响该规则实体的预估数量。

Only Tyson Foods — Waldron Plant 受到影响。对Tyson-Waldron有正向影响。

来源与假设：Section 2.306 特定水质量研究，Tyson Foods, Inc. Walron (2012) — 附于Tyson Foods, Inc. — Walron’s Petition to Initiate Third-Party Rulemaking as Exhibit F.

2. 该提案的经济影响是什么？州：1) 估计的增加或减少成本，一个平均设施实施该规则的成本；2) 估计的总计成本。

There are no economic effects of the proposed rule. Adoption of proposed rule will allow Tyson- Waldron to continue compliance with its NPDES Permit while protecting the attainment of the aquatic life designated uses in the Unnamed Tributary to the Poteau River and in the Poteau River.

来源与假设：Section 2.306 特定水质量研究，Tyson Foods, Inc. Walron (2012) — 附于Tyson Foods, Inc. — Walron’s Petition to Initiate Third-Party Rulemaking as Exhibit F.

3. 列出任何因该提案提出的费用变化及其理由。

None
4. What is the probable cost to ADEQ in manpower and associated resources to implement and
enforce this proposed change, and what is the source of revenue supporting this proposed rule.

None

5. Is there a known beneficial or adverse impact to any other relevant state agency to implement
or enforce this proposed rule? Is there any other relevant state agency's rule that could
adequately address this issue, or is this proposed rulemaking in conflict with or have any nexus
to any other relevant state agency's rule? Identify the state agency and/or rule.

There is no known impact to any other state agency; nor is there another state agency's
rule that could address the proposed change to APCEC Regulation No. 2. This
rulemaking is not in conflict with, nor does it have a nexus to any other relevant state
agency's rule.

6. Are there any less costly, non-regulatory, or less intrusive methods that would achieve the
same purpose of this proposed rule?

No

2B. ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT

What issues affecting the environment are addressed by this proposal?

This proposed rule will allow Tyson Foods – Waldron to continue to operate and be in compliance with
its NPDES permit and continue to protect the aquatic life designated uses of the affected streams. The
only available treatment technology for removal of dissolved minerals, reverse osmosis, is prohibitively
expensive ($30.5 million for initial installation with annual operating costs of approximately $4.5
million), generates a concentrated waste stream that is environmentally difficult to dispose of
and provides no significant environmental protection.

2. How does this proposed rule protect, enhance, or restore the natural environment or the well being of
all Arkansas?

The Section 2.306 Site Specific Study supporting Tyson-Waldron's requested modifications
establish that the requested changes will be protective of and have no adverse effect on, the
aquatic life communities in the affected streams. Toxicity testing using Tyson-Waldron's effluent
showed no significant lethal or sub-lethal toxicity in the test organisms.

3. What detrimental effect will there be to the environment or to the public health and safety if
this proposed rule is not implemented?

The only available treatment technology for the removal of minerals (reverse osmosis)
generates a concentrated waste stream that is environmentally difficult to dispose of and
provides no significant environmental protection.
Sources and Assumptions: 2.306 Site Specific Water Quality Study, Tyson Foods, Inc. Waldron (2012) - attached to Tyson Foods, Inc. – Waldron’s Petition to Initiate Third-Party Rulemaking as Exhibit P.

4. What risks are addressed by the proposal and to what extent are the risks anticipated to be reduced?

*The risk addressed by this proposal is the continued protection of the designated and existing uses of the affected stream segments. Under this proposal the risks should be substantially eliminated.*