

ECONOMIC IMPACT/ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT ANALYSIS

Answer to best of the proponent's ability, as required by ADPCEC Regulation 8, Chapter 3.5

APC&EC Regulation No. 30

(Arkansas Remedial Action Trust Fund Hazardous Substances Site Priority List)

June, 2005 Update

RULE SUMMARY: This revision to the Regulation adds one (1) site to the state list for matching or supplemental funds for Federal National Priority List (NPL) sites; adds one (1) site to both the Investigative and Remediation categories of the State Priority List, and adds seven (7) sites to the Investigation category of the State Priority List.

STEP 1: DETERMINATION OF ANALYSIS REQUIREMENT (to be included in petition to initiate rulemaking)

1A. Is the proposal expressly addressed by a Federal requirement?

Yes. See 1B.

No. Economic Impact/Environmental Benefit Analysis is not required

No. Regulation No. 30 is a State-only rule promulgated under the authority of the Arkansas Remedial Action Trust Fund Act, A.C.A. § 8-7-509(e)(1). It complies with a State statute providing for the Arkansas Pollution Control & Ecology Commission's review and approval prior to expending State trust funds for non-emergency remedial actions or investigations at suspected or identified hazardous substance sites.

1B. If 1A is YES, is proposed regulation equivalent, or more stringent, or less stringent than federal requirement?

- If equivalent – Economic Impact/Environmental Benefit Analysis is not required
- If more stringent - Economic Impact/Environmental Benefit Analysis is required
- If less stringent - Economic Impact/Environmental Benefit Analysis is not required, but does require federal agency approval prior to adoption if the proposal is part of an authorized state program.

STEP 2: THE ANALYSIS (to be included in petition to initiate rulemaking, if required)

2A. ECONOMIC IMPACT

1. Who will be affected economically by this proposed rule, what are the costs associated with this rule, and who will bear the costs of this proposed rule? Define specific public and/or private entities.

N/A

2. What are the economic benefits associated with the proposed rule, who will benefit from this proposed rule and how?

N/A

3. List sources of information used to determine economic impacts to public and/or private entities.

N/A

4. List any fee changes imposed by this proposal, and justification for each.

N/A

5. 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?

N/A

6. Is there a benefit or adverse impact to any other state agency to implement or enforce this proposed rule?

N/A

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

N/A

2B. ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT

1. What issues affecting the environment are addressed by this proposal?

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A