

EXHIBIT E

Economic
Impact/Environmental
Benefit Analysis

**ARKANSAS POLLUTION CONTROL & ECOLOGY
COMMISSION
ECONOMIC IMPACT/ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT
ANALYSIS**

Rule Number & Title: Regulation No. 6: Regulations for State Administration of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)

Petitioner: Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality, Water Division

Contact/Phone/Electronic mail: Ellen Carpenter
Water Division Chief
(501) 682-0655
carpenter@adeq.state.ar.us

2A. ECONOMIC IMPACT

1. *Who will be affected economically by this proposed rule? State: a) the specific public and/or private entities affected by this rulemaking, indicating for each category if it is a positive or negative economic effect; and b) provide the estimated number of entities affected by this proposed rule.*

Act 1511 of 2013 formed a committee that made recommendations to the Arkansas Legislative Council for updating the public notice requirements for proposed Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO) seeking coverage under the NPDES general permit for CAFOs (ARG590000). Those changes are incorporated into this regulation. As APC&EC Regulation No. 6 is the regulation governing the development and issuance of NPDES permits by ADEQ, this regulation should be amended to incorporate and fully implement the recommendations developed pursuant to Act 1511 of 2013.

Sources and Assumptions: Act 1511 of 2013

2. *What are the economic effects of the proposed rule? State: 1) the estimated increased or decreased cost for an average facility to implement the proposed rule; and 2) the estimated total cost to implement the rule.*

Nominal.

Sources and Assumptions: Calculating additional public notice requirements that are proposed, the nominal costs is estimated to be \$425.92.

3. *List any fee changes imposed by this proposal and justification for each.* 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?

No additional costs to ADEQ.

Sources and Assumptions: N/A

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 state agency and/or rule.

None

Sources and Assumptions: N/A

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

No

Sources and Assumptions: N/A

2B. ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT

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

None. This rulemaking proposes additional public notice requirements.

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

The proposed changes based on Act 1511 of 2013 and the other changes proposed are administrative in nature and do not change the current level of protection of the environment.

Sources and Assumptions: 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? None

Sources and Assumptions: N/A

4. What risks are addressed by the proposal and to what extent are the risks anticipated to be reduced? None

Sources and assumptions: N/A