STEP 1: DETERMINATION OF ANALYSIS REQUIREMENT (include in the petition to initiate rulemaking)

1A. Is the proposal expressly addressed by a Federal requirement? NO

Yes. See 1B.

No. Economic Impact/Environmental Benefit Analysis is not required

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

(include the following Analysis in the petition to initiate rulemaking, if required***)

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

Rule Number & Title:			
Petitioner:			
Contact/Phone/Email:			
Analysis Prepared by:			
Date Analysis Prepared:			
EC	ONOMIC IMI	PACT	
1. Who will be affected economically, eith the specific public and/or private entities that affected entity. Sources and Assumptions:	*		-
2. What are the costs associated with this equivalent analysis noting sources and associated ESTIMATED FINANCIAL IMPACT DU MONITORING/REPORTING Mark with X as appropriate:	amptions, using int E TO PROPOSED	formation reasonably RULE:	available.
			EXHIBIT

RECORDKEEPING	Hours X	Hourly Rate =	Cost
Mark with X as appropriate:	Initial Cos	ts	Annual Costs
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES			
I FGAI	Hours X	Hourly Rate ==	Cost
LEGAL ENGINEERING OTHER (specify)	Hours X	Hourly Rate =	Cost
OTHER (specify)	Hours X	Honrly Rate =	Cost
Mark with X as appropriate:	Initial C	Costs	Annual Costs
EQUIPMENT	< \$10,000		
	\$ 10,001 - \$50,	000	
	\$.50,001 - \$100	0.000	
	> \$100,001	,	
Mark with X as appropriate:	Initial C	Costs	Annual Costs
CONSTRUCTION	<\$10,000		
	\$ 10,001 - \$50,	000	
***************************************	\$ 50,001 - \$100	,000	
	> \$100,001		
Mark with X as appropriate:	Initial C	Costs	Annual Costs
OPERATIONAL COSTS	< \$10,000		
	\$ 10,001 ~ \$50,		
	\$ 50,001 - \$100),000	
Manadanna a a	> \$100,001		
Mark with X as appropriate:	Initial C	osts	Annual Costs
Sources and Assumption	ons:		
INCREASED PERMIT FEES			
(Indicate if the new regulatory	requirements will	result in an increased	permit fee assessment on
any entity due to changes mandated at			
Sources and Assumptions:	2 1	3 1	
•			
DECREASED COSTS	ovinas ao a racult	of the proposed rulem	akina)
(Indicate any anticipated cost s Sources and Assumptions:	savings as a resuit	of the proposed futern	aking)
•		+	
ESTIMATED AVERAGE COST T			EMENT RULEMAKING
(Provide summarized cost fact		tion provided above)	
	Cost Savings	nnn	
	\$0 -\$10,	000	
	\$ 10,001 - \$50,	000	
	\$ 50,001 - \$100	7,000	
	> \$100,001		

ESTIMATED TOTAL COST TO IMPLEMENT PROPOSED RULEMAKING

(Provide estimated Total Cost	for 1 year using Estimated Average Cost and the number of affected
entities)	
	Cost Savings
	\$0 -\$ 100,000
	\$ 100,001 - \$ 500,000
	\$ 500,001 - \$1,000,000
	> \$1,000,001

- 3. Who will bear the costs of this proposed rule? Define specific public and/or private entities.
- 4. What are the economic benefits associated with the proposed rule, who will benefit from this proposed rule and how? Define specific public and/or private entities.
 Sources and Assumptions:
- 5. List any new fees or changes in fees imposed by this proposal, and justification for each.
- 6. 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? Sources and Assumptions:
- 7. 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 rules? Identify state agency and/or rule.
- 8. Are there any less costly, non-regulatory, or less intrusive methods that would achieve the same purpose of this proposed rule?

Sources and Assumptions:

ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT

- 1. What issues affecting the environment are addressed by this proposal?
- 2. How does this proposed rule protect, enhance, or restore the natural environment for the well being of all Arkansans? Please describe any direct improvement in, or reduction of risk to human health, and any direct improvement in, or reduction of risk of adverse effects to wildlife, plant communities, the environment, or scenic or other esthetic values.

Sources and Assumptions:

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

Sources and Assumptions:

4. Will the proposed rule result in a direct reduction of emissions into the environment? If so, describe in detail.

Sources and Assumptions:

5. Will the proposed rule involve a transfer of the pollutants to another environmental medium? If so, describe in detail.

Sources and Assumptions:

6. Will the proposed rule result in an increase or decrease in the amount of waste that is generated by an affected entity? Will the proposed rule have an impact on the amount of materials that are likely to be recycled for beneficial reuse? If so, describe in detail.

Sources and Assumptions:

7. Does the proposed rule promote pollution prevention and result in other improvements to the environment or reductions in detrimental effects on the environment which are not described above? If so, describe in detail.

Sources and Assumptions:

***This Analysis shall be available for public review along with the proposed rule in the public comment period. The Commission shall compile a response to comments demonstrating a reasoned evaluation of the relative impact and benefits of the more stringent regulation (see A.C.A. 8-1-203 (b)(1)(E)).