

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

Rule Number & Title: 8 CAR part 60, “Solid Waste Management Rules”

Petitioner: Division of Environmental Quality

Contact Person: Jennifer Parslow

Contact Phone: 501-682-0860

Contact Email: Jennifer.Parslow@Arkansas.Gov

Analysis Prepared by: Jennifer Parslow

Date Analysis Prepared: 07/30/2025

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.

- (a) The Arkansas Pollution Control and Ecology Commission will be positively affected by removing redundant approvals. The Commission approved the Landfill Post-Closure Trust Fund Prioritization list in 2010. Therefore, there is no need for redundant approvals for routine expenditures at prioritized sites. The public benefit is positive with faster decision-making for corrective action at approved landfills.
- (b) Two entities are affected: The Arkansas Pollution Control and Ecology Commission and the Division of Environmental Quality.

2. What are the economic effects of the proposed rule?

State: a) the estimated increased or decreased cost for an average facility to implement the proposed rule; and b) the estimated total cost to implement the rule.

There are no additional costs to implement this rule for any of the persons impacted by the rule change. The subject facilities are not in operation. Therefore, there is no known impact to permittees.

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

There are no fee changes associated with this proposed rulemaking.

EXHIBIT E

4. What is the probable cost to DEQ in manpower and associated resources to implement and enforce this proposed change, and what is the source of revenue supporting this proposed rule?

There are no additional costs to implement this proposed rule change.

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.

There is no known economic impact or adverse impact to any other state agency.

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

There are no less costly, non-regulatory, or less intrusive methods that would achieve the same purpose of the rule. The rule amendments conform with special language contained in Act 791 of 2025.

EXHIBIT E

2B. ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT

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

None, this only affects financial management and post-closure trust fund stewardship.

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

No change.

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 amendment to the rule is statutorily mandated so there is no alternative to amending the rule.

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

There are no known risks associated with the rule proposal.

EXHIBIT E