

**NOTE:** As provided in LFC policy, this report is intended only for use by the standing finance committees of the legislature. The Legislative Finance Committee does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of the information in this report when used for other purposes.

The most recent FIR version (in HTML & Adobe PDF formats) is available on the Legislative Website. The Adobe PDF version includes all attachments, whereas the HTML version does not. Previously issued FIRs and attachments may be obtained from the LFC in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.

## FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

SPONSOR: Lopez DATE TYPED: 02/22/03 HB \_\_\_\_\_

SHORT TITLE: Hazardous Waste Regulations SB 514

ANALYST: Valenzuela

### APPROPRIATION

Appropriation Contained		Estimated Additional Impact		Recurring or Non-Rec	Fund Affected
FY03	FY04	FY03	FY04		
	NFI				

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Duplicates House Bill 781

### SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Office of the Attorney General  
Department of Environment

### SUMMARY

#### Synopsis of Bill

Senate Bill 514 would amend the Hazardous Waste Act by requiring to the Environmental Improvement Board to adopt rules for the management of hazardous waste to be at least as stringent as federal regulations, pursuant to the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.

#### Significant Issues

Currently, the Hazardous Waste Act does not authorize the Environmental Improvement Board to promulgate rules more stringent than the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations. This bill would allow the board to promulgate rules stronger than federal rules.

### FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

Senate Bill 514 does not contain an appropriation.

**OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES**

The Office of the Attorney General states the following concern.

The Bill raises the question of whether the proposed state regulatory scheme is preempted by the federal act.

Pursuant to RCRA, a state program can operate "in lieu of" the RCRA if the EPA Administrator formally approves the state program for that purpose. *Boyes v. Shell Oil Products Co.*, 199 F.3d 1260, 1268 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000) citing 42 U.S.C. §6991c(d)(2). More importantly, the state program can replace the federal regulations with more stringent regulations. *Id.* at 1270 n. 20 citing 42 U.S.C. § 6991g. (emphasis supplied).

It is further noted that for a state program to be approved, the Administrator must determine, after "notice and opportunity for public comment," that the state program "provides for adequate enforcement." *Id.* at 1262-3 citing 42 U.S.C. §6991c(d)(1). The requirement has been codified at NMSA 1978, § 74-4-4 (D).

**MFV/njw**