

this is a rewrite of an amendment which I had introduced earlier and had placed on your desk earlier. This amendment is designed to address the problem which I think is particularly unique to many of the small communities. As you know, the present statute requires a contribution of approximately \$25,000 from the owner of a station prior to the time that the utilization of the fund kicks in. This amendment would change that so that those service stations which pump less than 250,000 gallons of fuel per year would be responsible for only the first \$5,000 of the pollution abatement cost. I originally had a staged amendment, which would then make the station operator liable for 10,000 if they pumped less than 500,000, 15,000 if they pumped less than 750,000, and then, of course, the 25,000, if they went over that, but because of the fact that such an amendment would mean a major drain upon the fund, I redrafted this amendment. Senator Jennie Robak has signed it with me. The purpose of this amendment is very simple. It does this. It says that if you are a small operator in Bellwood, or Bruno, or Anselmo, or Prague, or some such little town, and you have a pollution problem, and you pump less than 250,000 gallons per year, that you will be responsible for only the first \$5,000 of the remedial action. I have asked the individuals who are in a position to know how much of an impact this would have upon the fund, and I want you to know, very frankly, it will probably increase the drain on the fund by approximately \$500,000. That is a substantial increase in the drain upon the fund, and I do not know nor do I know if anyone knows whether or not the procedure we have outlined today and the amount of funding we have provided will be accepted by the Environmental Protection Agency as adequate. If we adopt this amendment, and I believe we should, then we are taking responsibility for additional cleanup for the small plants. And the reason for the introduction of this amendment is this, when we introduced the original bill, I believe it was 259, several years ago, one of the reasons we introduced that bill was we said we wanted to keep small stations in the small rural areas, and if we did not provide some kind of assistance, we would not be able to do that. As it turned out, all of us know that \$25,000 is a lot of money to a small plant that may only pump 50 or 100 thousand dollars a year. We took many plants, many small service stations that were functioning and which were actually providing a very needed service to those communities and we made them virtually worthless because there was no way that the owner could afford the 25,000, and without that kind of initial help, the fund would not kick in and clean up in the event there was a