## **Commission on Local Government**

# **Estimate of Local Fiscal Impact**

2017 General Assembly Session

**Bill**: SB 1014 **Patron**: Ebbin **Date**: 1/20/2017

In accordance with the provisions of §30-19.03 of the Code of Virginia, the staff of the Commission on Local Government offers the following analysis of the above-referenced legislation:

#### **Bill Summary:**

Prohibits the State Corporation Commission from authorizing a water public utility, including a small water utility, from increasing its approved rates, fees, or charges through the use of a surcharge for non-revenue-generating infrastructure replacement or a similar surcharge pursuant to which the utility utilizes an automatic rate adjustment feature to increase its rates, fees, or charges. The measure further provides that the rates, fees, and charges that the Commission has approved for a utility to charge its customers shall not be authorized to increase above the amounts specified in an order of the Commission unless the Commission specifically increases such amounts in an order entered by the Commission.

#### **Executive Summary:**

SB 1014 prohibits the SCC from authorizing an increase of approved rates by water public utility through a surcharge, as defined in the bill. Furthermore, any approved increase in rates by the Commission cannot be above the amounts specified in an order by the Commission unless the Commission specifically increases such amounts in an order. Localities have evaluated a negative fiscal impact ranging from \$0.01 - \$1,000,000.00. Localities noted that any restrictions from recovery of infrastructure through a surcharge or improvement fee assessment severely impacts localities' ability to meet Federal & State standards and the impacts could be even greater depending on the improvements requirement. Localities also note that the bill would create a burdensome reporting requirement as the rate change process for utilities. Some localities noted that the bill would not impact them as their utilities are not governed by State Corporation Commission.

### **Local Analysis:**

Locality: Amherst County Estimated Fiscal Impact: \$5,000.00

I am not sure that this does anything for most utilities but give the State Corporation Commission unnecessary power. The utilities I have worked with have always done a rate analysis before raising rates. The analysis would have included all necessary expenses, debt requirements, and future capital needs. This appears that it will become a burdensome reporting as well as rate change process for utilities.

Locality: Chesapeake Public Schools Estimated Fiscal Impact: \$2.00

No impact on schools.

Locality: City of Danville	Estimated Fiscal Impact: \$0.01	
The State Corporation Commission does not administer our rates Council.	- they are governed locally by our City	
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	
Locality: City of Lynchburg	Estimated Fiscal Impact: \$1.00	
The best I can tell is there would be no financial impact on the City a private investor owned utility providing water service in Alexandr surcharge on water customers. Our various associations are track	ia that wanted a uniform statewide	
Locality: City of Manassas	Estimated Fiscal Impact: \$0.01	
Our utilities are not governed by the State Corporation Commission	n. This legislation is not applicable.	
Locality: City of Martinsville	Estimated Fiscal Impact: \$1,000,000.00	
Any restriction from recovery of infrastructure through a surcharge severely hampers a locality's ability to meet Federal and State req \$1,000,000, but the impact could be even greater depending on the collapsed lines, plant failure, etc. I understand the need for some obut the Commission would have to be able to react in a timely mar another board/commission oversight, especially for smaller localitic base.	uirements for quality, etc. I've listed the improvements needing to be made: oversight to prevent abuse of customers, need if needs arose, etc. Not in favor of	
Locality: City of Norfolk	Estimated Fiscal Impact: \$1.00	
There is no impact anticipated as a result of this bill as it is not applicable to Norfolk Utilities.		
Locality: City of Winchester	Estimated Fiscal Impact: \$1.00	
No impact, the City's Utility system is not under SCC jurisdiction.		
Locality: Fairfax County.	Estimated Fiscal Impact: \$1.00	
This bill would not have a direct impact on Fairfax County's government budget, but would rather potentially impact Fairfax Water, a public non-profit water utility company.		
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	

Locality: Franklin County	Estimated Fiscal Impact: \$1.00
Utility rates are imposed by the Western Virginia Water Authority in Franklin County.	
Locality: Louisa County	Estimated Fiscal Impact: \$1.00
The Louisa County Water Authority does not charge a surcharge replacement or utilize automatic rate adjustments to increase its not have a financial impact on the county at this time.	e for non-revenue-generating infrastructure
**System required an impact, so I put \$1, but it should be \$ .00.	
Locality: Rockingham County  Not Applicable.	Estimated Fiscal Impact: \$0.01
Locality: Spotsylvania County  No impact.	Estimated Fiscal Impact: \$0.01
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	
Locality: Town of Boones Mill	Estimated Fiscal Impact: \$1.00
I do not this bill would have any fiscal impact on the Town of Boo	ones Mill.
The Town operates a small utility system, and debt service for in utility fund. All of our infrastructure is vital to system operationv generating infrastructure." Further, our rate structure does not he and a usage rate, for all customers. Finally, we have no automat votes to set the rates each year.	we do not have any "non-revenue- ave any surcharges: there is only a base fee
This bill is a restriction on the rate setting practices of utilities. But	
Locality: Wise County	Estimated Fiscal Impact: \$1.00
In discussions with our PSA director this would have no impact of	on our PSA.