

Commission on Local Government

Estimate of Local Fiscal Impact

2024 General Assembly Session | 1/21/24

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 legislation impacting local governments.

HB 1085: PFAS Advisory Committee; established, monitoring PFAS levels by publicly owned treatment works (Patron: Del. Sam Rasoul)

Bill Summary: Requires the owner or operator of a publicly owned treatment works to monitor PFAS levels, as defined in the bill, in effluent, influent, and biosolids at least quarterly and report all such monitoring data on an applicable discharge monitoring report required by federal regulations. The bill requires the Department of Environmental Quality (the Department), in certain circumstances, to develop a PFAS action plan to identify and address sources of certain PFAS detected in a public water system's raw water source, perform outreach efforts regarding PFAS contamination, report annually on its activities, and work with certain entities in developing its PFAS action plans. The bill requires certain facilities that manufacture or use PFAS to report the use of such chemicals to the Department and to monitor such PFAS at least quarterly unless at another frequency at the direction of the Director of the Department. The bill also directs the Department and the Virginia Department of Health to jointly establish a PFAS Advisory Committee to assist with PFAS-related activities and appoint such committee's members to include legislative members and a wide range of nonlegislative citizen members and to report annually to the Governor and the General Assembly on the Committee's activities and recommendations.

Local Fiscal Impact: Net Additional Expenditure: X Net Reduction of Revenues:

Summary Analysis:

Number of Localities Responding: 1 Cities, 4 Counties, 1 Towns, 1 Other

Localities estimated a negative fiscal impact ranging from \$0 to \$1.2 million over the biennium.

Only localities that operate publicly-owned water treatment facility reported a fiscal impact. Responsive localities identified the bill's fiscal impact as recurring and non-recurring operating expenses related to administering testing, increased personnel costs, and unknown capital expenses.

Net Increase in Expenditures: Itemized Estimates by Responding Localities

Locality	Juris	Recurring Expense- Personnel		Recurring Expense - Operating		Recurring Expense - Capital		Recurring Expense - Other	
		FY25	FY26	FY25	FY26	FY25	FY26	FY25	FY26
Bedford	County								
Charlotte County	County								
City of Harrisonburg	City	0	0	450000	450000	0	0	0	0
Mecklenburg County	County								
Northern Neck PDC	Other								
Prince George County	County	100000	100000	100000	100000				
Town of Chincoteague	Town			5000	5000				

Net Increase in Expenditures: Itemized Estimates by Responding Localities

Locality	Nonrecurring Expense - Operating		Nonrecurring Expense - Capital		Nonrecurring Expense - Other		Total Increase in Expenses (Biennium Total)
	FY25	FY26	FY25	FY26	FY25	FY26	
Bedford							0
Charlotte County							0
City of Harrisonburg	2000	2000	0	0	0	0	904,000
Mecklenburg County							0
Northern Neck PDC							0
Prince George County	200000	500000	100000				1,200,000
Town of Chincoteague							10,000

Locality	Expenditure Narrative by Responding Localities
Bedford	
Charlotte County	
City of Harrisonburg	One time expenditure changes result from the need for the City to establish its reporting process. Operating cost increases result from the bill's requirements that the City test its water treatment works for PSAS and report on the data regularly. The cost of regular testing would dramatically increases the Department of Public Utilities operating costs.
Mecklenburg County	The County does not operate any publicly owned treatment works.
Northern Neck PDC	Water quality monitoring is not the responsibility of PDCs.

Locality	Expenditure Narrative by Responding Localities
Prince George County Town of Chincoteague	<p>5. Recurring Costs:</p> <p>FY 25</p> <p>Personnel -- \$100,000/yr operator costs</p> <p>Operating -- \$100,000/yr sampling, outreach and reporting costs, uniforms, training</p> <p>Capital - unknown at this time.</p> <p>Total - \$200,000/yr</p> <p>FY 26</p> <p>Personnel -- \$100,000/yr operator costs</p> <p>Operating -- \$100,000/yr sampling, outreach and reporting costs, uniforms, training</p> <p>Capital - unknown at this time.</p> <p>Total - \$200,000/yr</p> <p>6. One-Time Costs:</p> <p>FY 25</p> <p>Personnel -- \$100,000 Self-reporting of PFAs, prepared by consultant, to DEQ</p> <p>Operating -- \$100,000 new equipment, tools for new personnel</p> <p>Capital - \$100,000 vehicle for new personnel</p> <p>Total - \$300,000</p> <p>FY 26</p> <p>Personnel</p> <p>Operating -</p> <p>Capital - \$500,000 PFAs action plan prepared by consultant</p> <p>Total - \$500,000</p> <p>Sampling has not been performed, therefore all costs and actions assume PFAs are detected above the detection level. We have no comparison of costs, therefore costs presented for sampling, reporting and action plans are an educated guess.</p>