Mandates Currently Under Review

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: APA			
30	Comparative report of local government revenues and expenditures A considerable amount of time is spent on this report annually when the information comes from our Comprehensive Financial Report (which is already being sent to the Auditor of Public Accounts.) I suggest that the Auditor of Public Accounts obtain summary comparative information from the audited financial report each locality must prepare and submit annually. 15.2-2510	Currently under Review	County Administrator Spotsylvania County
356	APA Requirements--the APA mandates an annual comprehensive report be submitted by every locality. Many of the information is already available in the CAFR. Requiring an additional report duplicates effort. Align APA requirements to those presented in the CAFR. LEG.APA001 & LEG.APA002 § 15.2-2510	Currently Under Review	
355	Non Essential Reporting Requirements--the Comparative Report of Local Government Revenues and Expenditures require multiple forms of reporting. Many reports are redundant and unnecessary and provide little to no use for citizens. Examine the requirements laid out in the Comparative Report of Local Government Revenues and Expenditures to find redundancies and to ensure only that which is necessary and of use is reported. LEG.APA001 & LEG.APA002	Currently Under Review	
Subject Area: APA - Deadline for Reporting			
311	Annual Financial Report - change deadline to December 31, from November 30	Currently under Review	Smythe County
56	Annual Financial Report Change deadline from November 30 to December 31 § 15.2-2510	Currently under Review	County Executive Albemarle County
Subject Area: CB - Reporting			
65	Nonessential Reporting Requirements Virginia agencies require a mind-boggling amount of reporting and information that on the surface appears unnecessary and at times even frivolous. Yet this paperwork is mandated either by statute or is required to maintain funding for necessary services. An example is the monthly duplication of Constitutional Officers' payroll reports to obtain reimbursement for state-supported local employees from the Compensation Board. Compensation Board funding should be made on a lump-sum basis for those localities who meet certain standards without duplication of accounting and payroll processes. A thorough review by the state of what is actually required and necessary would reduce millions of dollars in unneeded costs annually to the various localities.	Currently under Review	County Administrator (Former) Bedford County

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: CB - Reporting			
69	Compensation Board The localities and Compensation Board currently maintain two separate annual budget processes and monthly payroll system data replication. The localities use their regular payroll process to pay constitutional officers and their employees and the Compensation Board uses similar data reported by the localities in the COIN System to provide locality reimbursements. Many localities already provide supplements for approved salary levels. Additionally, the Compensation Board manages and reviews requests for re-appropriation of vacancy and turnover savings through a different policy than the localities, even though the localities are then required to appropriate the funds at the local level. This duplication of effort combined with declining state resources for constitutional offices adds an additional financial burden to both the state and the localities. As an alternative to the current system the state could establish approved staffing levels and minimum pay levels eligible for state reimbursement (which they already do now), establish a lump sum reimbursement amount to the localities (which is basically the annual approved budget), and for those localities that certify that they meet the approved staffing levels and provide at least the minimum pay levels, the state would do a lump sum reimbursement method based on the approved budget.	Currently under Review	County Administrator Campbell County
55	Constitutional Officers funding The State should simplify the complexity of Compensation Board funding formula for constitutional officers and reduce localities' reporting requirements. §§ 15.2-1600, 15.2-1636.7, 15.2-1636.18	Currently under Review	County Executive Albemarle County
40	Jail revenues and expenditures reporting--current code mandates that all local and regional jails that receive funds from the Compensation Board provide information to the Board on revenues and expenditures. This is redundant because the APA already collects this information. Eliminate this mandate. SOA.CB005	Currently under Review	County Manager County of Henrico
37	Jail revenues and expenditures reporting??current code mandates that all local and regional jails that receive funds from the Compensation Board provide information to the Board on revenues and expenditures. This is redundant because the APA already collects this information. SOA.CB005	Currently under Review	City Manager City of Hampton
Subject Area: CSA			
200	Barriers to Using Lowest Regional Rate.-Each locality has a different match rate for the CSA program. If localities in a region want to try and create a single program to better serve children, in their area, the differing match rates remain. Currently, there is a barrier that does not allow localities to use the lowest rate available among the participating local governments within the regional contracting. If this barrier was eliminated, there are multiple other state dictated requirements that would need to be addressed prior to developing regional contracts.	Currently under Review	Loudoun County

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: CSA			
78	Comprehensive Services Act We think the Comprehensive Services Act is a program in need of serious review. The program should be subject to the Administrative Process Act so the impact of the administrative burdens of this program can be readily identified. Data collection and reporting requirements under CSA have increased significantly, but administrative funding needed to complete these tasks falls almost totally to localities. Mandates increasing local match rates for residential and foster care related services should be eliminated or returned to 2006 levels. Local governments pay a healthy portion of the state's Medicaid match for certain youth in this program. In other service areas, the state pays the Medicaid match and should do so for this program as well.	Currently under Review	Chesterfield County
323	Comprehensive Services Act • Make the Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) program subject to the Virginia Administrative Process Act. Local governments pay more than 80 percent of the administrative costs of this "shared" program. The state share of administrative costs has not been increased in more than a decade. At the same time, the administrative burdens on local governments have increased in data collection and reporting requirements.	Currently under Review	Stafford County
119	Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) Make the CSA program subject to the Administrative Process Act. Local governments pay more than 80 percent of the administrative costs of this “shared” program. The state share of administrative costs has not been increased in more than a decade. At the same time, the administrative burdens on local governments have increased in data collection and reporting requirements. The APA ensures adequate public notice about, and input into proposed rules and regulations that affect all taxpayers in the Commonwealth. Return local CSA service rates to the FY 2006 level. The Commonwealth has increased mandatory local participation percentages for the provision of services funded through the Comprehensive Services Act. Mandates increasing local rates for residential and foster care related services should be abolished and returned to the FY 2006 level. Increase state match for certain youth programs in CSA. Local governments pay a healthy portion of the state’s Medicaid match for certain youth in this program. The portion paid by local governments has increased over the life of this program, which began in the early 1990s. The state pays the Medicaid match for other service areas and should do so for this program. Establish financial incentives for local governments that foster regional contracting for provider services. Local governments who participate in regional contracts should provide local fund match at the lowest rate of the participating local governments.	Currently under Review	City of Galax
135	CSA: Administration of CSA is becoming very burdensome and complex particularly with the non-mandated (CHINS) cases. The additional funds that must be expended for these children create a significant financial burden for localities. In addition, the case management is overwhelming for most localities because of inadequate staffing and lack of funding for staff support. The constant changing of how CSA cases are managed, i.e. forms, reporting requirements, etc., creates confusion for those who are responsible for the program and the fear of punitive actions· if something is not done correctly adds more stress. The general feeling of CSA administrators is that we were better off before implementation of CSA and that the program would run more smoothly if the funding was returned to the various agencies involved with the care of the children.	Currently under Review	Poquoson

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: CSA			
325	• Increase state match for certain youth programs in CSA. Local governments pay a healthy portion of the state's Medicaid match for certain youth in this program. The portion paid by local governments has increased over the life of this program, which began in the early 1990s. The state pays the Medicaid match for other service areas and should do so for this program.	Currently under Review	Stafford County
333	It is a 1993 Virginia Law that providedfor the pooling of eight specific funding streams used to purchase services for high-risk youth. These fimds are returned to the localities with a required state/ local match and are managed by local interagency teams. Each locality is required to have at least two different interagency teams. They are the Community Policy and Managemen(Team and Family Assessment and Planning Team. The Community Policy and Management Teams (CPMTs) have the statutory authority and accountability for Imanaging the cooperative effort and developing interagency policies that govern CSA in the community. Family' Assessment and Planning Teams (FAPTs) are established by CPMTs to provide for family participation, assess strengths and needs of children and their families, develop individual family services plans, and make I recommendations to the CPMTs. In order to ensure and maintain compliance with statutory requirements many localities employ a CSA Coordinator to be the liaison to CPMT and F APT to assist in establishing procedures, policies and standards for the CSA Office while ensuring and maintain compliance with State and Federal guidelines, such as the requirement to provide monthly and quarterly reporting to the State CSA Office and Department of Education from both a client data set and financial reporting perspective.	Currently under Review	Warren County
201	State CSA Pool Funds are Reimbursable Only-The CSA program has a state "pool" of funds from which each locality gets an allocation each year. Each locality also pays a local match for funds it uses. Localities are unable to obtain any of this pool funding upfront to create services in their communities. Funds can only be used on a "per child" basis, and are only granted on a reimbursement basis. This creates a disincentive to build programs that can serve a number of children and families. If localities could use even a portion of its share of pool funds to build services upfront either through a private or non-profit vendor in most cases, the infrastructure would be sufficient to serve more children and families. This may provide better economies of scale for the locality and the taxpayers	Currently under Review	Loudoun County
337	COMPREHENSIVE SERVICES ACT (CSA): MAKE THE CSA PROGRAM SUBJECT TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS ACT, RETURN LOCAL CSA SERVICE RATES TO THE FY 2006 LEVEL, INCREASE THE STATE MATCH FOR CERTAIN YOUTH PROGRAMS, PERMIT LONGER-TERM CONTRACTS FOR LOCAL COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD DIRECTORS AND ESTABLISH FINANCIAL INCENTIVES FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS THAT FOSTER REGIONAL CONTRACTING FOR PROVIDER SERVICES.	Currently under Review	Washington County
350	The local share of the services included under the Act has steadily increased over the past several years. The administrative requirements placed on local governments have increased, including information gathering and report submissions. Mandatory local funding proportions have increased, and we recommend that the state's share of funding be restored to the 2006 levels.	Currently under Review	York County
324	• Return local CSA service rates to the FY06 level. The Commonwealth increased mandatory local participation percentages for the provision of services funded through the Comprehensive Services Act. Mandates increasing local rates for residential and foster-care related services should be abolished and returned to the FY06 level.	Currently under Review	Stafford County
Subject Area: CSA - Funding			

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: CSA - Funding			
164	Child Welfare Services Description: The State severely underfunds Child Protective Services, Foster Care, and Adoptions. The Code of Virginia, 63.2-401, authorizes the State Board to determine the amount of reimbursement, not less than 50%. The State Board has established a reimbursement rate of 84.5%; however, current State appropriations are covering only 58% of the cost of these programs. State Code Requiring Mandate: 63.2-319 (specifies funding) Estimated Annual Impact: $4.1 million	Currently under Review	Virginia Beach
315	CSA - reduce local share of mandated services/ reduce number of mandated services	Currently under Review	Smythe County
87	Comprehensive Services Act (CSA). The Alexandria CSA program has functioned exceptionally well and funding has been saved for both the State and the City with the successful effort to keep children in our community. This program was mandated with insufficient State funding for localities for administrative costs; new requirements are continuously added, thus increasing local costs-but no new State funding accompanies these new requirements. The state should either provide additional funding or revise its data collection and reporting procedures. In addition, regional service development should be encouraged by allowing localities to use the lowest match rate of the locality in that region in service development. Pool funding should be allowed to be used to provide up front development of services, rather than restricting funding to per child payments. Joint or State negotiation of services should be considered to lower costs of services.	Currently under Review	City of Alexandria
266	• Increase state match for certain youth programs in CSA. Local governments pay a healthy portion of the state's Medicaid match for certain youth in this program. The portion paid by local governments has increased over the life of this program, which began in the early 1990s. The state pays the Medicaid match for other service areas and should do so for this program.	Currently under Review	VACo
265	Return local CSA service rates to the FY 2006 level. The Commonwealth has increased mandatory local participation percentages for the provision of services funded through the Comprehensive Services Act. Mandates increasing local rates for residential and foster care related services should be abolished and returned to the FY 2006 level.	Currently under Review	VACo
155	Increase state match for certain your programs in CSA: Local governments pay a healthy portion of the state's Medicaid match for certain youth in this program. The portion paid by local governments has increased over the life of this program, which began in the early 1990s. The state pays the Medicaid match for other service areas and should do so for this program as well.	Currently under Review	Portsmouth
114	Comprehensive Services Act (CSA). The Fairfax-Falls Church CSA program has functioned exceptionally well and funding has been saved for both the State and the City with the successful effort to keep children in our community. This program was mandated with insufficient State funding for localities for administrative costs; new requirements are continuously added, thus increasing local costs—but no new State funding accompanies these new requirements. The state should either provide additional funding or revise its data collection and reporting procedures. In addition, regional service development should be encouraged by allowing localities to use the lowest match rate of the locality in that region in service development. Pool funding should be allowed to be used to provide up front development of services, rather than restricting funding to per child payments. Joint or State negotiation of services should be considered to lower costs of services.	Currently under Review	Falls Church

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: CSA - Funding			
154	Return local CSA service rates to the FY 2006 level: The Commonwealth has increased mandatory local participation percentages for the provision of services funded through the Comprehensive Services Act. Mandates increasing local rates for residential and foster care related services should be abolished and returned to the FY2006 level.	Currently under Review	Portsmouth
108	Danville's share for Comprehensive Services expenditures has increased from $242,000 in FY 2001 to $1.3 million in FY 2011. The State should, at a minimum, cover a greater portion of administrative expenses for this program.	Currently under Review	Danville
287	1. Comprehensive Services Act. a. The Commonwealth has increased mandatory local participation percentages for the provision of services funded through CSA. Mandates increasing local rates for residential and foster care related services should be abandoned.	Currently under Review	Powhatan County
306	o The Commonwealth has increased mandatory local participation percentages for the provision of services funded through the Comprehensive Services Act. Mandates increasing local rates for residential and foster care related services should be abolished and returned to the FY 2006 level.	Currently under Review	Scott County
314	CSA - administrative costs decreased for locality	Currently under Review	Smythe County
194	Eliminate or modify the local match percentage for the Comprehensive Services Act, the cost of which has been increasingly shifted to localities.	Currently under Review	Henrico County
17	CSA - State match funding should be returned to the 2006 level.	Currently under Review	Middlesex County
64	Increase State Match for CSA The state match for certain youth programs in the CSA should be increased. Local governments pay a healthy portion of the state Medicaid match for certain youth in this program. The portion paid by local government has increased over the life of this program, which began in the early 1990s. The state pays the Medicaid match for other service areas and should do so for this program as well.	Currently under Review	County Administrator (Former) Bedford County
239	One program that was identified by the County Social Services office is the Comprehensive Services Act (CSA). While they feel that the program cannot be suspended or eliminated, it does create an increasing administrative burden for the county. While administrative costs increase annually, as far as we know, the state funding available to the county for these costs have not been increased since the program was created in 1994. They suggest that the administrative requirements and funding be re-examined.	Currently under Review	Westmoreland County
346	• Comprehensive Services Act- Fund 100% of the administrative costs, increase the state match for all mandated services under this program, provide financial incentives for regional contracts and make available state contracts for the most expensive services a lower negotiated rates;	Currently under Review	Wise County

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: CSA - Funding			
217	The Comprehensive Services Act for At-Risk Youth and Families of 1992 requires New Kent County to coordinate services for youth and families in order to receive State funds for care and treatment of troubled and at-risk youths and families. The costs of this program are divided between the state and local governments; however, the more expensive programs are increasingly becoming more the obligation of local funds.	Currently under Review	New Kent County
Subject Area: CSA - Oversight			
264	Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) • Make the CSA program subject to the Administrative Process Act. Local governments pay more than 80 percent of the administrative costs of this “shared” program. The state share of administrative costs has not been increased in more than a decade. At the same time, the administrative burdens on local governments have increased in data collection and reporting requirements. The APA ensures adequate public notice about, and input into proposed rules and regulations that affect all taxpayers in the Commonwealth.	Currently under Review	VACo
183	Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) Make the CSA program subject to the Administrative Process Act. Local governments pay more than 80 percent of the administrative costs of this “shared” program. The state share of administrative costs has not been increased in more than a decade. At the same time, the administrative burdens on local governments have increased in data collection and reporting requirements. The APA ensures adequate public notice about, and input into proposed rules and regulations that affect all taxpayers in the Commonwealth. Return local CSA service rates to the FY 2006 level. The Commonwealth has increased mandatory local participation percentages for the provision of services funded through the Comprehensive Services Act. Mandates increasing local rates for residential and foster care related services should be abolished and returned to the FY 2006 level. Increase state match for certain youth programs in CSA. Local governments pay a healthy portion of the state’s Medicaid match for certain youth in this program. The portion paid by local governments has increased over the life of this program, which began in the early 1990s. The state pays the Medicaid match for other service areas and should do so for this program.	Currently under Review	Hanover County
153	Make the CSA program subject to the Administrative Process Act: Local governments pay more than 80% of the administrative costs of this "shared" program. The state share of the administrative costs has not been increased in more than a decade. At the same time, the administrative burdens on local governments has increased in data collection and reporting requirements.	Currently under Review	Portsmouth
211	Comprehensive Services Act-make the program subject to the Administrative Processes Act, fund 100% of the administrative costs, increase the state match for all mandated services under this program, provide financial incentives for regional contracts and make available state contracts for the most expensive services at lower negotiated rates;	Currently under Review	Montgomery County

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: CSA - Oversight			
276	Comprehensive Services Act Inefficiencies and Inequities Description: Local governments pay more than 80.0 percent of the administrative costs of this "shared" program. State money for administration has not been increased in more than a decade while the state has increased administrative costs through additional data collection and reporting requirements. Although local governments are a major funding partner in CSA, representation on the State Executive Council does not reflect this fact. Policy decisions made often drive up the program's costs and burden on localities. Proposal: The state should either provide additional funding for administrative support or revise its data collection and reporting requirements. Also, the CSA program should fall under the Administrative Process Act to ensure adequate public notice about, and input into proposed rules and regulations that affect all taxpayers. The current CSA process is broken, and does not provide sufficient time for the general public to provide comments and for local governments to analyze the fiscal and programmatic impact of proposed changes. Implementation: Appropriation Act and Legislation	Currently under Review	VML
295	Make the CSA program subject to the Administrative Process Act. The state share of administrative costs has not been increased in more than a decade. At the same time, the administrative burdens on local governments have increased in data collection and reporting requirements. The APA ensures adequate public notice about, and input into proposed rules and regulations that affect all taxpayers in the Commonwealth. In addition, it is essential that the state be prohibited from establishing a cap on state allocations of funds through CSA. By arbitrarily setting a cap on funding for state responsible services, the state is intentionally shifting costs to local governments who are then mandated to cover these unfunded costs.	Currently under Review	Roanoke County
308	The CSA program should fall under the Administrative Process Act. The APA ensures adequate public notice about, and input into, proposed rules and regulations that affect all taxpayers in the Commonwealth. At the current time, CSA has its own public participation process that has proven time and time again to be completely unsatisfactory in terms of notifying stakeholders and the general public of proposed changes, of allowing for sufficient time to provide public comments, and for analyzing the fiscal and programmatic impact of proposed changes in rules and regulations.	Currently under Review	Scott County
63	Comprehensive Services Act Make the CSA program subject to the Administrative Processes Act. The APA ensures adequate public notice about, and input into, proposed rules and regulations that affect all taxpayers in the Commonwealth, which would undoubtedly result in local and state savings.	Currently under Review	County Administrator (Former) Bedford County
199	Administrative Process Act Exclusion.--Currently the CSA program is excluded under the Administrative Process Act; therefore, the amount of funding available to the localities for administrative costs has remained flat for years. Loudoun receives less than $50,000 per year for administrative costs with accounts for about 17% of total yearly administrative costs for CSA.	Currently under Review	Loudoun County
289	Make the CSA program subject to the Administrative Process Act. The state share of administrative costs has not been increased in more than a decade, even as the administrative requirement on local government has increased in data collection and reporting requirements.	Currently under Review	Powhatan County

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: CSA - Regionalism			
326	Establish financial incentives for local governments that foster regional contracting for services. Local governments who participate in regional contracts should provide local matching funds at the lowest rate of the participating local governments.	Currently under Review	Stafford County
267	Establish financial incentives for local governments that foster regional contracting for provider services. Local governments who participate in regional contracts should provide local fund match at the lowest rate of the participating local governments.	Currently under Review	VACo
156	Establish financial incentives for local governments that foster regional contracting for provider services: Local governments who participate in regional contracts should provide local fund match at the lowest rate of the participating local governments. Although regional contracts may work well for rural and small localities, they will not work for larger cities and counties and there is no cost advantage to be recognized.	Currently under Review	Portsmouth
288	b. CSA - Establish financial incentives for local governments that foster regional contracting for provider services.	Currently under Review	Powhatan County
Subject Area: CSA - Reporting			
54	Comprehensive Services Act The state should revise its data collection and reporting requirements to reduce the administrative burden on local governments. §§ 2.2-2648, 2.2-2649, 2.2-5201	Currently under Review	County Executive Albemarle County
Subject Area: DCR			
185	6. Chesapeake Bay Act Related: · Fully fund the WQIF so that all eligible projects can be fully funded at a 50% or greater match. Paying for upgrades to existing pollution treatment facilities to meet nutrient standards proposed by the Tributary Strategies, Chesapeake Bay TMDL, and WIP presents a hardship for the rate payers of utilities. Utility rate payers on central wastewater treatment plants have already paid for significant pollution treatment technology. · Extend the implementation period for compliance with the Chesapeake Bay Tributary Strategies, Chesapeake Bay TMDL, and WIP over a longer period of time to allow for the phased implementation of improvements at WWTP's. Under the current general nutrient permit wastewater facilities, taken together, must be in compliance with their WLA at this time. No other sector is required to be in full compliance with their load allocation at this time. · The State should take over management and tracking of septic tank pump out programs from localities. The state permits and authorizes these facilities and should be responsible for managing their long term maintenance. · Credit to localities running MS4 programs should be given. If these programs do not improve water quality, the state should minimize the requirement associated with MS4 permits to the minimum required to meet federal requirements. This is a state administered but federally mandated program. · Delete local monitoring requirements in the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act. · Local governments subject to the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act are required to review soil and water runoff control and water quality assessments prepared by all agricultural operations within their jurisdiction, and to take enforcement action when necessary. This function should appropriately be the responsibility of either the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation or the Virginia Department of Agriculture.	Currently under Review	Hanover County

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: DCR			
141	DCR: Each year, three reports to DCR are required, with some of the same information included in each. The reports are the annual VPDES permit report; Chesapeake Bay reports; Erosion and Sediment Control Reports. One report only should be required, and contain only the information that DCR will actually use.	Currently under Review	Poquoson
341	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION: INCREASE FUNDING FOR CHESAPEAKE BAY CLEAN-UP AND DELETE LOCAL MONITORING REQUIREMENTS IN THE CHESAPEAKE BAY PRESERVATION ACT, AND PROVIDE STATE FUNDING FOR LOCAL ADMINISTRATION OF EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL PROGRAMS.	Currently under Review	Washington County
244	• Burdensome TMDL & Stormwater Compliance	Currently under Review	Town of Colonial Beach
219	Stormwater Management Programs by Localities New Kent County is located within Tidewater Virginia as defined by the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act (§ 10.1-2100 et seq.), and is required to adopt a local stormwater management program for land disturbing activities consistent with the Stormwater Management Law. This will add tremendously the cost of developing land and will also require local capital projects costs to increase.	Currently under Review	New Kent County
208	• TMDL and Stormwater Compliance- provide state assistance and funds to pay for the expertise needed to ensure compliance.	Currently under Review	Montgomery County
186	7. Stormwater: · Consolidate the Stormwater Program, Chesapeake Bay Program, and Erosion and Sediment Control Programs into one coordinated program. Localities having to show compliance with these three separate but related programs is inefficient. The State managing these three separate but related programs is inefficient. · Eliminate state inspections of construction site for E&S performance, in areas where E&S programs are administered by localities. VPDES inspections should only cover areas not covered by local programs. This is confusing and inefficient.	Currently under Review	Hanover County
281	1. Stormwater regulations/TMDL. The County supprtss requiring that any new mandatory storm water regulations placed on localities related to new development, redevelopment, and existing development be cost effective, affordable, and manageable for localities, there residents and developers. Furthermore, the General Assembly should provide effective, responsive, and competent technical support to assist localities in implementing any new mandated regulatory programs. Rural localities do not have resources available to implement new monitoring, permitting, or other regulatory processes that are imposed pursuant to state authority. In addition, VSMP and TMDL mandates should not be implemented without full state funding.	Currently under Review	Powhatan County

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: DCR			
257	SNR.DCR006 Stormwater Management Programs by Localities: This mandate would require local governments that own separate storm sewer systems to adopt a Comprehensive Stormwater Management Program that incorporates both structural and nonstructural measures to control the discharge of pollutants. This mandate appears to have stemmed from the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act, of which the Town of Victoria does not fall under. This mandate is by all purposes to place pretreatment controls prior to discharge into the environment. It is amazing that the Town of Victoria requested for bio-solids not be placed upstream from our town water supply and was directed it would still be applied. The Victoria Town Council believes that anything being discharged from stormwater is by far cleaner than bio-solids. The Victoria Town Council would request that this mandate not be required for those not in the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Area and if mandated municipalities be given the right to deny any upstream placement of bios-solids from local water supplies.	Currently under Review	Town of Victoria
Subject Area: DCR - Stormwater			
76	Increase funding for the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act – Savings $200,000 per year. Localities in Virginia face an estimated cost of more than $7 billion to comply with the new Watershed Improvement Plan under the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. The state and federal governments should share more of the cost burden of these mandates. The local monitoring requirements in the Act should be removed. Local governments are required under the Act to devote staff resources to monitor the five-year septic tank provisions of the Act, however that responsibility falls with the Virginia Department of Health and not the localities. Localities are additional required to review soil and water runoff control and water quality assessments generated by agricultural operations within their jurisdictions, and to take enforcement action when necessary. This function is more properly the responsibility of the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation or the Virginia Department of Agriculture.	Currently under Review	County Administrator Campbell County
15	Stormwater Management - New unfunded mandate, as this has historically been a state program	Currently under Review	Middlesex County
198	Chesapeake Bay - The state should consider an increase in the funding for Chesapeake Bay clean up. Virginia localities face an estimated cost of more than $7 billion to comply with the Watershed Implementation Plan (WHIP) under Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Localities need additional state and federal funds to meet these future requirements.	Currently under Review	Loudoun County

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: DCR - Stormwater			
174	WHEREAS, In the mid 1990's US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was sued for non-enforcement of the Federal Clean water act of 1972 for allowing high levels of pollution to flow into the Chesapeake Bay. A settlement in 1999 required the EPA to either achieve the water quality standards in the Chesapeake Bay by 2010 or impose a pollution diet that will reduce the pollution to acceptable levels. This pollution diet is known by the term Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL); and WHEREAS, the required water quality standards have not been met, EPA is requiring the District of Columbia and the six states in the watershed (Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New York) to each develop and adopt a Chesapeake Bay TMDL and related Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP); and WHEREAS, there is a lack of Federal and State commitments to provide funding for the necessary staff expertise, instrumentation tools, and legislative authority for local governments to administer Watershed Implementation Plans; and WHEREAS, aligning incentives between State and Federal programs responsible for point and non-point source pollution and Best Management Practices would reduce uncertainty with respect to statutory provisions, and funding available for local efforts; and WHEREAS, arbitrarily designating all state waters and wetlands for recreational uses, including swimming, regardless of their actual use or suitable use, and applying the Water Quality Standards for such uses, diverts scarce resources from viable TMDL initiatives; and WHEREAS, the Chesapeake Bay TMDL carries a significant financial burden for local government through implementation and regulation of Watershed Implementation Plans and will also affect citizens and many industries such as agriculture and development through increased fees and regulations: WHEREAS, while we agree that there is a benefit of clean waters within the Bay and local watershed, the economic costs for compliance must be balanced, and water quality programs cannot be developed in a vacuum without conSidering economic impacts to the local economy; NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Culpeper County Board of Supervisors hereby opposes the Chesapeake Bay TMDL Implementation Plan and the associated unfunded mandates. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Culpeper County Board of Supervisors strongly opposes the accelerated implementation of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL Implementation Plan.	Currently under Review	Culpeper County
79	Local governments subject to the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act are required to review soil and water runoff control and water quality assessments prepared by all agricultural operations within their jurisdiction, and to take enforcement action when necessary. This function should be the responsibility of either the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation or the Virginia Department of Agriculture. The calculation of Total Maximum Daily Loads for the Chesapeake Bay watershed is required under the federal Clean Water Act. At the state level, there is no funding available to implement the Chesapeake Bay TMDL's, and we believe localities will be forced to create storm-water utilities to cover the costs of complying with this mandate. We believe the mandate should not be implemented without appropriate state funding. The Department of Conservation and Recreation currently administers the Virginia Storm-water Management Permit program (VSMP) for construction activities. This program is due to be turned over to localities in 2014. While the state has a permit fee structure to cover their costs, and localities will be able to charge a fee, our analysis shows that the permit fee structure will not be sufficient to cover local implementation costs. This program should remain a state responsibility.	Currently under Review	Chesterfield County
230	• Local governments subject to the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act are required to devote staff resources to monitor the five-year septic tank pump out provision of the Act. This should be the job of the Virginia Department of Health since it currently has the records and personnel already in place to monitor this requirement.	Currently under Review	Stafford County

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: DCR - Stormwater			
142	New state stormwater regulations: Will make localities assume the State DCR duty of administering State construction stormwater permits. We don't have the staff. State positions should be cut if they are no longer going to do this work, with localities receiving the funding.	Currently under Review	Poquoson
143	Chesapeake Bay Act: Stormwater treatment measures must be allowed in the buffers if we are to accomplish Chesapeake Bay TMDL program retrofits. The resource protection area (RP A) or buffer rules unnecessarily discourage redevelopment if the site has not been designated an intensely developed area (IDA). That means land uses with no storm water treatment stay in place because it is too difficult to redevelop the site. The IDA definition should not require a special design~ticn procedure ',v~t11 State appro'val.	Currently under Review	Poquoson
16	CBPA - Specifically monitoring and enforcing the 5 year septic pump out provision of the act. This should be conducted by the VDH who issues the permits.	Currently under Review	Middlesex County
144	Chesapeake Bay TMDL program: Communication is lacking, and goals are changing. We need: • More active participation and clear communication from DCR. • Virginia to push back when EPA requirements are not technically justified. Most State staffers defend EPA when localities point out issues. • A slower timetable. The program is unaffordable at this pace. Local government upgrades of existing stormwater systems in wetlands areas/State waters: Eliminate Joint Permit applications for local governments upgrading or maintaining their existing storm drainage structures. Work should be covered under general permits with no paperwork.	Currently under Review	Poquoson
228	Environmental Protection • Increase funding for Chesapeake Bay clean-up. Virginia local governments face an estimated cost of more than $7 billion to comply with the Watershed Implementation Plan under the Chesapeake Bay total maximum daily load (TMDL.) Localities need additional state and federal funds.	Currently under Review	Stafford County
229	• Assume monitoring requirements in the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act.	Currently under Review	Stafford County
243	Stormwater Treatment It has come to our attention that new EPA and DCR stormwater management and/or treatment rules are being developed and that some have estimated the anticipated cost to of these to Virginia to be on the order of $7,000,000,000 (seven billion dollars). Although this stems from EPA's Chesapeake Bay cleanup initiative, apparently the working assumption is that most of the cost and effort will fall to local government. You should be aware that, although improving water quality is generally good, this comes at an extremely high cost and it will be difficult to explain the new taxes and fees required to fund such programs to our local residents and businesses when its main benefit is for a water feature that is about four driving hours away.	Currently under Review	Town of Amherst

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: DCR - Stormwater			
271	Environmental Protection • Increase funding for Chesapeake Bay clean up. Virginia local governments face an estimated cost of more than $7 billion to comply with the Watershed Implementation Plan under Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Localities need additional state and federal funds.	Currently under Review	VACo
334	Erosion and Sediment Control as it relates to the Chesapeake Bay Act code implementation and enforcement	Currently under Review	Warren County
332	Increase funding for Chesapeake Bay clean up. Virginia local governments face an estimated cost of more than $7 billion to comply with the Watershed Implementation Plan under Chesapeake Bay TMDL. Localities need additional state and federal funds. *Delete local monitoring requirements in Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act. *Local governments subject to the Chesapeak Bay Preservation Act are required to devote staff resources to imonitor the five-year septic tank pump out provision of the Act. This should be job of the Virginia Department of Health since it currently has the records and personnel already in place to monitor this requirement. *Local governments subject to the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act are required to review soil and water runoff control and water quality assessments prepared by all agricultural operations within their jurisdiction, take enforcement action when necessary. This function should appropriately be the repsonsibilty of either Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation or the Virginia Department of Agriculture.	Currently under Review	Warren County
272	• Delete local monitoring requirements in the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act. o Local governments subject to the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act are required to devote staff resources monitor the five-year septic tank pump out provision of the Act. This should be the job of the Department of Health since it currently has the records and personnel already in place to monitor this requirement.	Currently under Review	VACo
260	Planning and Zoning Department • Land Development and Ordinance Requirements in Tidewater Virginia (SNRDCR019) Related to the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act. Staff is not opposed to the Act itself, just the more restrictive requirements created by legislative acts of the Virginia General Assembly. We experienced this during our "Phase III Compliance" review in spring 2011, in which new regulations were enforced without our ability to comment prior to imposition.	Currently under Review	Town of Vienna
273	o Local governments subject to the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act are required to review soil and water runoff control and water quality assessments prepared by all agricultural operations within their jurisdiction, and to take enforcement action when necessary. This function should appropriately be the responsibility of either the Department of Conservation and Recreation or the Virginia Department of Agriculture.	Currently under Review	VACo
231	• Local governments subject to the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act are required to review soil and water runoff control and water quality assessments prepared by all agricultural operations within their jurisdiction, and to take enforcement action when necessary. This function should appropriately be the responsibility of either the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation or the Virginia Department of Agriculture.	Currently under Review	Stafford County

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: DCR - Stormwater			
250	1. Stormwater Management Programs. Costs for the Town to revise its Stormwater Management Master Plan to comply with the EPA's new Chesapeake Bay-wide TMDLs are estimated to run into hundreds of thousands of dollars and construction costs to implement the Master Plan will be millions of dollars, The issue for Towns that maintain their own MS-4 permits is that the Counties are responsible for submitting TMDL data to the State, not the Towns, Since Towns are not allowed to submit their own TMDL data, we recommend that the state legislation be amended to exclude Towns from management of TMDLs, as it is a County responsibility.	Currently under Review	Town of Leesburg
Subject Area: DEQ - Solid Waste			
300	Roanoke County opposes efforts by the General Assembly to fund the operating budget of the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) by imposing a "tipping fee" on solid waste disposed at public solid waste disposal facilities (landfills)	Currently under Review	Roanoke County
Subject Area: DSS			
278	7. Determining Program Eligibility Description: Determining an applicant's eligibility for social net programs can be both costly and inefficient (in terms of money and time) for state and local agencies as well as the applicant. Proposal: Examine whether the state should determine the eligibility for Medicaid and social services. Technology and computer software is available to determine eligibility for programs and other administrative functions. State determination of eligibility for Medicaid may also make it easier for the state to meet upcoming deadlines under the federal health care reform law. Implementation: Executive Order	Currently under Review	VML
152	3. Restoration of Local Social Services Administrative Funds-budget reductions, underfunding and unfunded mandates: The economic recession has had a definite impact on the rapidly escalating case loads for Local Departments of Social Services (LDSS). Many have seen increases ranging from 20-50%, but simultaneously we are dealing with budget and hiring freezes, staff reductions, and budget reductions. The budget reductions being experienced by LOSS are from all levels of government; local, state and federal. The net effect of this confluence of events has not only taxed our dwindling resources, but has also had a profound effect on dedicated and hard working frontline staff and managers. Although all divisions, departments and agencies of the Commonwealth have been hit with funding and staff reductions, the LOSS have been placed in a financial vice-grip through the aforementioned financial losses and the increased request for services from the citizens of the Commonwealth. Commissioner Martin D. Brown for the Virginia Department of Social Services (VOSS) recently appealed to the Senate Finance Subcommittee for Health and Human Services to restore the Fiscal Year 2012 five percent (5%) administrative reduction. The restoration of these funds would be greatly appreciated along with holding LDSS exempt from any further reductions for the duration of this economic recovery; and receiving emergency relief in the terms of additional dollars to provide for the needs of the needy citizens of the Commonwealth of Virginia.	Currently under Review	Portsmouth
133	5. Welfare reform requires that children who receive TANF be immunized and that the caretakers be sanctioned if these immunizations are not completed. Benefits staff requests this information periodically from the parent/caretaker. If the information is not received, the BPS must follow-up and make calls to the parent/caretaker in order to secure the information. Although our TANF rolls are relatively stable, when combined with the management of SNAP and Medicaid cases, this activity is time consuming. No additional funding has been provided for this activity.	Currently under Review	Lynchburg DSS

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: DSS			
130	1. The Code of Virginia requires that this Department have sufficient staff to manage the work. However, in FY 2012, the General Assembly decreased the funding to the administrative budget lines for both Benefits and Services staff. This has caused an additional burden to fall to the City of Lynchburg.	Currently under Review	Lynchburg DSS
113	Child Welfare Programs. The State and localities have embarked on a transformation of child welfare services. Consultation from the Casey Foundation has provided the direction and the training for new best practices. This effort has improved services on the local level but has increased the amount of time that staff has to spend on each case to provide services and document the services. The transformation has been a very effective and long overdue emphasis on improving services for our vulnerable children and families, but no new funding for staff is a part of the effort. Similar to eligibility determination described above, requirements have been added but no new funding has been provided by the State. The local share of costs has increased each year. This is an example of a mandate that initiated a new and better policy; but it is also an example of a case where the State should be a true partner and pay its fair share.	Currently under Review	Falls Church
165	The State requires persons incapacitated to receive guardianships. A Circuit Court judge decides whether a person is incapacitated and appoints a guardian through the City's Adult Protective Services. This court-ordered guardianship is mandated but unfunded. The total annual cost is $70,000. Typically, the City's share of funding is 34%. State Code Requiring Mandate: 37.1-134.6 Estimated Annual Impact: $46,200 (66% of $70,000)	Currently under Review	Virginia Beach
98	Energy Assistance (heating and cooling assistance for low income families) Energy Assistance components have pre-set days for processing each year. Cooling applications are taken from 06/15 thru 08/15 and heating from the second Tuesday in October until the last Friday in November. The Crisis component of energy assistance runs from November until March 15th each year. Staff normally has two weeks from date of closing of the components to input all eligibility data. Because of the depressed economy, Human Services is experiencing an unusually large volume of applications. State funding does not provide sufficient staffing to address stringent eligibility processes.	Currently under Review	City of Chesapeake
132	4. Benefits staff is required to inform applicants about voting and to offer the opportunity to register to vote. In addition to offering this explanation and registration opportunity, Benefits staff must also keep track of the number of registrations completed in the Department and must ensure that these documents are sent to the City of Lynchburg Voter Registrar in a timely manner. This often takes 10 to 15 minutes of additional time during the interview and another several minutes to compile the information for reporting following the interview. This time adds up during the day when staff is interviewing up to 25 applicants and 50 or more renewal clients each day. No additional funding has been provided for this activity.	Currently under Review	Lynchburg DSS
97	Eligibility Regulations for Medicaid All Medicaid applications must be processed within 45 days with the exception of those for pregnant women whose applications have a 10 day processing time frame. The 45 day limit for Medicaid is very hard to meet due to the complexity of the program and the numerous covered groups that have to be evaluated before a customer can be enrolled. Deadlines were diffi cult to meet when the economy was good; under current economic conditions, the agency staff is overwhelmed. Further regulations require the review of open Medicaid cases within thirty days of t he renewal date. Because of the depressed economy, Human Services is experiencing an unusually large volume of applications. State funding does not provide sufficient staffing to address stringent eligibility and review processes.	Currently under Review	City of Chesapeake

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: DSS			
96	Eligibility Regulations for SNAP Eligibility regulations for Supplemental Nutrition Programs (SNAP) require agency determination of eligibility within 30 days for regular applications and within 7 days for expedited applications. Expedited processes are required where gross weekly income is $150 or less and liquid assets are less than $100. Expedited processes also apply when monthly housing costs exceed gross monthly income and liquid resources. The vast majority of applications meet the expedited requirements and agency staff has only 7 days to determine eligibility. Because of the depressed economy, Human Services is experiencing an unusually large volume of applications. State funding does not provide sufficient staffing to address stringent eligibility processes.	Currently under Review	City of Chesapeake
95	Eligibility Regulations for TANF Eligibility regulations for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) require agency response to al l applications within 30 days, down from 45 days in the past. Because of the depressed economy, Human Services is experiencing an unusually large volume of applications. State funding does not provide sufficient staffing to address st ringent eligibility processes.	Currently under Review	City of Chesapeake
91	In addition to the suggestions made above with respect to eligibility, child welfare, and FPMs, there are a number of issues with respect mandates for social service programs that should be reviewed by the Task Force:. Examples of these are the following: • The State requires localities to have sufficient staff to manage the work of its social services departments, yet the General Assembly reduces ftmding provided to localities for this purpose; the cost is thus transfened to the localities. • The State requires localities to take responsibility indigent burials, yet it has terminated funding traditionally appropriated for this purpose; again, the cost is transferred to the localities. Alexandria paid $33,500 for 27 indigent burials or cremations in FY 2011 (note that even when the State did provide funding for this, it limited it to $5001burial or cremation). • Localities provide mandated services that are not reimbursed, such as paper applications for those without computers, and voter registration services, and immunization services for children who receive T ANF benefits.	Currently under Review	City of Alexandria
86	Child Welfare Programs. The State and localities have embarked on a transformation of child welfare services. Consultation from the Casey Foundation has provided the direction and the training for new best practices. This effort has improved services on the local level but has increased the amount of time that staff has to spend on each case to provide services and document the services. The transformation has been a very effective and long overdue emphasis on improving services for our vulnerable children and families, but no new funding for staff is a part of the effort. Similar to eligibility determination described above, requirements have been added but no new funding has been provided by the State. The local share of costs has increased each year. This is an example of a mandate that initiated a new and better policy; but it is also an example of a case where the State should be a true partner and pay its fair share.	Currently under Review	City of Alexandria
85	Eligibility Determination for Safety Net Programs. There are significant regulations related to determining eligibility for all safety net programs, and a number of these are State-driven. New requirements are added without additional funding added to administer the programs and determine eligibility. Caseloads have risen dramatically and there has been no funding assistance provided from the State level. The State is cognizant of this problem and has been working on technology solutions that could assist in managing the growing caseloads. The development of customer portals where applications, changes etc. will be able to be completed by clients online is very encouraging. The portals are to become operational in the Spring. We do not know at this point if this will help management at the local level but it appears promising. The State has taken over and streamlined the process for child care payments and this new process will go into effect in Alexandria this winter. Similar enhanced automation processes should be implemented for Medicaid eligibility determination.	Currently under Review	City of Alexandria

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: DSS			
307	o Local governments pay a healthy portion of the state's Medicaid match for certain youth in this program. The portion paid by local governments has increased over the life of this program, which began in the early 1990s. The state pays the Medicaid match for other service areas and should do so for this program.	Currently under Review	Scott County
316	DSS - increase state funding for cost of staff and operations of benefits and service programs	Currently under Review	Smythe County
317	DSS - request state funding of local assistance with TANF, SNAP, and/or Medicaid	Currently under Review	Smythe County
47	Eliminate duplicate data entry for Virginia Medicaid applicants. The Virginia Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) is used by local agencies to add newly eligible persons to the Medicaid system, but it cannot track whether Medicaid applications are being processed in a timely fashion. So localities are required to enter duplicate information into a separate State system known as Medicaid Pending (Medpend). Staff must reenter much of the applicant data and remember to go back to enter the disposition date. Medpend will not take an entry if another Virginia locality has entered the person previously so staff must contact the other locality for them to delete the previous entry. Medpend entries are included in calculating local Medicaid funding. This duplicate entry requirement was a temporary 6-month "fix" starting 15 years ago.	Currently under Review	County Manager Arlington County
99	Child Protective Services Human Services does not have sufficient staff to accommodate several new "mandated processes," including Safe Measures, Differential Response, Family Partnership Meetings, increased visitation requirements for foster care, and other Transformation components. The new process require added staff time and work, but the state has not recognized the need to hire additional staff to provide these expanded services. We agree that the state mandated changes are needed and will enhance the services that prevent out of home placements of children and to strengthen families. But we need funding to provide adequate staff, and this has been documented in several researched based studies. In short, agencies need additional staff and resources to implement and maintain excellent performance in our child welfare programs. New state mandated automation system: Each program that we are implementing is automated and the State dictates what computer system must be used. In the past, workers were able to tape their work and the transcribing unit would type it into the record. The new computerized information systems requ ire more staff time and are less efficient than the former processes.	Currently under Review	City of Chesapeake
234	• Increase State funding for the cost of staff and operations for benefit programs and service programs within Local Departments of Social Services (DSS). Local DSS continue to absorb significant increases in caseloads and work demands without any increase in state administrative funding.	Currently under Review	Stafford County
190	4. SHHR.DSS068 (pg.Sl) - State/Local Hospitalization Program Eligibility Local social services agencies are required to detennine eligibility upon application by local residents for assistance from the StatelLocal Hospitalization Program administered by the Department of Medical Assistance Services. Eliminating this mandate would provide a clear direction to localities in determining the necessary allocation of resources for this program.	Currently under Review	Henrico County

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: DSS			
235	• Fund the requirement for Local DSS to assist applicants for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (T ANF), Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and/or Medicaid with registering to vote. This is not a core function of social services and given DSS' significant caseload, it adds unnecessarily to the time spent with each applicant.	Currently under Review	Stafford County
236	Simplify the funding process. The monthly reimbursement submission process is cumbersome and time-consuming. An annual allocation formula (with revisions as necessary) could remove some of the administrative burden.	Currently under Review	Stafford County
218	New Kent County is required to participate in the State/Local Hospitalization Program. Localities are required to provide funds for a share of the total costs to provide hospital and medical care to qualified applicants. This should be a decision left up to the local governing body.	Currently under Review	New Kent County
237	Simplify the funding process, part 2. DSS must issue a check for every expenditure submitted for reimbursement. Several activities (phones-multiple bills, fuel, fleet services, etc.) cause Finance, Social Services, and the Treasurer to handle the transactions several times.	Currently under Review	Stafford County
195	[See King William County's submission on the Task Force website - KWC submitted a listing of most all DSS programs with citations]	Currently under Review	King William County
Subject Area: LVA			
168	State Aid to Libraries Description: The State mandates various services for libraries (State Certified Librarian, Library Operations Standards, Virginia Public Records Act, and Library Acceptable Internet Use Policy). Yet, State Aid to Libraries has been reduced by $140,000 since FY 2001-02. State Code Requiring Mandate: SOE.LVA001; SOE.LVA003; SOE.LVA005; SOE.LVA006 Estimated Annual Impact: $140,000 (approximate)	Currently under Review	Virginia Beach
363	Record keeping and retention requirements-- In general, these requirements are near impossible to meet, over burdensome, redundant, and resource consuming with little to no use served. Reform the state record keeping and retention requirements. SOE.LVA005	Currently Under Review	

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: LVA			
148	III. Library Department In reviewing mandates that are overly burdensome, fiscally and administratively, maintaining the current requirements for the following six (6) items are of concern to the operation of the City'S library services: I. Maintaining the requirement that a Library Director must be State certified. 2. Maintaining current requirements for Library Operations Standards. 3. Maintaining current requirements for Planning and Development Standards for Public Library Services. 4. Maintaining the requirements currently in place of the Virginia Public Records Act. 5. Maintaining the requirements currently in place for Library Acceptance Internet Use Policy. 6. Maintaining the mandates allowing local governments to choose to operate libraries in another way divorced from State aid. Items #2 and #3 are directly tied to State Aid to Public Libraries for which in FY 11 Portsmouth received $152,856. Any absence of these items would have the potential to significantly impact the quality of services provided to our citizens. Furthermore, eroding these requirements would impact the kind of person responsible for the department, the standards set for libraries and ensuring the safe use of the Internet. A decline in the quality of service that is provided to the citizens will diminish the City's goal of providing lifelong learning opportunities, which in turn generates a thriving community. Furthermore, loss of these two items would equate to a negative financial impact on the City because local libraries must meet State requirements for personnel, materials and operating procedures. Local governments are also mandated to follow the standards set by the State Library Board. Therefore, any loss of State revenue for these items that should not be relaxed nor eliminated will only serve to further financially burden localities adding to the list of unfunded State mandates.	Currently under Review	Portsmouth
Subject Area: NO AGENCY - PLANNING & ZONING			
35	Land Use/Zoning-Wireless Telecommunications Antenna Sites--current code requires that all applications for antennas be decided within 150 days for a new tower or 90 days for a co-located antenna. It also prohibits denying the application based on already existent wireless service. This places an unecessary burden on local governments and should be a decision the government makes, not the state. Hampton has 1 staff person tasked with this and many other duties. Having a longer deadline would help to prioritize tasks. federal mandate - NSO.111 - No state oversight	Currently under Review	City Manager City of Hampton
Subject Area: NO AGENCY - PUBLIC SAFETY OVERTIME			
25	The State shold elminate the mandate to pay fire fighters and EMTs overtime based on total paid hours as opposed to actual hours worked as required by FLSA. This State requirement costs the Fire Department approximately $400,000 per year in additional overtime and creates a higher level of benefit for fire fighters and EMT's than is available to other employees. No. Amend the Code section to comply with FLSA and to specifically state that overtime shall be based on actual hours worked not to include paid leave time taken. Code of Virginia ? 9.1-701. Overtime compensation rate	Currently under Review	Legislative Liaison City of Newport News
Subject Area: NO AGENCY - REPORTING			
352	There are a number of reporting and administrative requirements that are costly and time consuming. Examples include recycling reports and required advertising of public notices in newspapers when a majority of citizens receive their news by other less costly and more effective means. It is recommended that there be a comprehensive review to determine the need for such requirements. Any that could be eliminated would improve the efficiency of both state and local government.	Currently under Review	York County

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: NO AGENCY - REPORTING			
53	There are a number of reporting and administrative requirements that are costly and time con-suming. Examples include recycling reports and required advertising of public notices in news-papers when a majority of citizens receive their news by other less costly and more effective means. It is recommended that there be a comprehensive review to determine the need for such requirements. Any that could be eliminated would improve the efficiency of both state and local government.	Currently under Review	County Administrator York County
60	Reporting Except for taxes, make reporting to the State biennial rather than annual, i.e. fire program funds, emergency medical service funds, regional competitiveness grants, derelict structure grants, cash proffers received & expenditures, and always allow electronic filing rather than paper/fax filing.	Currently under Review	County Manager Arlington County
Subject Area: SUPCT			
365	Circuit Court Fee Collection--current law requires that circuit court clerks assess and collect a $10 fee per transaction that is then remitted to the supreme court. The circuit clerk must also purchase equipment and supplies from the supreme court. It is unequitable to require the circuit court clerks to collect fees for the supreme court then charge the clerks for supplies and equipment they are legally obligated to purchase from the supreme court. a portion of the fees collect should be retained by the circuit court clerks to assist in paying for purchases from the supreme court. § 17.1-502	Currently Under Review	
Subject Area: Unclaimed Property			
43	Unclaimed Property--current code requires that localities identify, collect, and return property that has been held for specified dormancy periods to rightful owners. Property held more than 1 year must be reported and remitted. This is a very time consuming task and has little to no benefit to the public. Establish a threshold ($25) under which this mandate would not apply. FOIA	Currently under Review	County Manager County of Henrico
Subject Area: VDH VITA			
367	VITA Health Department--current code requires that health departments paid by the cooperative budget utilize IT services provided by VITA. VITA recently outsourced their IT services to Northrop Grumman and the costs have risen significantly. Modify mandate to allow the local health departments to determine which IT service is best for them. ITEM 66-from Mandates Identified for Potential Elimination by the Task Force and Comments from Agencies and Public	Currently Under Review	
Subject Area: VDOT			
187	8. Work In Street Permits: New VDOT permitting fees and requirements have made it significantly more expensive for local utilities to maintain facilities located in VDOT right-of-ways. A less expensive general permit would be helpful to localities that work in VDOT right-of-ways.	Currently under Review	Hanover County
139	VDOT red tape: Localities must complete countless forms and procedures anytime we have a grant or are doing a new construction project. The paperwork could easily be streamlined. Submittal dates for status reports could be uniform so that local staff would know when information is due.	Currently under Review	Poquoson

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: VDOT			
203	POTENTIAL FUTURE CONCERNS Transportation Related: I. Urban Street Payments - Recent developments at the State level suggest that payments could be reduced for urban streets which would indicate the potential for incremental "devolution." 2. Corridors of Statewide Significance - The implications of this mandate are vague, particularly with respect to recent developments concerning the north-south corridor identified by the Commonwealth Transportation Board. Local transportation planning as addressed by local governing bodies must playa large part in any future development of these corridors. 3. Subdivision Street Development Control - This potential mandate on its surface will likely require additional costs to local governments for this state responsibility. 4. Transportation Enhancement Program - Reported changes to the transportation enhancement program may impact local government's ability to certain community based transportation related projects. 5. Bridge Safety Inspection Standards - This mandate may suggest that local governments are required to inspect all bridges and culverts on public roads. This is normally a state responsibility.	Currently under Review	Loudoun County
46	Allow greater efficiency and a more cost effective VDOT project delivery process by eliminating redundant plan review and permitting processes, and implementing statewide VDOT urban design standards.	Currently under Review	County Manager Arlington County
34	Local Use of Transportation Funds?? Current mandates require oversight from VDOT on certain local road projects. This mandate is unnecessary as it only adds additional personnel to a road project and local officials could be trained and perform the same oversight duties as VDOT officials while not tying up VDOT resources. Modify. Currently VDOT has certification for UCI Cities, but it is very difficult to achieve; only 1 city has been certified to date. This process needs to be relaxed and easier to achieve. From First Interim Report to the Governor STO.VDOT022	Currently under Review	City Manager City of Hampton
Subject Area: VDOT - 527			
149	1. Eliminate the VDOT "527" plan review and traffic impact statement process (Reference Virginia State Code Section 15.2-2222)	Currently under Review	Portsmouth
Subject Area: VDOT - Devolution			
343	In reviewing Montgomery County's letter, I would like to reiterate that shifting the responsibility of secondary road maintenance to localities would be a very expensive and complicated burden to place on localities.	Currently under Review	Wise County
207	To begin the process of eliminating burdensome local mandate s, stop any discussion now and in the future of shifting the responsibility of secondary road maintenance to localities. We believe the shifting of responsibili ty for transporta tion is an area of critical concern to local governments.	Currently under Review	Montgomery County

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: VDOT - Devolution			
299	Devolution: It is not fiscally prudent to proceed with this plan (i) without bringing roads up to required standards, (ii) without expanding local replacement revenue authority, and (iii) without addressing the costs to the taxpayers of Virginia and inefficiencies of duplication arising from over 100 local transportation departments. This plan will only increase the costs to the taxpayers of Virginia by shifting required and necessary transportation costs onto the backs of the residential real estate taxpayer and homeowner. Based on information provided by VDOT, Roanoke County can expect to realize additional annual "net" costs of $4.6 million (2011 dollars) for maintenance, operations, and construction. These costs equate to an increase of 5.7 cents on the real estate tax rate. In addition, start-up costs associated with the proposal are estimated to be $11.2 million.	Currently under Review	Roanoke County
90	Any legislation shifting responsibility for secondary roads onto counties. Counties like Chesterfield are very aware that the state would not consider giving up authority for these roads unless the funding situation was desperate. Not only do we not have funds to handle the on-going maintenance, the roads themselves are in deteriorated condition and the funds needed to bring them up to acceptable standards is extremely high.	Currently under Review	Chesterfield County
291	1. Devolution. The County opposes any legislation or regulations that would require the transfer of responsibility to localities for construction, maintenance or operation of new and existing roads without providing a complete, consistent, pennanent funding source and competent technical assistance to help with local implementation.	Currently under Review	Powhatan County
Subject Area: VDOT - Funding			
248	2) VDOT Urban Maintenance Funding - Preliminary reports have been released that the State is considering reducing road maintenance funds to municipalities through lowering the per mile funding for local roads. While VDOT does not prioritize maintenance on roads with this classification, the citizenry of local governments reside on these street and deserve local streets that are pothole free and cleared of snow. Reduction of maintenance funding will have a dramatic impact on local governments continuing to provide the level of service expectations of our citizens.	Currently under Review	Town of Front Royal
125	Primary and Secondary Road Funding As a city, we receive funds under the VDOT Urban Allocation Program. These funds are not keeping up with inflation in regards to maintenance of roads, paving costs, snow removal, etc. With discussions at the legislative level of passing along costs for secondary road costs to local governments, the state is effectively mandating local governments to recover this revenue from another source such as our citizens. Proposed reductions for FY13 are approximately 20% of our total allocation.	Currently under Review	City of Galax

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: VDOT - Funding			
138	Road maintenance funding: We are required to construct and maintain roads to VDOT standards, yet the state is cutting funds, so we don't have enough money to maintain the streets per VDOT requirements.	Currently under Review	Poquoson
140	VDOT/regional transportation funds allocation process: Creates a huge regional bureaucracy that favors larger cities and interstate projects at the expense of small communities.	Currently under Review	Poquoson
146	2. Do not implement any VDOT proposal to reduce road maintenance payments for cities and towns. This move, if implemented it would represent more than a $2 million hit to the City of Portsmouth	Currently under Review	Portsmouth
Subject Area: VDOT - Illegal Signs			
175	Removal of Illegal Signs from VDOT Right-of-way STO.VDOT038 Comment: Currently we remove and destroy. It should be the responsibility of the sign owner to discover the proper location to place signs. Removal and holding for 5 days impacts costs of labor and management systems.	Currently under Review	Frederick County
Subject Area: VDOT - Plan review			
57	VDOT Plan Review Processes Allow greater efficiency and a more cost effective VDOT project delivery process by eliminating redundant plan review and permitting processes, and implementing statewide VDOT urban design standards.	Currently under Review	County Manager Arlington County
Subject Area: VDOT - Planning			
368	Six Year Secondary Improvement Plan--current code requires that local governments publish a 6 year plan that outlines secondary road improvements. This is unnecessary when there is no funding for these planned improvements. Eliminate. STO.VDOT023	Currently Under Review	
224	Coordination of State and Local Transportation Planning New Kent County must submit comprehensive plans, plan amendments and rezoning proposals that substantially affect transportation on a state-controlled highway to VDOT for review and comment. In addition, a traffic impact analysis must be prepared and submitted for most rezoning requests and small area plans for urban development areas or transit oriented developments. This slows down the review and permitting process.	Currently under Review	New Kent County
Subject Area: VDOT - Revenue Sharing Program			
81	The VDOT revenue-sharing program should become a grant program with no administrative interference or deduction of VDOT administrative costs from the funding. Localities should certify compliance with all appropriate regulations and policies when the projects are completed.	Currently under Review	Chesterfield County
Subject Area: VRS - Funding			

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: VRS - Funding			
240	The "borrowing" of funds from VRS by the Governor and Legislature has now resulted in placing the burden on local budgets to "pay back" in the form of higher VRS employer contribution rates. We have been informed that our VRS employer share will likely increase 10-12% for the coming budget year (additional funds needed of approximately $175,000, assuming no salary increase). This, in combination with the change in our Composite Index announced yesterday by DOE will result in a sharp increase in local funds needed to maintain level funding (additional funds needed of approximately $360,000).	Currently under Review	Prince Edward County Schools
258	• Employee Retirement System: INDVRS001 The current cost to the Town (employer portion only) is 9.80% of payroll. The Town of Vienna's membership is irrevocable, leaving Vienna unable to explore other retirement plan options for its employees.	Currently under Review	Town of Vienna
296	Roanoke County requests the General Assembly to fulfill its responsibility by adequateiy funding VRS as recommended by its actuaries and restores VRS to an actuarially sound status; also, requests the General Assembly to maintain local discretionary authority to determine the share paid by local government employees and school board employees.	Currently under Review	Roanoke County
284	Virginia Retirement System. The County opposes any legislation which reduces the State's financial responsibility to fully fund the Virginia Retirement System. The cost of the mandated Virginia Retirement System continues to increase at the local level.	Currently under Review	Powhatan County
Subject Area: VRS - LEORS			
302	Law Enforcement Officers Retirement Program Required by the state for sheriff's deputies and regional jail employees, this is a retirement program with enhanced benefits. Initial indication was that the state would pay a portion of the additional costs; however, that has not been the case.	Currently under Review	Scott County
Subject Area: VRS - LODA			
345	• Line of Duty Act- Eliminate the local funding requirement for the Line of Duty benefit;	Currently under Review	Wise County
61	Line of Duty Act Modify the Line of Duty program so that it remains an obligation of the State, or if the obligation remains local, the localities should be able to define who is covered and how.	Currently under Review	County Manager Arlington County
349	The Line of Duty Act was a program established by the General Assembly as a state paid benefit program. The understanding was that the state would always pay the costs of providing the benefit. The state should honor this commitment and reverse the decision to require local fundmg.	Currently under Review	York County
336	LINE OF DUTY ACT: DELETE LOCAL FUNDING REQUIREMENT FOR LINE OF DUTY BENEFIT.	Currently under Review	Washington County
321	Line of Duty - remove requirement that emergency personnel be paid benefits	Currently under Review	Smythe County

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: VRS - LODA			
18	LODA - This was a state paid benefits program and localities were never told that the state would always pay the bill for the program. The General Assembly expanded the personnel covered and the level of benefits and now, when the State cannot afford it, passed the program on to the localities for payment. In addition, the state is still retaining authority over the administration of these benefits.	Currently under Review	Middlesex County
232	• Delete local funding requirement for Line of Duty Act benefit. The 2010 General Assembly included budget language transitioning the Line of Duty Act benefit in FY12 from a fully state-funded program to one paid by local governments and state agencies.	Currently under Review	Stafford County
62	Line of Duty Act The 2010 General Assembly included budget language transitioning the costs of the Line of Duty Act to local governments while still allowing the state to continue administration of the program. The localities had no input into design of the LODA benefits program or on eligibility, but are being asked to fully fund its costs now that the program has grown beyond what the state is willing to pay. The Commonwealth should pay for the program, make LODA coverage optional at the local level, or allow localities to design the program specific to local needs. In addition, LODA administration should fall under the State Workers Compensation Commission and not under the State Comptroller's Office if it continues to be a state-administered program.	Currently under Review	County Administrator (Former) Bedford County
197	Line-of-Duty Act (LODA) - This program requires payments to public safety employees and their families if they are killed or disabled in the line-of-duty. Although this program has many merits, it was transferred wholesale to local governments. Further irony with this transferred mandate is that the payments to any beneficiaries funded by individual localities will still be made by the Commonwealth and not the local government. This mandate is estimated to cost Loudoun County at least $105,000 based upon past experience.	Currently under Review	Loudoun County
263	• Delete local funding requirement for Line of Duty benefit. The 2010 General Assembly included budget language transitioning the Line of Duty benefit in FY 2012 from a fully state funded program to one paid by local governments and state agencies. The program is administered by the state and many local governments opting to self fund need the authorization to administer the program.	Currently under Review	VACo
162	Line of Duty Credit Description: State Code Requiring Mandate: The Line-of-Duty Health Care pays for health care for sworn-job related disability retirees (and qualified dependents), who are considered disabled in the line of duty; this payment for health care includes Medicare Gap coverage beyond the age of 65. Beginning in FY 12, the General Assembly shifted this cost to localities. State Code Requiring Mandate: 2011 Acts of the General Assembly, Chapter 890, Item 258 Estimated Annual Impact: $621,00 in FY 13 rising to $1.1 million in FY 15	Currently under Review	Virginia Beach
182	Delete local funding requirement for Line of Duty benefit. The 2010 General Assembly included budget language transitioning the Line of Duty benefit in FY 2012 from a fully state funded program to one paid by local governments and state agencies.	Currently under Review	Hanover County
259	• Line of Duty Act Benefits: INDVRS002 The benefits provided under this plan have been expanded over time by the State without the input of the Town. This was previously funded 100% by the State. As of July 1, 2011, 100% of this program's costs have been passed on to Vienna and other local jurisdictions with no ability to control the program's scope or design.	Currently under Review	Town of Vienna

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: VRS - LODA			
275	2. Line of Duty Act Administrative Challenges Description: These state-created benefits were enacted with the understanding that the state would pay for it. The state has shifted the funding responsibility for the program to local governments. The General Assembly has provided local governments the opportunity to make an irrevocable choice to either pay VRS to administer a local government's LODA program or to have another party do so. Proposal: VML and VACo recommend the attached paper (Appendix A) as a prescription for making the administration and management of LODA programs as efficient and effective as possible. These recommendations do not change the state's policy decision to transfer the funding responsibility. Implementation: Legislation	Currently under Review	VML
147	2. Transferring the cost of benefits under the Line of Duty Act from the State to localities for public safety employees who are injured or die in the line of duty, which now includes paid employees and volunteers presents an undue financial burden on the City.	Currently under Review	Portsmouth
280	Delete local funding requirements for Lone of Duty benefit. The 2010 General Assembly included budget language transitioning the Lone of Duty benefit in FY 2012 from a fully state funded program to one paid by local goverrnnents and state agencies. The program is administered by the state, and many local goverrnnents opted to self-fund need the authorization to administer the program	Currently under Review	Warren County
285	Line of Duty Act. Line of Duty Costs for career and volunteer members beginning July 1, 2011. This is a new and very costly obligation for localities and the state retained the administration of the benefits of this program. In addition, coverage for volunteers was added and this increased the cost that was pushed to localities as well.	Currently under Review	Powhatan County
136	Line of Duty: In FY 12, the Line of Duty costs became the respunsibility of each locality. The State 'still maintains all control over the program with the localities having no input on this matter. The'$12;000 that we pay t6 the State for the Line ot:Duty includes a payback of benefits for FY 2011.	Currently under Review	Poquoson
293	Line of Duty Act General Assembly included budget language transitioning I Code of Virginia §§ 9.1-400 et. seq; Item the Line of Duty benefit in FY 2012 from a fully state 258, Chapter 890, 2011 Acts of Assembly funded program to one paid by local governments and state agencies. Expenditure budget for FY 12 is $186,000	Currently under Review	Roanoke County
92	Line of Duty benefits for public safety personnel In this case, the General Assembly balances the state budget by transferring the cost of a popular and here-to-fore state funded program on local governments. Originally this benefit was for volunteer public safety personnel, but was later expanded to include paid employees for whom other benefits already existed. If the Assembly wishes to provide generous benefits to public safety personnel who are injured or die in the line of duty, it should do so with state funds. Estimated annual impact: first year - $275,000; sixth year - $964,000	Currently under Review	City of Chesapeake

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: VRS - LODA			
256	IND.VRS002 Line of Duty Act Benefits and 599 Funding: This state created benefit was established by the state with the intention for it to be funded by the state. The state shifted this funding responsibility to the local governments while at the same time decreasing the 599 funding to local law enforcement. While these cuts have a direct impact on the Town of Victoria additionally our regional police academy had a reduction of $692,425 from FY 2002-2012 which equals a 58.23% reduction. As we all know most of these reductions are passed down to its members by fee increases. Typically during hard economic times it is well documented that crimes will increase and as such these programs should not be cut. The Victoria Town Council request that LODA and 599 Funding be reinstated by the state.	Currently under Review	Town of Victoria
74	Delete local funding requirement for Line of Duty Act benefit – Savings $40,000 per year. The 2010 General Assembly included budget language transitioning the cost of the Line of Duty Act to local governments while still allowing the state to administer the program with no local determination on eligibility or program design. The localities had no input into the design of the LODA benefits program, but are being asked to fund thecosts now that the program has expenditures beyond what the state wants to pay. The state should pay for the program, make LODA coverage optional at the local level, or provide localities the option to design the program specific to local needs. Additionally, LODA administration should fall under the State Workers Compensation Commission and not under the State Comptroller's Office if it continues to be a state administered program.	Currently under Review	County Administrator Campbell County
117	Line of Duty Act Delete local funding requirement for Line of Duty benefit. The 2010 General Assembly included budget language transitioning the Line of Duty benefit in FY 2012 from a fully state funded program to one paid by local governments and state agencies. The program is administered by the state with little to no information regarding claims or investigations provided to the localities that must bear this cost. If there is no desire by the State to assume this cost again, at the very least the program should be modified to exclude lifetime health insurance benefits for spouses, clarification of how volunteers are affected, etc.	Currently under Review	City of Galax
112	2. Line of Duty Act. This is one of the best examples in recent years of a mandate that the State put into the Code, as good public policy paid for by the State, but shifted to localities with no funding. The Line of Duty Act requires payments to public safety officials and their families if they are killed or disabled in the line of duty. The State initiated the program some 30 years ago and fully covered its cost. When State revenues fell in recent years, it shifted the responsibility for paying for this multi-million dollar program to localities.	Currently under Review	Falls Church
105	Line of Duty Act -- Our position is that financial responsibility for programs created and funded by the Commonwealth should not be .later imposed on local governments. The Line of Duty Act was created and funded by the Commonwealth without consultation or involvement with local. governments. Recent legislation has shifted the burden for funding the program to local governments. The City of Danville's costs to administer this program are difficult to forecast, but expenses this year alone could easily reach $150,000. We request that the Commonwealth rescind this unfunded mandate on local governments.	Currently under Review	Danville
100	Line of Duty Act There is legislation that is passing this expense to the localities which will create more long-term liabilities on the localities while reducing 599 funding.	Currently under Review	Colonial Heights
245	• Line of Duty Act benefit payments administration by non-participating employers should be allowed	Currently under Review	Town of Colonial Beach

ID#	Issue	Status:	Submitted by:
Subject Area: VRS - LODA			
204	In regards to the Line of Duty Act funding (IND.VRS002) - This was originally passed by the state and funded by the state, but in their effort to reduce state funding obligations, the funding obligation was shifted to localities. Additionally, any pre-existing cases that were active within the LODA system had the funding burden shifted to the locality should the locality choose to use a non-VRS carrier. We ask that state funding be restored and this burden be taken off of localities.	Currently under Review	Town of Culpeper
126	Rescind the requirement that localities pay for expenses related to the Line of Duty Act. The act is legislation adopted by the General Assembly without input from the localities and, until recently, has been funded by the State.	Currently under Review	Lynchburg
210	• Line of Duty Act -eliminate the local funding requirement for the Line of Duty benefit;	Currently under Review	Montgomery County
84	Line of Duty Act. This is one of the best examples in recent years of a mandate that the State put into the Code, as good public policy paid for by the State, but shifted to localities with no funding. The Line of Duty Act requires payments to public safety officials and their families if they are killed or disabled in the line of duty. The State initiated the program some 30 years ago and fully covered its cost. When State revenues fell in recent years, it shifted the responsibility for paying for this multi-million dollar program to localities.	Currently under Review	City of Alexandria
303	FY 12 – Localities were required to take on full payment of this benefit for all local volunteer and paid personnel who work in hazardous positions. This mandate cost us an additional $22,365. Additionally, it has added administrative duties to our employees.	Currently under Review	Scott County
77	When the Line of Duty Act was passed by the General Assembly, it was a state paid benefits program for public safety personnel. Localities were told that the state would always pay the bill when localities protested about potential costs. The General Assembly expanded both the personnel covered (volunteers as well as employed) and the level of benefits (lifetime health care benefits for surviving dependents). Now that costs have risen exponentially, the program has been shifted to every local government for payment. This is the most expensive example of a new unfunded mandate in recent years. In addition, while shifting costs to local governments, the state retained authority over the administration of these benefits. Separating responsibility for administration from the costs is inappropriate. We suggest the Governor reverse this and fund the benefits in his budget.	Currently under Review	Chesterfield County
193	• Rescind the requirement that localities pay for benefits related to the Line of Duty Act. This is a benefit program created by the State. While the Code of Virginia still requires administration that benefits under the Act be paid out of the state treasury, budget changes have shifted funding to localities.	Currently under Review	Henrico County