

townhall.virginia.gov

Periodic Review and Small Business Impact Findings Where Result is "Retain the Regulation As Is"

Agency name	Board for Waterworks and Wastewater Works Operators and Onsite Sewage System Professionals
Virginia Administrative Code (VAC) citation	18 VAC160-20
Regulation title	Waterworks and Wastewater Works Operators and Onsite Sewage System Professionals
Date	February 5, 2016

This information is required pursuant to Executive Order 17 (2014).

Legal basis

Please identify the state and/or federal legal authority for the regulation, including: 1) the most relevant law and/or regulation; and 2) promulgating entity, i.e., agency, board, or person.

§ 54.1-201.5 of the Code of Virginia (<u>http://leg1.state.va.us/cgi-bin/legp504.exe?000+cod+54.1-201</u>) states that the Board has the power and duty "To promulgate regulations in accordance with the Administrative Process Act (§ 2.2-4000 et seq.) necessary to assure continued competency, to prevent deceptive or misleading practices by practitioners and to effectively administer the regulatory system administered by the regulatory board."

§ 54.1-2301 of the *Code of Virginia* (<u>http://leg1.state.va.us/cgi-bin/legp504.exe?000+cod+54.1-2301</u>) provides the authority for the Board to promulgate regulations for the licensure of onsite sewage system professionals, waterworks operators, and wastewater works operators. The content of the regulations is pursuant to the Board's discretion, but shall not be in conflict with the purposes of the statutory authority.



Please describe all viable alternatives for achieving the purpose of the existing regulation that have been considered as part of the periodic review process. Include an explanation of why such alternatives were rejected and why this regulation is the least burdensome alternative available for achieving the purpose of the regulation.

No viable alternatives for achieving the purpose of the existing regulation could be determined. The regulation enables the Board to fulfill the statutory requirements established in Chapter 2 and Chapter 23 of Title 54.1 of the Code of Virginia. Further, the regulation is necessary to ensure that the Board's statutory requirements are executed in the least burdensome and most efficient and cost effective manner possible while protecting the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Virginia.

Public comment

Please summarize all comments received during the public comment period following the publication of the Notice of Periodic Review, and provide the agency response. Please indicate if an informal advisory group was formed for purposes of assisting in the periodic review.

		-
Commenter	Summary of Comment	Agency Response
Bob Marshall,	The commenter provided the	The Board thanks the commenter for
Cloverleaf	following comments:	providing comments for consideration. It
Environmental		appears that several of the comments
Consulting, Inc.	-Repeal the Board's existing	provided do not pertain to the current
	regulations as it no longer protects	regulations, but to a separate regulatory
	public health, safety and welfare.	action for which there is an opportunity for
		public comment specific to those changes. In
	-Promulgate new regulations and	addition, other comments suggest changes to
	abandon the Board's authority to	the Board's statutory authority. Chapter 23 of
	promulgate regulations for the	Title 54.1 of the Code of Virginia mandates
	onsite sewage system	the Board for Waterworks and Wastewater
	professionals, specifically	Works Operators and Onsite Sewage System
	evaluators and installers.	Professionals establish a program for
		licensing individuals as onsite soil evaluators,
	-Withdraw the currently proposed	onsite sewage system installers, and onsite
	creation of two chapters, until	sewage system operators. The Board's
	inconsistencies regarding §54.1-	adherence to the above mandate is not
	2301 of the Code of Virginia are	discretionary. Any changes to the Board's
	eliminated.	statutory mandates would have to be made
		legislatively.
	-Proposed regulations will not	
	improve clarity of regulations, will	
	not ensure consistency with current	
	Board practices and legal	
	requirements, and blatantly	
	disregards standards of practice.	
	-Believes that the Periodic Review	
	is an excellent opportunity for the	
	Board to evaluate its active market	
	participants and any effects on	
	competition.	
Bob Marshall,	The commenter provided a graphic	The Board thanks the commenter.
Cloverleaf	regarding, "Essentialism".	

1	class of license thus placing an	
Robert Savage, Savage Onsite Septic, LLC	 undue burden and cost on citizen. The commenter provided the following comments: Recommends that the General Assembly and Governor McCauliffe (sic) remove the onsite soil evaluators from the Board and place them with the APELSCIDLA board. Such recommendation is based on the following rationale: onsite soil evaluators, through an exemption to the practice of engineering, have more in common with the APELSCIDLA Board and there appears to be a conflict with the WWWOOSSP Board to regulate the interest of those who install sewage systems and those who design them. The board has failed to address a conflict of interest that exists between the Virginia Health Department (VDH) who employees onsite soil evaluators as direct service providers and the private sector. The direct offering of design services by VDH incentives citizens to seek taxpayer subsidized rates offered by VDH wherein the private sector must charge 	The Board thanks the commenter for providing comments for consideration. Chapter 23 of Title 54.1 of the Code of Virginia mandates the Board for Waterworks and Wastewater Works Operators and Onsite Sewage System Professionals establish a program for licensing individuals as onsite soil evaluators, onsite sewage system operators. The Board's adherence to the above mandate is not discretionary. Any changes to the Board's statutory mandates would have to be made legislatively.
	a fair market rate for services to cover operating costs.	
Jeff T. Walker	The commenter provided the	The Board thanks the commenter for
Jen T. Warker	 The commenter provided the following comments: The Virginia Department of Planning and Budget Economic Impact Analysis dated August 18, 2015 is inadequate in regards to small businesses that employ onsite soil evaluators who are in 	The Board thanks the commenter for providing comments for consideration. Issues and concerns regarding the provision of design services by a public sector agency cannot be addressed via the Board's regulations, thus, it would not be appropriate for the Board to commence a regulatory action on issues outside of the Board's purview. In addition, it appears that several of the comments provided do not pertain to the current regulations, but to a separate

r		1 <u>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 </u>
	agency that provides	opportunity for public comment specific to
	subsidized design services.	those changes.
	These regulations lack	
	reference to standards of	
	practice, provisions for	
	disclosure of conflict of	
	interest, an appearance of	
	benefit to individuals and	
	organizations which offer	
	training to fulfill	
	requirements.	
	- The Board should be	
	disqualified from	
	promulgating any	
	amendments to the	
	regulations until an	
	investigation by the Office	
	of the Inspector General or	
	the appropriate responsible	
	party has addressed this	
	apparent conflict of interest.	
	- The largest design firm in	
	the state, which competes	
	with small businesses, has	
	undisclosed influence over	
	the Board. The result is	
	promulgation of dual	
	standards of entrance,	
	training, and class of	
	licensure not enabled by	
	legislation and which	
	contribute to the Virginia	
	Anti-trust Act §59.19.1 of	
	the Code of Virginia.	
	- The journeyman class of	
	Conventional Onsite Soil	
	Evaluator has no	
	requirements for education	
	and minimal need to	
	document training or	
	experience, nor any	
	guarantee of past or future	
	supervision.	
	 Requests redevelopment of 	
	Department of Planning	
	and Budget to return to the	
	issue and develop a study	
	in consistent(sic) with	
	applicable guidance and	
	code.	
Jeff Walker	The commenter provided the	The Board thanks the commenter for
	following comments:	providing comments for consideration. It
	 The proposed regulations 	appears that several of the comments
	should be amended.	provided do not pertain to the current
	 Documents obtained under 	regulations, but to a separate regulatory
	 Documents obtained under 	regulations, but to a separate regulatory

r		· · · · · · · · ·
	the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) have disclosed	action for which there is an opportunity for public comment specific to those changes. In
	inappropriate influences,	addition, other comments suggest changes to
	including financial	the Board's statutory authority. Chapter 23 of
	incentives, prejudices and	Title 54.1 of the Code of Virginia mandates
	apparent collusion by and	the Board for Waterworks and Wastewater
	between officers of the	Works Operators and Onsite Sewage System
	Board.	Professionals establish a program for
-	Review has been	licensing individuals as onsite soil evaluators,
	complicated by private	onsite sewage system installers, and onsite
	meetings between staff of	sewage system operators. The Board's
	the VDH and the	adherence to the above mandate is not
	Department of Professional	discretionary. Any changes to the Board's
	and Occupational	statutory mandates would have to be made
	Regulation. Conflict of	legislatively.
	Interest forms do not	
	provide disclosure of	
	conflicting interests	
	The Board, under guidance	
	from staff, neglected to develop a regulated	
	professional seal in	
	compliance with 18 VAC	
	10-20-760 B. 4.4. A seal	
	benefits the public by	
	conveying that the	
	document is authentic and	
	under the control of the	
	licensed professional.	
	The distinct differences in	
	responsibilities, risk and	
	scale (comparing water and	
	wastewater works	
	operators to onsite soil	
	evaluators and installers)	
	further strengthens the	
	point that onsite soil	
	evaluators should be	
	administered through the	
	APELSCIDLA board and	
	licensed contractors	
	properly belong within the	
	Contractors board.	

Effectiveness

Please indicate whether the regulation meets the criteria set out in Executive Order 17 (2014), e.g., is necessary for the protection of public health, safety, and welfare, and is clearly written and easily understandable.

The regulation meets the criteria set forth in Executive Order 17 (2014). The regulation establishes the licensing requirements for individuals seeking licensure as waterworks operators, wastewater works

operators, onsite soil evaluators, onsite sewage system installers, and onsite sewage system operators. The regulation is clearly written and easily understandable.

Result

Please state that the reason why the agency is recommending that the regulation should stay in effect without change.

The agency is recommending that the regulation stay in effect without change.

Small business impact

In order to minimize the economic impact of regulations on small business, please include, pursuant to § 2.2-4007.1 E and F, a discussion of the agency's consideration of: 1) the continued need for the regulation; 2) the nature of complaints or comments received concerning the regulation from the public; 3) the complexity of the regulation; 4) the extent to the which the regulation overlaps, duplicates, or conflicts with federal or state law or regulation; and 5) the length of time since the regulation has been evaluated or the degree to which technology, economic conditions, or other factors have changed in the area affected by the regulation. Also, include a discussion of the basis for the agency's determination to retain the regulation as is, consistent with the stated objectives of applicable law, to minimize the economic impact of regulations on small businesses.

Code of Virginia §§ 54.1-201.5 and 54.1-2301 mandates the Board to promulgate regulations. The continued need for the regulation is established in statute. Repeal of the regulation would remove the current public protections provided by the regulation.

The comments received during the public comment either require a statutory change in order to remove the Board's authority or did not pertain to this regulatory action; therefore a change is not warranted.

The regulation is clearly written and easily understandable. The regulation does not overlap, duplicate, or contravene federal or state law or regulation. A periodic review of the regulation was completed on January 11, 2012. On January 14, 2016, the Board reviewed the regulation and, for reasons stated in this section, determined that the regulation should not be amended or repealed, but should be retained in its current form.