

## **AUDIT SUMMARY**

The Auditor of Public Accounts has conducted a review of the Department of Environmental Quality's permitting, licensing, and other fees programs to determine:

- whether current and projected revenues from permitting, licensing, and other fees are sufficient to fund related operations;
- if revenues are not self-sustaining, the feasibility of whether such fees can fund all related operations;
- to what extent these operations depend upon General Fund resources; and
- whether the Department should establish working capital reserves.

We found that current and projected permitting, licensing, and other fees are not sufficient to fund operations. It appears that the legislation establishing these programs did not intend for fees to fully fund operations. Further, there is neither legislative nor policy guidance indicating the extent to which fees should fund operations. Therefore, these programs rely on General Fund appropriations to cover a significant portion of program expenses. Depending upon the permitting program, fees are set by either the Air Pollution Control Board, the Waste Management Board, or the State Water Control Board. It appears that the regulatory boards could increase several fees and still remain within the range of similar fees in neighboring states. The Department of Environmental Quality does not have an effective method to accurately forecast permitting, licensing, and other fees revenue. Finally, there does not appear to be a need for the Department to establish and maintain additional working capital reserves.

Our recommendations include:

- The General Assembly may wish to consider providing legislative guidance concerning the extent to which permitting, licensing, and other fees should support program operations.
- The regulatory boards may consider establishing procedures to review fees for adequacy and to compare fees to those in neighboring states on a biennial basis.
- The Department should develop a budgeting methodology that considers the yearly fluctuations in permit and license revenue.

November 23, 1998

The Honorable Vincent F. Callahan, Jr.  
Co-Chairman, House Appropriations  
Committee

The Honorable V. Earl Dickinson  
Co-Chairman, House Appropriations  
Committee

The Honorable Raymond R. Guest, Jr.  
Co-Chairman, House Conservation and  
Natural Resources Committee

The Honorable Alfred V. Thomas  
Co-Chairman, House Conservation and  
Natural Resources Committee

The Honorable John H. Chichester  
Co-Chairman, Senate Finance Committee

The Honorable Stanley C. Walker  
Co-Chairman, Senate Finance Committee

The Honorable Madison E. Marye  
Chairman, Senate Agriculture, Conservation  
and Natural Resources Committee

Gentlemen:

The Auditor of Public Accounts has conducted a review of the **Department of Environmental Quality's** permitting programs to determine:

- whether current and projected revenues from permitting, licensing, and other fees are sufficient to fund related operations;
- if revenues are not self-sustaining, the feasibility of whether such fees can fund all related operations;
- to what extent these operations depend upon General Fund resources; and
- whether the Department needs to maintain working capital reserves.

## **Conclusion**

We found that current and projected permitting, licensing, and other fees are not sufficient to fund operations. Neither policy nor legislative guidance exists stating whether permitting, licensing, or other funds should fund all or a portion of any related operations or enforcement. We were able to determine that permit programs are not self-sustaining and rely on General Fund appropriations to cover a significant portion of program expenses.

It appears that the regulatory boards could increase several permitting, licensing, and other fees and still remain within the range of similar fees in neighboring states. The Department of Environmental Quality does not have an effective method to accurately forecast permitting, licensing, and other fees revenue. We determined that there is not an apparent need to establish permitting program working capital reserves at this time.

The General Assembly may wish to consider providing legislative guidance concerning the extent to which permitting, licensing, and other fees should support program operations. The regulatory boards may consider establishing procedures to biennially review fees for adequacy and to compare permit fees in the Commonwealth to those in neighboring states. The Department should develop a budgeting methodology which considers the yearly fluctuations in permit and license revenue.

## **Exit Conference**

We discussed this report with agency officials at the Department of Environmental Quality on November 23, 1998.

AUDITOR OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

## **Introduction**

Chapter 464 of the 1998 Virginia Acts of Assembly mandated that “The Auditor of Public Accounts shall examine the current and projected revenues and expenses of the Department of Environmental Quality to determine if permitting, licensing, and other fees provide sufficient resources to fund related operations and, if not, the feasibility of whether such fees can fund all related operations. If these activities are not self-sustaining, the Auditor will determine the extent to which these operations depend upon general fund resources. This review shall include both current and future operating costs to consider whether the Department should maintain working capital reserves....”

In order to satisfy the above mandate, we reviewed the Department of Environmental Quality’s (DEQ) fiscal years 1997 and 1998 air, water, and waste permit revenues; direct and indirect permitting expenses; and general and federal funding. We also examined applicable sections of the Code of Virginia and the Virginia Register of Regulations to determine the statutory requirements for the permits issued by DEQ. In addition, we collected permit fee information from neighboring states in order to determine the propriety of the Commonwealth’s permit fee structures in relation to those of the other states. We also reviewed the Department’s budgeting process to determine their projected permitting, licensing, and other fees revenues.

### **Review of Permitting, Licensing, and Other Fees Revenues**

We examined the financial activity in the Air, Waste, and Water Permit Programs special funds. Table I presents air, waste, and water permitting revenue, expense, and funding data for fiscal years 1997 and 1998. As shown in this table, waste and water permitting, licensing, and other fees provide insufficient revenues to fully fund operations at DEQ.

In their biennial report to the General Assembly, DEQ uses a full costing approach, which allocates other expenses that DEQ considers indirect expenses of the permitting operations. Consequently, DEQ’s report to the General Assembly may have total expenses greater than the amounts in Table I.

A review of applicable sections of the Code of Virginia show that in several instances it does not appear that permitting, licensing, and other fees should provide the sole source of funding. For example, Section 10.1-1402.1 of the Code of Virginia established that permit fees set by the Waste Management Board “shall be collected in order to recover a portion of the agency’s costs.” The Code Section further stipulates that fees collected shall not supplant or reduce the General Fund appropriation to the Waste Management Board. We found similar language in the statutes establishing the Air and Water Permit Programs.

However, it appears that the federal government, in passing Title V of the Clean Air Act, expects that DEQ will operate this Air Program as self-supporting for the permit fees levied. DEQ began collecting fees under this program during fiscal year 1998 and at present, the program is supporting its activities. Before the implementation of this program however, air-permitting revenues were insufficient to fund operations.

Table I – Permit Program Revenues and Expenses

	Air		Waste		Water	
	<u>FY 1997</u>	<u>FY 1998</u>	<u>FY 1997</u>	<u>FY 1998</u>	<u>FY 1997</u>	<u>FY 1998</u>
Permit/fee revenue	\$ 3,090,244	\$ 9,311,259	\$ 297,360	\$ 272,720	\$ 880,890	\$ 972,990
Other revenue	245,641	476,306	24,044	32,049	89,416	74,400
Total revenue	\$ 3,335,885	\$ 9,787,565	\$ 321,404	\$ 304,769	\$ 970,306	\$ 1,047,390
Direct expenses	\$ 4,055,416	\$ 7,024,226	\$ 1,537,052	\$ 1,911,381	\$ 5,120,616	\$ 5,649,089
Overhead expenses	1,907,222	2,175,755	993,095	1,121,218	1,935,121	2,162,799
Total expenses	\$ 5,962,638	\$ 9,199,981	\$ 2,530,147	\$ 3,032,599	\$ 7,055,737	\$ 7,811,888
Revenues over (under) expenses	\$ (2,626,753)	\$ 587,584	\$ (2,208,743)	\$ (2,727,830)	\$ (6,085,431)	\$ (6,764,498)

Source: CARS

The large increase in air permitting fees for fiscal year 1998 as shown in Table I relates to the implementation of Title V of the Clean Air Act. Before implementation, the Code of Virginia limited the permit fees and the maximum charge to individual permit holders. Title V removed both restrictions, which resulted in increased revenue for fiscal year 1998. Although the Department by law, maintains separate accounts, we have combined solid and hazardous waste revenue and expenses for illustration purposes.

Except for the general intent of the statutory language, we could find neither policy nor legislative guidance on the extent to which permitting, licensing, or other fees should fund all or a portion of any operations or enforcement.

We examined permit program funding sources and determined that General Fund appropriations contribute a significant amount of funding. Table II below shows the percentage of funding provided from General Fund appropriations for the last two years. The information presented in the table pertains to all categories of permits issued within each of the Air, Water, and Waste Divisions. We were unable to determine separate revenue and expense data for each individual permit type.

Table II – Funding for Permit Programs

	FY 1997			FY 1998		
	Air	Waste	Water	Air	Waste	Water
Program revenue	\$ 3,335,884	\$ 321,404	\$ 970,306	\$ 9,787,565	\$ 304,769	\$ 1,047,390
<b>GF appropriations</b>	<b>1,927,568</b>	<b>1,735,499</b>	<b>4,425,645</b>	<b>1,616,651</b>	<b>2,103,420</b>	<b>4,596,287</b>
Federal	2,297,744	1,583,626	1,422,438	2,371,142	1,551,707	3,403,346
Total funding	<u>\$ 7,561,196</u>	<u>\$ 3,640,529</u>	<u>\$ 6,818,389</u>	<u>\$13,775,358</u>	<u>\$ 3,959,896</u>	<u>\$ 9,047,023</u>
% from GF	<b>25%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>51%</b>

Source: CARS and DEQ financial data.

As Table II illustrates, General Fund appropriations have provided significant levels of support for the Waste and Water Permitting Programs. The large increase in air permitting fees for fiscal year 1998 due to Title V of the Clean Air Act resulted in increased revenue and a reduction in the percentage of funding from General Funds for the Air Permit Program.

We also found that the regulatory boards could increase several permitting, licensing, and other fees and still remain within the range of similar fees in neighboring states. We will discuss these matters to a greater extent later in this report.

**Recommendation #1: The General Assembly may wish to consider providing legislative guidance concerning the extent to which permitting, licensing, and other fees should support program operations.**

### **DEQ Permitting Programs**

DEQ issues various environmental permits in accordance with laws or regulations. Generally, permits fall within three main groups: air permits under the Air Pollution Control Board (APCB) issued by DEQ's Regional Offices in coordination with the Air Division; waste permits by the Waste Management Board (WMB) issued by the Waste Division; and water permits under the State Water Control Board (SWCB) issued by the Water Division.

Although the Air Pollution Control Board, the Waste Management Board, and the State Water Control Board each set the permitting, licensing, and other fees for their programs, the General Assembly sets the maximum annual fees for the programs. We have compiled a listing of the various air, waste, and water programs' permits, licenses, and other fees at Appendix A. Included in the listing is information showing the applicable laws and regulations, permit terms, fee structures, when they were established, and the numbers of permits issued during fiscal year 1998. We found, except for the federal Title V Air Permit, the present fee structures for the various air, waste, and water permits have not changed since adoption. Discussions with DEQ personnel stated that the regulatory boards do not regularly undertake processes to evaluate their permit fee structures. Generally, the Boards review or evaluate fees only when requested by DEQ or outside parties. The Code of Virginia requires the Boards, when adopting regulations for permit programs, to consider the permit fees charged in neighboring states and the importance of not placing existing or prospective industries in the Commonwealth at a competitive disadvantage. In adopting Title V of the Clean Air Act, the federal government superceded Virginia's statutes setting permitting, licensing, and other fees.

### **Permit Fee Comparison with Other States**

We compared data from Maryland, North Carolina, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Virginia to determine where the Commonwealth stands in relation to neighboring states with respect to permitting, licensing, and other fees. The state-to-state comparison is at Appendix B.

We determined that Virginia's permitting, licensing, and other fees are generally comparable to those in neighboring states. We noted, however, that Virginia could restructure some fees or permit terms to increase revenue and still remain within the range of similar fees in neighboring states. For example, Virginia does not charge a fee for a new or modified air pollution source construction permit whereas other states' fees range from \$100 to \$20,200 for a similar permit. Virginia could begin assessing a fee, which could increase revenue. Another example is the hazardous waste transporter permit. Although the fee for this permit is comparable to other states, Virginia's permit is good for ten years, which is significantly longer than the one-year term for this type of permit in other states. Virginia could shorten the permit term, thereby increasing revenue by collecting the permit fee more often. It should be noted that increasing permitting, licensing, and other fees above the legislatively established maximums would require action by the General Assembly.

**Recommendation #2: The regulatory boards should consider studying the permitting, licensing, and other fees charged in neighboring states biennially to determine whether Virginia can raise fees without placing existing and prospective industries within the Commonwealth at a distinct competitive disadvantage.**

**DEQ Revenue Forecasting**

We discussed the Department’s budgeting process with DEQ personnel. DEQ provides six-year permit revenue projections to the Department of Planning and Budget. We determined, however, that DEQ does not have an effective methodology to forecast these revenues. DEQ assumes that revenues will remain relatively constant from year to year. This assumption does not consider any revenue fluctuations, which may result from the varying terms of permits. DEQ believes any analysis of the effect of permit terms on future revenues would not prove cost effective and would outweigh any benefits derived from such an exercise.

**Recommendation #3: DEQ should consider developing a methodology which would effectively project future permitting, licensing, and other fees revenues to provide an accurate measure of the extent to which fees defray permit program costs.**

**Permit Funds Working Capital Reserves**

We reviewed the financial activity recorded in the air, waste, and water special funds to determine whether the Department should maintain working capital reserves. We found, as illustrated in Table III, that the fund balances in the air and waste funds have increased each year despite the determination that the permit programs have not been self-sustaining. The fund balance in the water fund appears to follow a cycle, which shows a significant increase in the fund balance one year and a gradual decrease in subsequent years. Again, the significant increase shown in the air program year-end fund balance in fiscal year 1998 resulted from increased fee revenue collected under the federal Title V Air Program.

Table III – Year-End Fund Balances

	<u>Air</u>	<u>Waste</u>	<u>Water</u>
FY 1994	\$ 1,494,546	\$ 860,496	\$ 1,554,683
FY 1995	1,779,747	871,421	1,825,152
FY 1996	2,942,416	938,251	1,683,433
FY 1997	3,804,740	1,073,538	1,477,557
FY 1998	8,642,013	1,146,032	1,256,826

Source: CARS

The air and waste fund balance increases resulted from the use of General Funds to pay program expenses rather than a planned use of both permitting, licensing, and other fees and General Fund resources. For example, as illustrated in Table IV on the following page, the air program collected \$3,335,884 in revenue and paid \$2,423,600 in expenses in fiscal year 1997, resulting in an excess of revenue over expenses of \$912,284 without its use to pay expenses. Using this revenue to pay expenses could reduce the need for General Fund resources. In fiscal year 1998, the Air Program generated sufficient revenues to fully fund air permitting operations. Excess revenues occurred in the waste permit fund for fiscal years 1997 and 1998 as well. As illustrated in Table IV, however, the Water Permitting Program cannot pay all expenses without significant general funding.

Table IV – Permit Program Activity and General Funding

	Air		Waste		Water	
	<u>FY 1997</u>	<u>FY 1998</u>	<u>FY 1997</u>	<u>FY 1998</u>	<u>FY 1997</u>	<u>FY 1998</u>
Revenue	\$3,335,884	\$9,787,565	\$ 321,404	\$ 304,769	\$ 970,306	\$1,047,390
Expenses	2,423,600	5,000,252	173,212	230,331	1,164,566	1,279,737
Revenue over (under) expenses	912,284	4,787,313	148,192	74,438	( 194,260)	( 232,347)
Transfers in (out)	( 49,960)	49,960	( 12,905)	( 1,944)	( 11,616)	11,616
Beginning fund balance	2,942,416	3,804,740	938,251	1,073,538	1,683,433	1,477,557
Ending fund balance	<u>\$3,804,740</u>	<u>\$8,642,013</u>	<u>\$1,073,538</u>	<u>\$1,146,032</u>	<u>\$1,477,557</u>	<u>\$1,256,826</u>
GF appropriations	\$1,927,568	\$1,616,651	\$1,735,499	\$2,103,420	\$4,425,645	\$4,596,287
GF expenses	1,631,816	2,023,974	1,363,840	1,681,050	3,956,051	4,369,352

Source: CARS

It appears that in the absence of definitive guidance, excess revenues will continue to accumulate in the air and waste funds while the programs rely on General Fund resources. The increasing fund balances in the air and waste programs suggest that there is not presently a need to establish and maintain working capital reserves in those funds until the guidance is provided concerning the use of resources.

**Recommendation #4: The General Assembly may wish to consider providing legislative guidance as to the use of excess permit program revenues.**

Virginia Environmental Permits, Licenses and Fees

## Air Division Permits

Permits	Applicable Law and/or Code Section(s)	Applicable VA Regulation(s)	Permit Term	Fee	Fee Estab.	# Permits Issued in FY 1998*
Federal Operating (Title V)	Clean Air Act; 40 CFR 70; VAC 10.1-1300 et. Seq.	VR for Control and Abatement of Air Pollution: Rules 8-5 and 8-6	5 years	\$32.91 per ton of emissions	Mar 98	9**
State Operating	Clean Air Act; 40 CFR 51; VAC 10.1-1300 et. Seq.	VR for Control and Abatement of Air Pollution: Rules 8-4 and 8-6	5 years	\$32.91 per ton of emissions (collected biannually)	1993	47
Existing Sources Registration & Standards	Clean Air Act; 40 CFR 51; VAC 10.1-1300 et. Seq.	9VAC5-20-10 et. Seq. 9VAC5-30-10 et. Seq. 9VAC5-40-10 et. Seq. 9VAC5-50-10 et. Seq. 9VAC5-60-10 et. Seq.	Permanent (Revised as emissions change)	Up to maximum fee of \$100,000 per facility.	1993	0
Major New or Modified Source Construction	Clean Air Act; 40 CFR 51; VAC 10.1-1300 et. Seq.	9VAC5-50-10 et. Seq. 9VAC5-60-10 et. Seq. 9VAC5-80-30 et. Seq.	Indefinite***	None	1993	0
Minor New or Modified Source Construction	Clean Air Act; 40 CFR 51; VAC 10.1-1300 et. Seq.	9VAC5-50-10 et. Seq. 9VAC5-60-10 et. Seq. 9VAC5-80-10 et. Seq.	Indefinite***	None	1993	386
Prevention of Significant Deterioration	Clean Air Act; 40 CFR 51; VAC 10.1-1300 et. Seq.	9VAC5-50-10 et. Seq. 9VAC5-60-10 et. Seq. 9VAC5-80-20 et. Seq.	Indefinite***	None	1993	2

Virginia Environmental Permits, Licenses and Fees

## Waste Division Permits

Permits	Applicable Law and/or Code Section(s)	Applicable VA Regulation(s)	Permit Term	Fee	Fee Estab.	# Permits Issued in CY 1998*
Hazardous Waste Management Facility	VAC 10.1-1400 et. Seq.	9VAC20-60-10 et. Seq.	Up to ten years	\$9,720 to \$32,310 for permits; Amendments: \$50 to \$32,310	1984	2 14
Hazardous Waste Emergency	VAC 10.1-1400 et. Seq.	9VAC20-60-1050	Up to 90 days	\$1,330	1984	0
Hazardous Waste Transporter	VAC 10.1-1426	9VAC20-60-420 thru 9VAC20-60-500	Ten years	\$80 or \$120	1984	24
Regulated Medical Waste Management Facility	VAC 10.1-1400 et. Seq.	9VAC20-120-10	Ten years; Permit-by-rule is permanent	None for Permit-by-rule**** \$3,300 to \$4,500 for others	1992	6
Solid Waste Landfill	VAC 10.1-1408.1	9VAC20-80-480 thru 9VAC20-80-620	Permanent	Part A - \$3,200 Part B - \$14,300; Amendments: \$300 to \$17,500	1992	1 33
Solid Waste Incinerator & Energy Recovery Facility	VAC 10.1-1408.1	9VAC20-80-480 thru 9VAC20-80-620	Permanent	None for Permit-by-rule**** \$4,500 for others	1992	
Materials Recovery from Solid Waste Facility	VAC 10.1-1408.1	9VAC20-80-480 thru 9VAC20-80-620	Permanent	None for Permit-by-rule**** \$3,300 for others	1992	3
Solid Waste Compost Facility	VAC 10.1-1408.1	9VAC20-80-480 thru 9VAC20-80-620	Permanent	Part A - \$1,600 Part B - \$8,100	1992	1
Solid Waste Transfer Station	VAC 10.1-1408.1	9VAC20-80-480 thru 9VAC20-80-620	Permanent	None for Permit-by rule**** \$3,300 for others	1992	2
Yard Waste Composting Facility (Permit-by-rule****)	VAC 10.1-1408.1	9VAC20-100-10 et. Seq.	Permanent	None	1992	1
Solid Waste Experimental Facility	VAC 10.1-1408.1	9VAC20-80-480 thru 9VAC20-80-620	One year; may be renewed up to 3 times	\$3,300	1992	0
Solid Waste Emergency	VAC 10.1-1408.1	9VAC20-80-480 thru 9VAC20-80-620	Up to 90 days	None	1992	9
Coal Combustion By Product Site Notification	VAC 10.1-1408.1	9VAC20-85-150 thru 9VAC20-85-160	Permanent	None	N/A	0

Virginia Environmental Permits, Licenses and Fees

## Water Division Permits

Permits	Applicable Law and/or Code Section(s)	Applicable VA Regulation(s)	Permit Term	Application Fee	Fee Estab.	# Permits Issued in FY 1998*
VA Pollutant Discharge Elimination System	Clean Water Act; VAC 62.1-44.15 thru 44.30	9VAC25-30-10 et. Seq.	Up to five Years	General - \$200 Individual - \$1,400 to \$8,000	1993	893
VA Pollution Abatement	VAC 62.1-44.17	9VAC25-30-10 et. Seq.	Up to ten years	General - \$200 Individual - \$250 to \$3,500	1993	9
VA Water Protection	Clean Water Act; VAC 62.1-44.2 et. Seq. and 62.1-44.15:5	9VAC25-210-10 et. Seq.	Up to ten years	General - \$200 Individual - \$800 to \$3,000 Waiver - \$300	1993	841
Groundwater Withdrawal	VAC 62.1-254 et. Seq.	9VAC25-610-10	Permanent	\$400 to \$2,000	1993	0
Underground Storage Tank Corrective Action Plan	VAC 62.1-44.34:9	9VAC25-580-10 9VAC25-30-10 et. Seq.	Up to five years	None	1993	0

\* Source: DEQ Database.

\*\* The nine air permits issued under the Title V Program were acid rain operating permits.

\*\*\* Indefinite: Permit remains in effect until further modifications are made, the source is relocated, or the permit is replaced by an operating permit.

\*\*\*\* Permit-by-rule: Under the Virginia Waste Management Act, this category of waste facility may be deemed to have a permit if it meets specific regulatory requirements.

Comparison of Permit, License, and Other Fees Among States

	Virginia Fee/Term	North Carolina Fee/Term	West Virginia Fee/Term	Maryland Fee/Term	Tennessee Fee/Term
<b>Air Permits</b>					
Federal Operating (Title V)	Annual - \$32.91 per ton of emissions. Maximum 4,000 tons. Term: 5 yrs.	Application - \$60 to \$23,656; annual fee \$5,691 + \$16.32 per ton of emissions. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	\$17.82 per ton of emissions. Minimum \$200 fee and maximum 4,000 tons. Term: 5 yrs.	Annual base - \$200 + \$32.65 per ton of emissions maximum 4,000 tons. Maximum per facility - \$254,240. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	Annual fee - \$23.09 per ton of emissions or \$12.70 per ton of allowable emissions; maximum of 4,000 tons. Term: 3-5 yrs.
State Operating	Annual - \$32.91 per ton of emissions. Term: 5 yrs.	Application - \$25 to \$400; annual fee \$250 to \$1,500. Offers 25% reduction if no notices of violation in previous year. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	\$200 to \$10,000 depending upon type of facility. Term: 5 yrs.	Annual base - \$200 + \$32.65 per ton of emissions; maximum for facility is \$261,206; maximum tons is 4,000. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	Annual fee - \$100 or \$3 to \$8 per ton of allowable emissions. Term: 9-10 yrs.
Existing Sources Registration and Standards	Maximum fee - \$100,000. Term: Permanent				
New or Modified Source Construction	No fee. Term: Indefinite		Application - \$1,000 + annual fee of \$1,000 to \$10,000 Term: Indefinite	\$200 to \$20,000. Term: Indefinite	Major: \$1,000 to \$5,000 depending upon anticipated levels of emissions. Minor: \$100 to \$500. Term: Less than 1 yr.
Prevention of Significant Deterioration	No fee. Term: Indefinite		Application - \$1,000 + annual fee of \$1,000 to \$10,000 Term: Indefinite	\$200 to \$20,000. Term: Indefinite	Major: \$1,000 to \$5,000 depending upon anticipated levels of emissions. Minor: \$100 to \$500. Term: Less than 1 yr.
<b>Hazardous Waste Permits</b>					
Hazardous Waste Management Facility	Application - \$9,720 to \$32,310. Term: Up to 10 yrs.	Application - \$1,200 to 25,000. Modifications - \$100 to \$1,000. Term: Up to 10 yrs.	Application - \$2,500 to \$25,000. Term: 10 yrs.	Annual - \$12,000 to \$45,000. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	Application - Part A \$400 to \$2,000; Part B \$10,000 to \$40,000. Annual fee \$1,000 to \$15,000. Term: Up to 10 yrs.
Hazardous Waste Emergency	Application - \$1,330. Term: Up to 90 days	No fee. Term: 5 to 10 days	\$0 to \$500. Term: Up to 90 days		

Comparison of Permit, License, and Other Fees Among States

	Virginia Fee/Term	North Carolina Fee/Term	West Virginia Fee/Term	Maryland Fee/Term	Tennessee Fee/Term
<b>Hazardous Waste Permits (Cont'd)</b>					
Hazardous Waste Transporter	Application - \$80 to \$120. Term: 10 yrs.	Application - \$600. Term: 1 yr.		\$50 per vehicle and 420 per driver. Term: 1 yr.	\$50 to \$650. Term: Up to 1 yr.
Regulated Medical Waste Management	\$3,300 to \$4,500 Term: 10 yrs.	Classified as solid waste permit. Term: 5 yrs.			
<b>Solid Waste Permits</b>					
Solid Waste Landfill	Application – Part A \$3,200; Part B \$14,300 Term: Permanent	No fee. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	Application - \$250 to \$7,500. Term: 5yrs.	No fee. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	Application - \$2,000 to \$6,000; annual fee - \$1,000 to \$15,000. Term: Permanent
Solid Waste Incinerator & Energy Recovery Facility	Application - \$4,500. Term: Permanent	No fee. Term: Up to 5 yrs.		No fee. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	
Materials Recovery from Solid Waste Facility	Application - \$3,300. Term: Permanent				
Solid Waste Compost Facility	Application – Part A \$1,600; Part B \$8,100. Term: Permanent	No fee. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	Application - \$2,500. Term: 5 yrs.	No fee. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	
Solid Waste Transfer Station	Application - \$3,300. Term: Permanent	No fee. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	Application - \$2,500. Term: 5 yrs.	No fee. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	
Solid Waste Experimental Facility	Application - \$3,300. Term: 1 yr. with 3 one-year renewals.				
Solid Waste Emergency	No fee. Term: Up to 90 days.				
Yard Waste Composting Facility (Permit-by-rule)	No fee. Term: Permanent	No fee. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	No fee. Term: 5 yrs.	No fee. Term: Up to 3 yrs.	
Coal Combustion By-Product Site Notification	No fee. Term: Permanent				
<b>Water Permits</b>					
Pollutant Discharge Elimination System	Application – General \$200; Individual \$1,400 to \$8,800. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	Application – General \$240; Individual \$400; annual fee for individual permit \$450 to \$1,600. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	New Application \$2,500 to \$7,500; renewal \$1,000 to \$2,500; annual fee \$50 to \$2,500. Term: 5 yrs.	Application - \$50 to \$20,000; annual fee \$100 to \$5,000 volume dependent. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	Plan review fees - \$250 to \$1,500; annual fee \$500 to \$7,500. Term: Up to 5 yrs.

Comparison of Permit, License, and Other Fees Among States

	Virginia Fee/Term	North Carolina Fee/Term	West Virginia Fee/Term	Maryland Fee/Term	Tennessee Fee/Term
<b>Water Permits (Cont'd)</b>					
Pollution Abatement	Application – General \$200; Individual \$250 to \$3,500. Term: Up to 10 yrs.	Application - \$400; annual fee \$450 to \$1,500. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	Sludge - \$5 per ton; groundwater protection annual fee \$10 to \$500. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	Sludge - \$25 to \$750. Term: Up to 5 yrs.	Annual fee - \$250 to \$1,250. Term: Up to 5 yrs.
Water Protection	Application – General \$200; Individual \$800 to \$3,000; Waiver \$300. Term: Up to 10 yrs.	No fee.	No fee.		Application – General \$0; Individual \$0 to \$2,500; annual fee (for gravel dredge only) \$100. Term: Up to 5 yrs.
Groundwater Withdrawal	Application - \$400 to \$2,000. Term: Permanent	Registration Fee - \$50. Term: N/A	No fee. Term: N/A	No fee. Term: Up to 12 yrs.	
Underground Storage Tank Corrective Action Plan	No fee. Term: Up to 5 yrs.				