

Capitol Contact

Virginia General Assembly

Virginia Association of Counties • 1207 E. Main Street, Suite 300 • Richmond, VA 23219
www.vaco.org • 804.788.6652



Tuesday, February 4, 2020

Positive changes made to Public Employee Collective Bargaining bills

On February 3, the Senate Commerce and Labor Committee made significant changes to the Collective Bargaining [bills](#) under review in that chamber. [SB 1022 \(Boysko\)](#) was incorporated into [SB 939 \(Saslaw\)](#), which was reported and referred to the Senate Finance and Appropriations Committee, 11-3, with a substitute that preserves local choice for local governing bodies. Other changes include language to remove the ability of public employees to strike and provides an exemption to constitutional officers.

VACo opposed SB 1022 in its original form, as it mandated collective bargaining for all employees. The amended SB 939 is an improvement as it preserves local choice, however, the bill does allow school boards to determine whether their employees participate in collective bargaining, regardless of whether a local governing body has passed an ordinance to opt-in to collective bargaining. Significantly, the amended bill no longer includes the employees of state agencies and provides no governance structure for any local government that wishes to allow collective bargaining.

In the House, [HB 582 \(Guzman\)](#) was passed by for the day after Delegate Israel O'Quinn offered a floor amendment removing employees of constitutional officers from the provisions of the bill. HB 582 will likely be heard on February 4. VACo opposes the bill as it mandates collective bargaining for public employees.

VACo requested a local [Fiscal Impact Statement](#) from the Commission on Local Government. Read the full [statement](#) here.

According to the executive summary in the statement:

“A majority of localities noted that the bill would require (i) additional staff for collective bargaining contracts including ensuring compliance, (ii) additional attorneys/legal team that specialize in labor relations, (iii) and upgrading financial/payroll system to allow management and collection of dues. They also noted that their estimated cost does not include the possible increases in benefits due to collective bargaining, but the locality that provided the highest estimate is based on difference between union and nonunion compensation, which does not take into account any benefits which could be expected to greater. Some localities noted that the bill would require increase in real estate tax rate to comply with the provisions of the bill. Of those who responded with no cost, [they] noted that [the] cost of the bill indeterminate but would be significant.”

As currently written, HB 582 removes the prohibition on local public employers (counties, cities, towns, school boards, and regional political subdivision or body politic and corporate, designated as such by the General Assembly) from entering into collective bargaining with a union or association representing their public employees.

The bill mandates that local public employers be forced into collective bargaining with their employee’s representative if 30 percent of their employees in a collective bargaining unit petition to form a bargaining unit. Additionally, the majority of the votes cast in a bargaining unit can elect to designate an exclusive bargaining representative (union or employee association) to negotiate terms of employment including grievances, labor disputes, wages, hours, and other issues. These provisions apply to nearly all State and Local public employees, except employees of the General Assembly.

The bill mandates that the Public Employee Relations Board (PERB) be established but is silent on local government representation/expertise among the three-member board. Yet this board will be deciding issues involving management of local governments and employees. The PERB would also be responsible for overseeing the election of exclusive representatives once an initial petition to has been filed. Though the bill defines broad categories of state employees for the purpose of forming collective bargaining unit, the matter of local public employee bargaining units is left to the determination of the PERB.

The cost of establishing and administering the PERB for the state is indeterminate according to the Department of Planning and Budget’s [fiscal impact statement](#). Member budget amendments from [Delegate Krizek](#) and [Senator Boysko](#) for \$1.5 million have been filed, but it remains unknown if this is sufficient to cover the expenses of the PERB and staff. There is no funding in the budget or through member amendments to offset local costs.

The legislation will change the existing grievance process for public employees. This will make management difficult and costly for local government employers. Employee choice in how grievance procedures may be taken can be preempted by any agreement on the grievance procedure process contained in the terms of a collective bargaining

agreement. Public employees in a collective bargaining unit can only opt out of paying union/association dues by contacting their exclusive representative.

Public employers are required to provide the personal contact information of their employees to the exclusive representative and provide a list of this updated information for all employees in the bargaining unit to the exclusive representative monthly – an additional administrative burden for local governments.

Meetings between employees and exclusive representatives could disrupt the ability of local governments to provide core services to their constituents. Exclusive bargaining representatives are granted the right to meet with employees during the workday and shall be granted at least 30 minutes of mandatory time with new hires.

The process in which collective bargaining disputes are adjudicated will likely lead to increased costs imposed on local governments. Any accusations of violation of the terms of collective bargaining brought against a public employer to the PERB must be answered within 10 days by the employer. The legislation makes an effort to define the negotiation and impasse procedures/timelines for state government and its collective bargaining units, however the process for local governments is vague.

It is problematic that there is no dedicated funding source to handle the administration of collective bargaining at the local level. Costs may include additional administrative and legal staff, negotiation with exclusive representatives, mediation, and arbitration. Without a funding mechanism this will likely lead to higher taxes and/or a reduction in existing benefits and services and has the potential to be felt in every community of the Commonwealth.

For these reasons, VACo continues to oppose HB 582 and urges you to contact your legislators to oppose it as well.

VACo Contacts: [Jeremy R. Bennett](#) and [Phyllis Errico, Esq.](#)

VACo supports County authority to determine local tax incentives for large solar projects

[SB 800 \(Lewis\)](#) advances the expiration date of the state-mandated 80 percent tax exemption from Machinery and Tool Tax (M&T) for utility-scale solar projects greater than 20 megawatts (MW) from 2024 to 2021. The legislation has been heard in the [Senate Finance and Appropriations Committee](#) two weeks in a row with VACo speaking in support of the measure both times. A final hearing and vote on the bill are scheduled for the morning of Wednesday February 5.

ACTION REQUIRED – Contact [Senate Finance and Appropriations Committee](#) Members today and express your support for SB 800.

This proposed change will allow Counties to decide by local ordinance, as is allowed under Virginia law, to determine at their discretion a lower M&T rate for projects greater than 20 MW in generating capacity. Successful legislation supported by VACo in 2018 returned this authority to counties for projects 150 MW or larger in capacity in advance of the 2024 expiration date.

KEY POINTS

- The state-mandated exemption from local tax has resulted in significant loss of both current and future revenues that would otherwise be utilized to fund state-mandated services such as public education, public safety, and human services.
- This bill allows localities, at their discretion, to provide a tax incentive for these larger installations.

KEY CONTACTS

SENATE FINANCE AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: [Howell \(Chair\)](#), [Saslaw](#), [Norment](#), [Hanger](#), [Lucas](#), [Newman](#), [Ruff](#), [Vogel](#), [Barker](#), [Edwards](#), [Deeds](#), [Locke](#), [Petersen](#), [Marsden](#), [Ebbin](#), [McClellan](#)

Email entire committee at once – [Senate Finance and Appropriations Committee](#)

VACo Contacts: [Joe Lerch, AICP](#) and [Chris McDonald, Esq.](#)

VACo opposes bills extending state-mandated exemption from local taxes for large solar projects

[HB 1131 \(Jones\)](#), [HB 1434 \(Jones\)](#) and [SB 762 \(Barker\)](#), [SB 763 \(Barker\)](#), if adopted, would extend a state mandate to exempt utility-scale solar projects from local tax to 2030 (currently set to expire in 2024). HB 1131 and HB 1434 passed in subcommittee earlier this week on identical [6 to 4 votes](#) and will be heard in the full House Finance Committee in the afternoon of Wednesday, February 5. SB 762 and SB 763 will be heard in the Senate Finance and Appropriations Committee on the morning of Wednesday February 5.

ACTION REQUIRED – Contact [Senate Finance and Appropriations Committee](#) Members today to oppose [SB 762](#) and [SB 763](#) AND contact [House Finance Committee](#) Members to oppose to [HB 1131](#) and [HB 1434](#).

In 2016 the state mandated an 80 percent exemption from local Machinery and Tool Tax (M&T) for solar projects greater than 5 megawatts (MW) in energy capacity. Legislators, recognizing the impact this could have on local revenues and wary of providing the tax subsidy in perpetuity, set an expiration date for the exemption. Specifically, for projects greater than 20 MW the mandatory exemption expires for any project that has not begun construction by January 1, 2024. Four years in advance of the expiration, the utility-scale solar construction industry wants to extend this exemption an additional six years.

VACo supports returning the authority to counties to determine local tax incentives for utility-scale solar installations and opposes any expansion or extension of the state-mandated tax exemption on local property taxes for solar equipment. Successful legislation supported by VACo in 2018 returned this authority to counties for projects 150 MW or larger in capacity in advance of the 2024 expiration date.

KEY POINTS

- Many counties are concerned about the loss of valuable farm and forest land, critical to local economies. Solar facilities generating greater than 20 MW and less than 150 MW in generating capacity can occupy anywhere from several hundred acres to more than two square miles and are in effect largescale power plants with oversized footprints.
- HB 1131, HB 1434 and SB 762, SB 763 extend a state-mandated exemption from local tax. This extension of a mandated subsidy from local revenues will result in significant loss of future revenues that would otherwise be utilized to fund state-mandated services such as education, police, and human services.

KEY CONTACTS

[SENATE FINANCE AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE](#) – [Howell \(Chair\)](#), [Saslaw](#), [Norment](#), [Hanger](#), [Lucas](#), [Newman](#), [Ruff](#), [Vogel](#), [Barker](#), [Edwards](#), [Deeds](#), [Locke](#), [Petersen](#), [Marsden](#), [Ebbin](#), [McClellan](#)

Email entire committee at once – [Senate Finance and Appropriations Committee](#)

[HOUSE FINANCE COMMITTEE](#) – [Watts \(Chair\)](#), [Keam \(Vice Chair\)](#), [Kory](#), [Lindsey](#), [Sullivan](#), [Murphy](#), [Heretick](#), [Ayala](#), [Carter](#), [Carroll Foy](#), [Mugler](#), [Hudson](#), [Scott](#), [Orrock](#), [Byron](#), [Ware](#), [Wright](#), [Gilbert](#), [Poindexter](#), [Fowler](#), [McNamara](#), [Campbell, R.R.](#)

Email entire committee at once – [House Finance Committee](#)

VACo Contacts: [Joe Lerch, AICP](#) and [Chris McDonald, Esq.](#)

Legislation establishing state-level “preclearance” for local election practices advances

[HB 761 \(VanValkenburg\)](#) would establish a process by which the state would review certain election-related actions at the local level before those actions could take effect, similar to the federal preclearance previously required for jurisdictions covered by Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act.

Prior to the United States Supreme Court’s ruling in the 2013 *Shelby County v. Holder* case, jurisdictions covered by Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act were required to “pre-clear” proposed changes to voting procedures with the federal government as prescribed in Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, in order to be sure that the proposed changes were not discriminatory.

Virginia was included in the preclearance requirement, although some localities followed the procedure to “bail out” after demonstrating to a federal three-judge panel that they met certain criteria for voting rights compliance over the past 10 years. After the coverage formula was struck down in the *Shelby County* case, the preclearance procedures no longer applied in Virginia.

HB 761 would apply to any locality that has a voting-age population containing two or more racial or ethnic groups, each constituting at least 20 percent of the voting-age population. The list of covered jurisdictions would be determined each year by the Attorney General, in consultation with the State Board of Elections and relevant executive branch agencies.

For covered localities, before enacting certain voting practices or procedures, the governing body would be required to seek preclearance through one of two options: (1) seeking a declaratory judgment in the circuit court that the practice would not limit access to voting on account of race or color or membership in a language minority group, or result in “retrogression in the position of members of a racial or ethnic group with respect to their effective exercise of the electoral franchise,” or (2) submitting the practice to the Office of the Attorney General, who would have 60 days to object (the bill would allow for an expedited approval upon good cause shown). The governing body would be able to appeal the Attorney General’s objection in the circuit court, and an aggrieved voter would be able to appeal the Attorney General’s lack of objection, if his or her right to vote was affected by the covered practice.

Practices that would require preclearance include changes to the method of election of members of a governing body or school board; changes to the boundaries of a jurisdiction or to election districts or wards within the jurisdiction; or changes that would reduce the number of, consolidate, or relocate polling places (except under certain emergency circumstances).

VACo raised concerns during the Privileges and Elections subcommittee hearing on the bill, as well as in its subsequent hearing in a subcommittee of House Appropriations, about how the proposed preclearance process would be implemented, in particular the need to avoid unnecessary delays in implementing routine changes in practice, such as minor changes to polling locations. The bill has been reported from House Appropriations and heads to the House floor.

VACo Contact: [Katie Boyle](#)

Subcommittee halts House version of unfunded mandate for deputy sheriffs' salaries

A bill requiring an increase in minimum salaries for deputy sheriffs failed to advance in the House, as the legislation was voted to be carried over until 2021 in subcommittee.

[HB 1302 \(Hurst\)](#) is the House counterpart to [SB 1085 \(Pillion\)](#), which was previously stricken in favor of studying the issue for the next year. The legislation provided that the minimum salary for all deputy sheriffs, law enforcement and non-law enforcement, shall be set at the compensation board minimum plus a 20 percent supplement.

This supplement would have required localities to foot the bill unless that locality was designated as high or above average according to the Commission on Local Government's Fiscal Stress Index as of July 1, 2020. For those localities at high or above average fiscal stress, the bill directed the Commonwealth to pay the entire sum of the difference between the current salary paid and the new required minimum. For those localities not at high or above average fiscal stress, however, the cost fell directly to them.

VACo was quick to raise concerns about the fiscal impact of this legislation as well as the dangerous precedent it would have set. We also voiced our concern this legislation would open the door for greater future financial impacts should localities fiscal stress level change in ensuing years.

VACo worked with Senator Todd Pillion to forge an agreement to meet with a group of relevant stakeholders to comprehensively study the issue of deputy sheriffs' salaries and come back for the 2021 legislative session with fresh ideas.

VACo Contact: [Chris McDonald, Esq.](#)

VACo supports maintaining authority of Counties to address impacts of large-scale solar

This year the legislature is considering several bills that would limit and restrict local land use authority to address impacts due to the placement and operation of utility-scale solar projects. VACo opposes these efforts that include the following legislative proposals:

[HB 657 \(Heretick\)](#) and [SB 893 \(Marsden\)](#) exempt a solar facility that is 150 megawatts (MW) or less in capacity from the requirement that it be reviewed for substantial accord with a locality's comprehensive plan. A 150-megawatt (MW) project has a footprint of more than two square miles with potential significant impacts to forest, farm and water resources. A substantial accord review is typically a first step in the land use application process for such projects and provides both applicants and localities with guidance on whether the use and its location are appropriate. If the answer is "no" then the applicant and locality can forego the cost and time of a special use or rezoning process. If "yes" then the applicant can choose to apply for any necessary legislative and administrative approvals.

ACTION REQUIRED – Contact your House Members today to oppose HB 657.

Despite VACo testimony in opposition, HB 657 passed [House Labor and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee #3](#) by unanimous vote and is scheduled to be heard in full committee on the afternoon of February 4. However, VACo successfully testified on SB 893 in the [Senate Local Government Committee](#) where it was defeated by unanimous vote. With this positive result, Counties should now focus on defeating the House version.

KEY POINTS

- Many Counties are concerned about the loss of valuable farm and forest land, critical to local economies. Solar facilities 150 MW in generating capacity can occupy anywhere from several hundred acres to more than two square miles and are in effect largescale power plants with oversized footprints.
- Comprehensive plan review of utility-scale solar projects is necessary to determine if the use and location are consistent with land use goals and objectives. The state should not usurp local authority to determine how such facilities fit within local landscapes.

[HB 656 \(Heretick\)](#) and [SB 875 \(Marsden\)](#) restrict the authority of Counties to regulate the use of solar panels and solar storage through provisions in local zoning ordinances. Specifically, while the bills seemingly provide an option for localities to include certain industry standards when regulating the "... use of solar panels and

battery technologies”, there is a complicated enactment clause that usurps local authority by mandating these standards apply when regulating the use of such technologies, regardless of whether such standards are incorporated in local ordinances.

It is VACo’s understanding that the purpose of the enactment clause is to prohibit a locality from determining what types of solar panels and solar batteries they will, or will not allow, through implementation of a zoning ordinance, including the approval of special use permits. HB 656 passed [House Labor and Commerce Committee’s Subcommittee #3](#) by a [vote of 9 to 1](#) and is scheduled to be heard in full committee on the afternoon of Tuesday, February 4. SB 875, at the urging of VACo, was amended in the [Senate Local Government Committee](#) to remove the requirement included in the enactment clause.

ACTION REQUIRED – Contact your House Members today to oppose HB 656.

KEY POINT

- Differences in solar panels and solar storage technologies, regardless of whether they meet certain industry standards, should be subject to local zoning authority regarding their use and location.

VACo Contact: [Joe Lerch, AICP](#)

Virginia Food Access Investment Fund survives Senate Finance

The Virginia Food Access Investment Fund (VFAIF) has survived the powerful Senate Finance and Appropriations Committee, reporting with amendments to the full Senate by a vote of 13-0.

[SB 1073 \(McClellan\)](#) provides funding for the construction, rehabilitation, equipment upgrades, or expansion of grocery stores, small food retailers, and innovative food retail projects in underserved communities. The effort is a refreshed take on legislation that has been introduced numerous times the past several years seeking to create the Virginia Grocery Investment Fund (VGIF). While the VGIF sought exclusively to provide funding for public-private partnerships that would aid in opening and expanding grocery stores in underserved communities, the VFAIF has two components – one focusing on infrastructure improvements and one focusing on nutrition efforts.

While SB 1073 passed out of committee unanimously, there was concern about the VFAIF’s fiscal impact on the Commonwealth. As such, prior to its passage, the bill was amended to stipulate that the VFAIF shall not become effective

unless the General Assembly appropriates funding for the program in the 2020 budget bill.

SB 1073 (McClellan) is the Senate counterpart to Delegate Delores McQuinn's [HB 1509](#), which initially passed out of subcommittee last week. SB 1073 will now be heard this week by the full Senate, while HB 1509 will now be heard by the House Appropriations Committee.

VACo was pleased to speak on behalf of SB 1073 and HB 1509 and will continue to support these bills.

VACo Contact: [Chris McDonald, Esq.](#)

Legislation to allow local discretion over certain real property tax exemptions fails

[HB 679 \(LaRock\)](#) addresses a situation created in 2002 when a Constitutional Amendment was approved by voters allowing localities to grant certain real or personal property tax exemptions by ordinance for property used for religious, charitable, or other public purposes, within certain criteria. Prior to this time, these property tax exemptions were granted by the General Assembly at the request of the locality; a locality could also request the General Assembly to remove the exemptions. The Constitutional amendment did not provide localities the ability to eliminate exemptions that had been granted before it took effect, so those exemptions in effect on January 1, 2003, may only be repealed by the General Assembly, while those granted after that date may be revoked by local governments.

HB 679, introduced at the request of Frederick County, would repeal the pre-2003 tax exemptions, effective July 1, 2025, and allow localities to opt to continue those exemptions by ordinance.

VACo spoke in favor of the bill, pointing out that decisions about exemptions from a major local revenue source should be made by localities, but, as was the case last year, concern from the nonprofit community about potential loss of their tax exemptions prevailed and the bill was tabled.

VACo Contact: [Katie Boyle](#)

Helpful clean energy financing bill advances to full House

A bill that could help localities take advantage of creative clean energy financing mechanisms has successfully passed out of committee and will now be taken up by the full House of Delegates.

[HB 654 \(Mugler\)](#) authorizes the Department of Mines, Minerals and Energy (DMME) to sponsor a statewide clean energy financing program. More specifically, this legislation would enable DMME to engage with a private entity in order to develop and administer a statewide commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) program.

PACE is an innovative financing mechanism that enables low-cost and long-term funding for energy efficiency, renewable energy, and water conservation projects. The appeal of PACE is that it can cover up to 100 percent of a project's upfront hard and soft costs, and then can be repaid on the property tax bill over a period of up to 30 years, enabling longer payback periods that can be cash flow positive from day one. PACE financing is repaid as an assessment on the property's regular tax bill and is processed the same way as other local public benefit assessments (such as sidewalks or sewers).

VACo supports HB 654, which was reported out of the House Counties, Cities and Towns Committee, 19-3, and will be heard on the House floor later this week.

VACo Contact: [Chris McDonald, Esq.](#)

Problematic animal shelter bill advances out of subcommittee

A troubling bill pertaining to animal shelter policies and practices advanced out of subcommittee late last week.

[HB 1279 \(O'Quinn\)](#) increases from five to 10 the number of days an animal confined by a public or private animal shelter or releasing agency shall be kept prior to disposal of the animal unless sooner claimed by the rightful owner. The bill also increases from five to 10 the number of additional days such animal shall be held if the owner or custodian of the shelter determines that the animal has a collar, tag, license, tattoo, or other form of identification.

VACo opposes HB 1279 due to the fiscal impact this legislation will have on localities. HB 1279 will likely be heard by the House Agriculture, Chesapeake and

Natural Resources Committee on Wednesday, February 5, and VACo will be on hand to speak in opposition.

VACo Contact: [Chris McDonald, Esq.](#)

Bill clarifying local ability to exempt forestry equipment from personal property taxes moves forward

[HB 1021 \(Adams, L.\)](#) amends a Code section dealing with a local option to exempt farm machinery from personal property taxation. The bill authorizes a local option to exempt equipment and machinery used for forest harvesting and silvicultural activities and was brought at the request of the Virginia Loggers Association in order to clarify that such equipment could qualify for an exemption or differential rate at local option, similar to existing provisions governing equipment used for horticulture and farm wineries. VACo worked with the proponents and patron of the bill to ensure that the language specified a separate local option to exempt or partially exempt forestry equipment, so that a local governing body could choose whether to offer the exemption to forestry equipment in addition to any exemptions it may already provide to traditional farming equipment or other types of property already covered by the existing statute. VACo now supports the bill, which was unanimously reported from subcommittee and full committee and is now on the House floor.

VACo Contacts: [Joe Lerch, AICP](#) and [Katie Boyle](#)

Public employee striking bill struck

On January 30, [HB 67 \(Carter\)](#) was struck at the request of the patron in the House Labor and Commerce Committee. The bill would have authorized non-law enforcement public employees to engage in strikes or work stoppages without having been deemed to terminate their employment and prohibited from re-employment by a public employer in the Commonwealth for 12 months. These provisions in code are used to deter strikes by public employees and ensure delivery of essential public services. VACo staff expressed concern to the patron regarding the provisions of the bill. Hb 67 was one of many pieces of [legislation](#) impacting public employment and local governments filed this session.

VACo Contact: [Jeremy R. Bennett](#)

Litter tax repeal fails in subcommittee

Members of House Finance Committee's Subcommittee #3 heard several bills on January 31 relating to litter tax, which is levied on manufacturers, wholesalers, distributors, and retailers of certain products, including groceries, soft drinks, beer, wine, and paper products, at the rate of \$10 per year per business location. An additional \$15 is levied on each location that manufactures, sells, or distributes groceries, soft drinks, or beer. Along with an excise tax on soft drinks and a portion of an excise tax on beer and wine coolers, funds from the litter tax are deposited into the Litter Control and Recycling Trust Fund, which is used to provide grants to localities for litter prevention and recycling programs.

According to the Department of Environmental Quality, the litter tax generated \$664,102 in FY 2019 for the Fund, and the three revenue sources for the Fund collectively generated \$1.7 million. In FY 2018, localities matched approximately \$1.8 million in Fund revenues with more than \$22 million in other sources of funding and in-kind contributions.

The subcommittee recommended advancing [HB 1154 \(Lopez\)](#), which would increase the annual litter tax from \$10 to \$20 and the additional tax from \$15 to \$30 per year. [HB 502 \(Krizek\)](#), which adds a \$100 penalty for litter tax delinquency, will likely be incorporated into HB 1154 in full committee.

After advancing the other bills, the subcommittee tabled [HB 302 \(McNamara\)](#), which would have repealed the tax. The patron explained his view that the administration of this tax was burdensome for businesses relative to the amount of funding it generated. VACo opposed the bill, as it would have eliminated a local revenue source without replacing it.

VACo Contact: [Katie Boyle](#)

Key Dates for 2020 General Assembly Session

The House and Senate adopted the procedural resolution governing the schedule for the 2020 General Assembly session on January 10, 2020. Key dates for the 2020 Session are as follows:

- **January 8:** General Assembly convened at noon. Bills that were “prefiled” were due to be submitted by 10 a.m. Bills affecting the Virginia Retirement System or creating or continuing a study were required to be filed before adjournment of their respective chambers of introduction.
- **January 10:** Deadline for submission of budget amendments by 5 p.m.

- **January 17:** Deadline for remaining bills to be filed at 3 p.m. (there are some exceptions, such as when legislation is granted unanimous consent to be introduced after the deadline).
- **February 11:** “Crossover” deadline for each chamber to complete work on legislation originating in that chamber (except for the budget bill)
- **February 16:** House Appropriations and Senate Finance and Appropriations Committees report their respective budgets by midnight.
- **February 20:** Deadline for each chamber to complete work on its budget.
- **February 26:** Deadline for each chamber to complete work on the other chamber’s budget and appoint budget conferees; also the deadline for each chamber to act on revenue bills from the other chamber and appoint conferees.
- **March 2:** Deadline for committee action on bills at midnight.
- **March 7:** Scheduled adjournment *sine die*.
- **April 22:** Reconvened session to consider gubernatorial amendments and vetoes.

VACo Contact: [Katie Boyle](#)

Advocate for your locality at the VACo Local Government Day | In Partnership with VML and VAPDC



February 6, 2020 | Omni Richmond Hotel
 100 S 12th Street | Richmond, VA 23219
[Registration Form](#) | [Register Online](#) | [Omni Room Reservation Form](#)

Join us at the VACo/VML/VAPDC Local Government Day on Thursday, February 6!
This is our day to advocate for localities at the 2020 General Assembly Session.

The event kicks off at noon. Governor Ralph Northam is confirmed to speak. In addition, VACo and VML staff will provide legislative reports on the major issues facing Localities in the 2020 General Assembly Session. Attendees will spend the afternoon meeting and advocating their General Assembly representatives. There's a reception for VACo members and state legislators at 530pm.

- 930am** VACo Board of Directors' Meeting
- 11am** Registration
- 1130am** Box Lunch
- Noon** Governor Ralph Northam | VACo and VML Staff Reports
- Afternoon** Visit Capitol and Lobby Legislators
- 530pm** Reception

For information on how to reach your representatives, see the [Virginia House of Delegates](#) and the [Senate of Virginia](#) member websites. Find information about VACo's positions in the [2020 Legislative Program](#). We will distribute the Local Government Day Bulletin at the event.

Local leaders will have the opportunity to advocate on behalf of localities throughout the day and network and share information at a reception in the evening. Be a part of the legislative process at the 2020 General Assembly Session.

Register for the event at [VACo Local Government Day Online](#) or fax the [Registration Form](#) to 804.788.0083. Also, here's how you can book a room at the [Omni Richmond Hotel](#).

VACo Contact: [Valerie Russell](#)