

Fiscal Note

State of Alaska
2022 Legislative Session

Bill Version: HB 171
Fiscal Note Number:
() Publish Date:

Identifier: HB171-DOT-COM-4-22-22
Title: PFAS USE & REMEDIATION; FIRE/WATER SAFETY
Sponsor: HANNAN
Requester: House Resources
Department: Department of Transportation and Public Facilities
Appropriation: Administration and Support
Allocation: Commissioner's Office
OMB Component Number: 530

Expenditures/Revenues

Note: Amounts do not include inflation unless otherwise noted below.

(Thousands of Dollars)

	FY2023 Appropriation Requested	Included in Governor's FY2023 Request	Out-Year Cost Estimates				
			FY 2023	FY 2023	FY 2024	FY 2025	FY 2026
OPERATING EXPENDITURES	FY 2023						
Personal Services	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Travel							
Services							
Commodities							
Capital Outlay							
Grants & Benefits							
Miscellaneous							
Total Operating	***	***	***	***	***	***	***

Fund Source (Operating Only)

None							
Total	***						

Positions

Full-time							
Part-time							
Temporary							

Change in Revenues

None							
Total	0.0						

Estimated SUPPLEMENTAL (FY2022) cost: 0.0 *(separate supplemental appropriation required)*

Estimated CAPITAL (FY2023) cost: 18,191.4 *(separate capital appropriation required)*

Does the bill create or modify a new fund or account? no

(Supplemental/Capital/New Fund - discuss reasons and fund source(s) in analysis section)

ASSOCIATED REGULATIONS

Does the bill direct, or will the bill result in, regulation changes adopted by your agency? no

If yes, by what date are the regulations to be adopted, amended or repealed?

Why this fiscal note differs from previous version/comments:

Updated to FY23 fiscal note form and to reflect estimates of capital project costs.

Prepared By:
Division:
Approved By:
Agency:

Andy Mills, DOT&PF Legislative Liaison
Commissioner's Office
Dom Pannone
DOT&PF

Phone: (907)465-3900
Date: 04/22/2022
Date: 04/22/22

FISCAL NOTE ANALYSIS

STATE OF ALASKA
2022 LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BILL NO. HB 171

Analysis

The bill defines and establishes concentration limits for per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) in drinking water. It requires that the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities test all drinking water in areas where PFAS has been released near a drinking water source. If results are above the limits established by the bill, it requires the Department to provide alternative drinking water. It prohibits the use of PFAS containing firefighting substances once no longer required by federal law.

DOT&PF has conducted PFAS testing at eleven of thirty airports (Nome, Iliamna, Aniak, Gustavus, Fairbanks, Yakutat, Cordova, King Salmon, Dillingham, Homer and Valdez) suspected of PFAS contamination due to aqueous film-forming foam (AFFF) used by airport crash rescue personnel, with five of those airports not exceeding previous PFAS health advisory limits. However, nearly all tests did not include samples for HFPO-DA so most sites will require re-testing at an approximate cost of \$100,000 per airport. Test results dictate the follow-on actions required of the Department so are largely unknown at this time. DOT&PF has been providing bottled water at other communities including Fairbanks, Gustavus and Yakutat, at an approximate cost of ~\$180,000 per community, while longer term water solutions are investigated.

Personal Services: The department currently has a PFAS coordinator that is managing a private contract and overseeing PFAS testing, monitoring, characterization, and assessment activities related to investigations and airport development or rehabilitation projects.

Travel: Travel will be required for staff to conduct outreach, investigation, training, assessment, and site characterization activities.

Contractual: Contractual costs include water sampling and testing of sites where PFAS has been released, as well as providing alternative sources of drinking water to those relying on impacted drinking water wells. The Department will need to contract with a third party to dispose of PFAS containing firefighting substances once an alternative is approved. As the testing continues, the universe of impacted sites is expected to continue to grow, increasing the contractual costs each year.

Commodities: Supply costs reflect interim water needs while contractual arrangements are secured.

Estimate of Capital Project Costs using average per airport testing costs to date:

Average Phase 1 (Initial Well Search and Sampling Tasks): \$101,353
Average Phase 2 (Initial Site Characterization): \$449,890

Estimated total cost for testing all known sites (airports) under new requirements of this legislation:

Phase 1: Average multiplied by 30 = \$3,040,950
Phase 2: Average multiplied by 30 = \$13,496,700
10% water costs and contingency = \$1,653,765
Total: \$18,191,415