

CONFIDENTIAL
LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2016

Bill Number: H.872 Name of Bill: An act relating to Executive Branch fees

Agency/ Dept: Agriculture Author of Bill Review: Diane Bothfeld

Date of Bill Review: 5/20/16 Related Bills and Key Players Appropriations Bill

Status of Bill: (check one): ☐ Upon Introduction ☐ As passed by 1st body ☒ As passed by both

Recommended Position:

☒ Support ☐ Oppose ☐ Remain Neutral ☐ Support with modifications identified in #8 below

Analysis of Bill

1. Summary of bill and issue it addresses. *Describe what the bill is intended to accomplish and why.*

This bill updates Agency of Agriculture Fees within the three year cycle as well as other agency and department fees.

2. Is there a need for this bill? *Please explain why or why not.*

Yes – agency and department fees are adjusted every three years. The Agency adjusted all fees this year based on cost to operate including administration (back of the house) costs. The fee increases will support operations and further water quality work at the agency. Fees were compared to surrounding states and in most cases were in line with other states. Where changes were made by the legislature to initial proposal – house added general funds to fill revenue hole.

3. What are likely to be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for this Department?

This fee bill provides \$1.2 million in added revenue to the Agency of Agriculture Budget in specials funds that will meet agency needs until the next fee bill cycle.

4. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for other departments in state government, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?

Other departments that were in the fee bill process this year also need fee revenue to operate.

5. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for others, and what is likely to be their perspective on it? *(for example, public, municipalities, organizations, business, regulated entities, etc)*

Unknown

6. Other Stakeholders:

6.1 Who else is likely to support the proposal and why?

Agency of Agriculture, Grocers Association - grudgingly

Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word document to Jahala.Dudley@vermont.gov & Jessica.Mishaan@vermont.gov

6.2 Who else is likely to oppose the proposal and why?

Those paying fees – farmers, agricultural industry

7. Rationale for recommendation: *Justify recommendation stated above.*

Agency worked to keep fees in line with other states and to cover the cost of operations of inspection and services at the Agency of the next 3 years. Increase is \$1.2 million and will just cover expenses in FY20 – next fee bill round.

8. Specific modifications that would be needed to recommend support of this bill: *Not meant to rewrite bill, but rather, an opportunity to identify simple modifications that would change recommended position.*

No modifications

9. Will this bill create a new board or commission AND/OR add or remove appointees to an existing one? If so, which one and how many?

No new boards or commissions.

Secretary/Commissioner has reviewed this document: _____ **Date:** _____