

CONFIDENTIAL
LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2016

Bill Number: S.198 Name of Bill: Open Meeting Law

Agency/ Dept: VTrans/Policy & Planning Author of Bill Review: Joe Segale

Date of Bill Review: May 3, 2016 Update Related Bills and Key Players H.521 is identical _____

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 proposes to amend the charge of the joint legislative Government Accountability Committee (GAC); amend the State's population-level outcomes and their related indicators; and change the date by which the Chief Performance Officer must submit the annual report on those outcomes and indicators.

Changes to the GAC's charge related to the frequency of its meetings, allows the GAC to approve rather than recommend changes in the population level outcomes and indicators, and some other minor clarifications.

The percent of structurally deficient bridges as defined by AOT is relocated as an indicator for the "Vermont has a prosperous economy" population outcome to an indicator for the newly created population outcome Vermont's State infrastructure meets the needs of Vermonters, the economy, and the environment."

NOTE: Reviewed Final Version passed by Senate. There were no significant changes compare to the Bill as Introduced". The House Passed the Senate version without ammendments.

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

From VTrans' perspective including a population outcome specific to infrastructure is an important change and recognizes the role that infrastructure plays every day for Vermonters and overall for the economy and environment.

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

No programmatic implications. We have been collecting data and reporting on structurally deficient bridges for many years. We have voluntarily submitted other RBA performance measures to the GAC as well including pavement condition, safety, transit ridership, rail ridership and wait times at DMV offices.

Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word document to laura.gray@state.vt.us and jessica.mishaan@state.vt.us

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?

The bill includes a number of clarifications and changes to indicators for other population outcomes. Other state agencies need to review those changes to make sure data are available and can be collected annually. Sue Zeller, the Chief Performance Officer, has worked with the Agencies on the changes that are included in the bill.

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)

The bill includes a number of clarifications and changes to indicators for other population outcomes. It's possible that some outside interests will have views on the measures. It is unlikely that others will be concerned with the addition of the Infrastructure outcome and the percent of structurally deficient bridges.

6. Other Stakeholders:

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

Sue Zeller worked with members of GAC on this bill, so AOA and the GAC should support it.

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

There is unlikely to be significant opposition to this bill.

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

VTrans should support this bill because it includes improving the state's infrastructure on par with the other eight population level outcomes.

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.*

None

9. Gubernatorial appointments to board or commission?

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