

CONFIDENTIAL
LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2014

Bill Number: H.543 Name of Bill: An act relating to records and reports of the auditor of accounts

Agency/ Dept: Auditor of Accounts Author of Bill Review: Jason Aronowitz, F&M

Date of Bill Review: 4/21/2014

Status of Bill: (check one):

Upon Introduction As passed by 1st body As passed by both bodies

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 amends statute to include changes to Auditor reports made in session law (Act 155 of 2012 Secs. 23 and 24).

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

This bill makes permanent a 1-time reporting requirement. The Auditor's Office already delivers/posts reports meeting the requirements of this bill and intends to continue doing so regardless of passage.

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

Fiscal - None, see Question #2 above. Sec. 2(4) adds an exemption to the Public Records Act for audit materials until the completion of an audit. Finance & Management does not have an opinion on this change, but we are pointing it out for review by Governor's Counsel.

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?

None.

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)*

Municipalities may now "send" rather than "mail" their municipal reports, thereby saving on postage and copies.

6. Other Stakeholders:

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

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

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

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

8. Specific modifications that would be needed to recommend support of this bill:

An apparent drafting error omits “***” at the end of Sec. 2 (on page 5). This would have the (presumably) unintended effect of repealing all subsections of 32 V.S.A. § 163 after subsection (4). Recommended position is that this correction is necessary and, once corrected, our position is Neutral or Support.

Not meant to rewrite bill, but rather, an opportunity to identify simple modifications that would change recommended position.

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