

**CONFIDENTIAL**  
**LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2014**

Bill Number: H. 373\_ Name of Bill: Human Services; Title 33 reorganization

Agency/ Dept: AHS/ DCF Author of Bill Review: Ken Schatz, AHS General Counsel

Date of Bill Review: 3/24/14 Status of Bill: (check one):

Upon Introduction     As passed by 1<sup>st</sup> body     As passed by both bodies     Fiscal

---

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.

My understanding is that the bill was developed over several years in close coordination with AHS, particularly AAG Susan Harritt, and introduced in January 2013. The intent is to update, clarify and reorganize Title 33 as opposed to making substantive changes. The bill passed the House and currently sits in the Senate Committee on Health and Welfare. While much of the substance concerns DCF, it also touches upon legislation relating to DAIL, DVHA, VDH and the Secretary's Office.

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

Yes, many provisions in Title 33 are out of date.

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

All AHS departments were asked to review the bill this summer. No department reported any objections to the bill. On behalf of DCF recommendations were made for a few additional technical corrections which were accepted and approved by the House. There may be some additional requests for technical corrections from stakeholders and /or the Legislative Council.

**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)

No expected fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for others

**6. Other Stakeholders:**

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

Stakeholders interested in programs addressed in Title 33 have agreed that making technical corrections makes sense.

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

No expected opposition.

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

It is well past time to make technical corrections and update Title 33. For example, the statute should refer to the Department of Children and Families, instead of the Department of Prevention, Assistance, Transition, and Health Access. (33 V.S.A. Chapter 1).

**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.*

Not applicable.