

CONFIDENTIAL
LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2015

Bill Number: S. 138 – Sections Pertaining to DFR **Name of Bill:** An act relating to Economic Development

Agency/ Dept: Dept. of Financial Regulation **Author of Bill Review:** Susan L. Donegan

Date of Bill Review: 6/1/2015 **Related Bills and Key Players** _____

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.*

Section A3 requires DFR, along with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, to study blockchain technology.

Section E4 increases the amount a person may lend (excluding residential mortgage loans) from \$75,000 to \$250,000 in any one year before being required to obtain a lender license, mortgage broker license, or sales finance company license.

Section E5 requires DFR, in collaboration with ACCD, to study models for peer-to-peer lending and investment.

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

Yes. This bill proposes to study certain innovative technologies and methodologies. The studies are likely to lead to further economic development in Vermont. The amendment to the licensed lender law in Section E4 will make it easier for persons to make loans up to \$250,000, therefore promoting economic development as well.

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

None. DFR has adequate resources to handle any additional workload created by this bill.

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?

It is not anticipated that Sections A3, E4, and E5 will create fiscal and programmatic implications for the other departments mentioned in those sections.

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

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 studies are not anticipated to create fiscal and programmatic implications for others.

6. **Other Stakeholders:**

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

The public; businesses; organizations/entities which promote economic development.

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

There was no significant opposition to this bill.

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

DFR agreed to Section E4 as a compromise with legislators. DFR has no issues with conducting the studies noted in Sections A3 and E5.

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?**

None.

~~Secretary~~ **Secretary/Commissioner has reviewed this document:**

Susan Z. Donaghy

Date:

6/1/15