

CONFIDENTIAL

LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2015-2016

Bill Number: S.217 Name of Bill: Professions and occupations; Office of Professional Regulation; report; regulation transfer

Agency/ Dept: ANR/DEC Author of Bill Review: Joanna Pallito

Date of Bill Review: 12/31/15 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.* This bill proposes to require specified State agencies that regulate professions or occupations to provide the Secretary of State's Office of Professional Regulation (OPR) with a comprehensive report on the resources necessary for that regulation. The reports will be used by OPR and the State to review the organization of professional regulation across the various agencies and departments listed to determine whether the regulation of certain professions and occupations should be transferred to the OPR as a way to allow State government to operate in a more effective and efficient manner.

2. Is there a need for this bill? *Please explain why or why not.* Yes, in state government we should always be looking at ways to be most effective and efficient in all of our processes especially with staffing and resource constraints.

3. What are likely to be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for this Department?
The purpose of this Bill is to actually perform this analysis and prepare reports that will outline and ascertain any potential implications (fiscal and programmatic) with transferring to OPR.

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? See response to #3 above.

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)* In light of the recent retirements across state government, this analysis/report may be viewed positively, but it isn't clear what, if any, implications to those impacted might be so the analysis required as part of the proposed Bill will provide a greater perspective.

6. Other Stakeholders:

6.1 Who else is likely to support the proposal and why? Given that this Bill creates only a reporting requirement at this time we believe most stakeholders would be neutral and there would be no significant issue.


6.2 Who else is likely to oppose the proposal and why? Given that this Bill creates only a reporting requirement at this time we believe most stakeholders would be neutral and there would be no significant issue.

7. Rationale for recommendation: *Justify recommendation stated above.* This reporting requirement gives the DEC greater information on how to provide more efficient service to licensed recipients and potentially minimize resource impacts on the state.

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.* We support the Bill as stated above as we should always be looking at providing the most effective and efficient service across state government. The only aspect we feel should be added to S.217 is an equivalent reporting requirement from the OPR after departments/agencies have filed by October 15, 2016. The idea is that this would be a similar report covering the items listed below to ensure that any and all transfer decisions are arrived at in fair and balanced approach. Items the report from OPR would cover or take into consideration:

- impact to the customer/licensee (covering both financial and service),
- effect of the profession as a whole,
- effect on access to data and our IT systems,
- effect on any federal funding (if applicable),
- effect on state resources
- resources available/capacity needs to assume respective programs

9. Gubernatorial appointments to board or commission? N/A

Commissioner has reviewed this document:  Date: 1/8/16

Secretary has reviewed this document:  Date: 1/8/16