



Ohio Legislative Service Commission

Bill Analysis

Michael Burns

Sub. S.B. 3*

130th General Assembly

(As Reported by S. State Government Oversight and Reform)

Sens. LaRose, Faber, Eklund, Gardner, Obhof, Widener, Uecker, Hite, Balderson, Beagle, Coley, Patton, Jones, Manning, Lehner, Seitz

TABLE OF CONTENTS

No change rules to be put through business review	2
Noncompliance with Periodic Review of Rules Act.....	4
JCARR referral or re-referral of proposed or existing rule to CSIO.....	5
Abbreviated compliance with business review by elected state officers	7
Applicability of Common Sense Initiative Act clarified.....	7
Fines imposed by state agencies to be deposited into General Revenue Fund.....	7
Rule Watch System	8
Customer service standards.....	9
Publication of customer service standards	9
Optional review of customer service standards	9
Deadlines for developing initial customer service standards.....	10
Entrepreneur in Residence Pilot Program	10
Participation in the pilot program	10
Duties of entrepreneurs in residence.....	11
Report by entrepreneurs in residence	11
Working groups of entrepreneurs in residence	12
Report on pilot program by Small Business Advisory Council	12
Agency consideration of information learned at public hearing on proposed rule	13
Legislative invalidation of proposed and existing rules: procedure clarified	14
Suspension of proposed rules upon recommended invalidation	14
Legislative review December carry-over clause modified	15
Electronic mail address to be provided in Rule Summary and Fiscal Analysis	15
Legislative review mandatory	16
Extension or revival of review time for proposed rule if later version rejected.....	16
Operational duration of emergency rules increased	16
Procedural changes for adopting auditing rules.....	17
Transition rules	17

* This analysis was prepared before the report of the Senate State Government Oversight and Reform Committee appeared in the Senate Journal. Note that the list of co-sponsors and the legislative history may be incomplete.

Transitional duties of Legislative Information Systems	17
Recodification of legislative review acts	18
References to "119.032 review dates"	20
Miscellaneous improvements	20

BILL SUMMARY

- Revises rule-making and rule review procedures.

No change rules to be put through business review

- Requires existing rules that, as a result of their review under the Periodic Review of Rules Act, are being filed as "no change" rules, to be put through business review.¹

Under current law recently enacted by the Common Sense Initiative Act,² beginning on January 1, 2012, proposed rules that are being drafted are put through business review before they begin the formal rule-making process. Business review is carried out by an agency in the Governor's Office, the Common Sense Initiative Office (CSIO). Under the bill, existing rules that, as a result of periodic review under the Periodic Review of Rules Act, are being filed as "no change rules" are subject to business review, just as draft rules currently are subject.

Under the Periodic Review of Rules Act, an agency is required, approximately every five years, to review its existing rules against several enumerated standards. The agency then must determine whether the rule needs to be amended or rescinded in light of its review. If the agency determines that the rule needs to be amended or rescinded, it proceeds to do so according to the appropriate rule-making procedure. If, however, the agency determines that the rule does not need to be amended or rescinded, it must file the rule, without change, for review under the Periodic Review of Rules Act. Such a rule is referred to as a "no change rule."

An agency that files a no change rule must comply with the following procedural steps:

(1) The agency first must reconsider its review of the no change rule under the review standard of the Periodic Review of Rules Act that required the agency to determine whether the no change rule has an adverse impact on businesses.

¹ R.C. 106.03(B)(2), 106.031, and 106.04.

² S.B. 2 of the 129th General Assembly.



(2) If the no change rule does not have an adverse impact on businesses, the agency can proceed with filing the no change rule for legislative review.

(3) If, however, the no change rule has an adverse impact on businesses, the agency must prepare a business impact analysis that describes its review of the no change rule against the standard explained in (1) above and that explains why the regulatory intent of the no change rule justifies its adverse impact on businesses.

(4) The agency must transmit a copy of the full text of the no change rule and the business impact analysis electronically to CSIO. CSIO must make the no change rule and analysis available to the public on its web site.

(5) CSIO must evaluate the no change rule and business impact analysis against the Business Impact Analysis Instrument and any other relevant criteria, and is authorized, but not required, to prepare and transmit recommendations to the agency on how the no change rule might be amended or rescinded to eliminate or reduce any adverse impact the no change rule has on businesses.³

Note: The Business Impact Analysis Instrument is a document prepared by CSIO. The instrument functions as a tool for evaluating rules to determine whether the rules have an adverse impact on businesses.⁴

(6) The agency must consider any recommendations made by CSIO.

(7) Not earlier than the 16th business day after transmitting the no change rule and business impact analysis to CSIO, the agency must either (a) proceed to file the no change rule with the Joint Committee on Agency Rule Review (JCARR) for review under the Periodic Review of Rules Act as a no change rule, or (b) commence the process of rescinding the no change rule or of amending the no change rule to incorporate into the rule features CSIO's recommendations suggest will eliminate or reduce the adverse impact the rule has on businesses.

(8) If the agency receives recommendations from CSIO, and determines not to amend or rescind the no change rule, the agency must prepare a memorandum of response that explains why the no change rule is not being rescinded or why the recommendations are not being incorporated into the rule.

³ R.C. 107.54(A)(2).

⁴ See R.C. 107.52 (definition of when a rule has an "adverse impact on businesses") and 107.53 (Business Impact Analysis Instrument). Both of these sections are in the bill.



Subject to the provision described in the following topic, JCARR does not have jurisdiction to review, and must reject, the filing of a no change rule if, at any time while the no change rule is in its possession, it discovers that the no change rule has an adverse impact on businesses and the agency has not complied with the procedure outlined above. When the filing of a no change rule is rejected, it is as if the filing had not been made. JCARR must electronically return a rule that is rejected to the agency, together with any documents that were part of the filing. The rejection does not preclude the agency from refileing the rule with JCARR after complying with the procedure outlined above. This power to reject the filing of a no change rule is in addition to JCARR's continuing power to recommend invalidation of a no change rule if the rule has not been properly reviewed and amended or rescinded when reviewed against the standards for periodic review, including the standard pertaining to reducing or eliminating adverse impacts on businesses.

When the joint committee recommends that a rule be invalidated, the rule remains operational pending action by the Senate and House of Representatives on the concurrent resolution embodying the recommendation. If the Senate and House of Representatives adopt the concurrent resolution, the rule is invalid. If, however, the Senate and House of Representatives do not adopt the resolution, the rule continues in effect, and is next to be reviewed according to the new periodic review date the agency has assigned to the rule in the course of the Periodic Review of Rules Act process.

Noncompliance with Periodic Review of Rules Act

- Authorizes JCARR to recommend invalidation of an existing, no change rule if the agency has not complied with the Periodic Review of Rules Act and fails to appear before JCARR to show cause for the noncompliance.⁵

Under continuing law, if an agency fails to comply with the Periodic Review of Rules Act, JCARR must afford the agency an opportunity to appear before JCARR to show cause why the agency has not complied with the act. JCARR is authorized to recommend, by vote of a majority of its members present, invalidation of the existing rule if the agency fails to show cause. The bill clarifies that if the agency appears before the joint committee at the time scheduled for the agency to show cause, and fails to do so, the joint committee, by vote of a majority of its members present, may recommend adoption of a concurrent resolution invalidating the rule for the agency's failure to show cause. The bill adds that, if the agency fails to appear before the joint committee at the time scheduled for the agency to show cause, the joint committee, by vote of a majority of its members present, may recommend adoption of a concurrent resolution invalidating the rule for the agency's default.

⁵ R.C. 106.031(E) (second to last paragraph).



JCARR referral or re-referral of proposed or existing rule to CSIO

- Authorizes JCARR to refer or re-refer a proposed or existing rule to CSIO if JCARR is uncertain whether the rule has an adverse impact on businesses or if it appears that such an impact has not been addressed or has been inadequately addressed.⁶

If JCARR is reviewing a proposed or existing rule under the Periodic Review of Rules Act and is uncertain whether the rule has an adverse impact on businesses, or if the rule appears to have an adverse impact on businesses that has not been addressed or that has been inadequately addressed, JCARR electronically may refer or re-refer the rule to the CSIO. JCARR also may transmit a memorandum to CSIO along with the proposed or existing rule explaining specifically why it is referring or re-referring the rule to CSIO. The joint committee electronically must notify the agency if it refers or re-refers the proposed or existing rule to CSIO.

Such a referral or re-referral tolls (stops) the running of the time within which the joint committee is required to recommend adoption of a concurrent resolution invalidating the proposed or existing rule. The time resumes running when the proposed or existing rule is returned to the joint committee after the referral or re-referral. The tolling does not affect the continued operation of an existing rule.

CSIO, within 30 days after receiving a proposed or existing rule from JCARR as explained above, must evaluate or re-evaluate the rule to determine whether it has an adverse impact on businesses, and then must proceed as explained below, as is appropriate to its determination.

If CSIO determined that the proposed or existing rule does not have an adverse impact on businesses, CSIO must prepare a memorandum stating that finding. CSIO electronically must transmit the memorandum to the agency, and must return the proposed or existing rule to the joint committee. CSIO also must transmit a copy of its memorandum to JCARR along with the proposed or existing rule. JCARR may review or reject the proposed or existing rule, the same as if the rule had not been referred or re-referred to CSIO. If, when the proposed or existing rule is returned to JCARR, fewer than 30 days remain in the time by which a concurrent resolution invalidating the rule must be recommended, the time for making such a recommendation is extended until the thirtieth day after the day on which the rule was returned to JCARR.

If, however, CSIO determined that the proposed or existing rule has an adverse impact on businesses, CSIO electronically must transmit the memorandum to the

⁶ R.C. 106.05.

agency, and must also return the proposed or existing rule to the agency. CSIO also must transmit a copy of its memorandum to JCARR along with the proposed or existing rule. After receiving the memorandum and proposed or existing rule from CSIO, the agency must evaluate the impact of the proposed or existing rule on business, complete a business impact analysis, and submit the business impact analysis to CSIO for review.

When CSIO transmits a copy of a proposed rule to JCARR, if fewer than 30 days remain in the time by which a concurrent resolution invalidating the rule must be recommended, the time for making such a recommendation is extended until the thirtieth day after a copy of the rule was transmitted to JCARR. The agency, after considering the CSIO's recommendations, may revise the proposed rule. And, if the agency does so, the agency may either incorporate into the revised proposed rule features the recommendations suggest will reduce or eliminate any adverse impact the proposed rule might have on businesses or document in writing reasons why the recommendations are not being incorporated into the revised proposed rule. The agency then must prepare a memorandum of response identifying features suggested by any recommendations that were incorporated into the proposed rule, explaining how those features reduce or eliminate any adverse impact the revised proposed rule might have on businesses, and explaining why features suggested by the recommendations that were not incorporated into the revised proposed rule were not incorporated.

When, on the other hand, CSIO transmits a copy of an existing rule to JCARR, it is the same as if the agency had withdrawn the rule from JCARR's jurisdiction. If the agency determines, after considering CSIO's recommendations, that the existing rule needs to be amended or rescinded, the agency is to commence the process of doing so. If, however, the agency determines, after considering the CSIO's recommendations, that the no change rule does not need to be amended or rescinded, the agency must resume periodic review of the no change rule by preparing a memorandum of response explaining why the no change rule is not being rescinded or why CSIO's recommendations are not being amended into the no change rule. The memorandum and no change rule must be filed with JCARR.

When JCARR gives notice that it is referring or re-referring a proposed or existing rule to CSIO, and when JCARR or CSIO transmits a memorandum to the other or to an agency, JCARR or CSIO also electronically must transmit a copy of the notice or memorandum to the Director of the Legislative Service Commission (LSC). The Director of LSC is required to publish the notice or memorandum in the *Register of Ohio* together with a notation identifying the proposed or existing rule to which the notice or memorandum relates.



Abbreviated compliance with business review by elected state officers

- Specifies that rule-making by the offices of the state elected officers must comply with the business review provisions, but may bypass CSIO and file relevant business review documents directly with JCARR.
- Specifies that these rules may become subject to review by CSIO under the referral and re-referral provisions of the bill (described above).⁷

The offices of the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Auditor of State, Secretary of State, Treasurer of State, and Attorney General are required to comply with the business review provisions of existing law (proposed rules) and the bill (existing, no change rules), but are not required to submit any document to CSIO or to prepare any document that would have been prepared in response to recommendations of CSIO, but rather are to prepare all other documents required under the business review provisions and submit the documents directly to JCARR along with the proposed or existing rule. These rules may become subject to review by CSIO, however, under the referral or re-referral provision described above.

Applicability of Common Sense Initiative Act clarified

- Amends the Common Sense Initiative Act to clarify its applicability under the bill to existing, no change rules.⁸

The Common Sense Initiative Act currently refers specifically to "draft rules."⁹ This usage emphasizes the original intent of the act to put rules that are being drafted through business review before they begin the formal rule-making process. The bill adds references to "existing rules." This clarifies that the bill is expanding the Common Sense Initiative Act to make it apply expressly also to existing, no change rules, which the bill subjects to business review according to the procedure described above.

Fines imposed by state agencies to be deposited into General Revenue Fund

- Specifies, beginning in fiscal year 2016, that if a state agency imposes a fine as punishment, and does so in its sole discretion, or solely by implication from a

⁷ R.C. 121.81(A) and 121.811.

⁸ R.C. 121.81(B) and R.C. 107.52, 107.53, 107.54, 107.55, 107.62, and 107.63.

⁹ R.C. 121.81(B).



constitutional or statutory grant of authority, the fine is to be deposited into the General Revenue Fund.¹⁰

- Requires agencies, in their budget request forms, also to account separately for revenues received from fines.

Under the bill, beginning in fiscal year 2016, if a state agency imposes a fine or other sum of money as punishment for an act or omission, and does so in its sole discretion, or solely by implication from a constitutional or statutory grant of authority, any money recovered from imposition of the fine or other sum of money must be deposited into the state treasury to the credit of the General Revenue Fund. A state agency is not subject to this requirement if it imposes a fine or other sum of money as punishment for an act or omission pursuant to a constitutional or statutory mandate that expressly contemplates such an imposition.

The bill specifies that the phrase "fine or other sum of money" refers to a pecuniary punishment however it is named.

The bill specifies that the budget request forms agencies file to request appropriations of money must require an agency also separately to report revenues received from fines or other sums of money imposed by the agency as contemplated by the provision described above.

Rule Watch System

- Requires JCARR to establish, maintain, and improve a Rule Watch System that enables persons to register to receive electronic mail alerts when an agency files a rule for review by JCARR.¹¹
- Requires JCARR to integrate the Common Sense Initiative Office and the Ohio Business Gateway into the Rule Watch System in furtherance of the goal of providing one world wide web portal through which information about rules can be obtained.

The bill requires JCARR to establish, maintain, and improve a Rule Watch System. The system is to be designed so that a person may register electronically to receive an electronic mail alert when an agency files a rule for review by JCARR. Failure of the system to transmit such an electronic mail alert to a person is not grounds for

¹⁰ R.C. 113.091. Fiscal year 2016 begins on July 1, 2015.

¹¹ R.C. 101.351.



questioning the validity of a rule or the validity of the process by which the rule was adopted.

The goal of the Rule Watch System is to provide one world wide web portal through which a person can obtain information about the rules of, and about rulemaking by, state agencies. In furtherance of this goal, JCARR is to integrate the Common Sense Initiative Office and the Ohio Business Gateway into the Rule Watch System. JCARR is declared to be the principal member of the Rule Watch System, but is required to work in collaboration with the Common Sense Initiative Office and the Ohio Business Gateway to achieve the integration.

Customer service standards

- Requires an agency to post its customer service standards on the Internet.
- Authorizes the Common Sense Initiative Office, upon agency request, to review and comment on the agency's customer service standards.
- Imposes deadlines by which state agencies must develop initial customer service standards.

Continuing law requires a state agency to develop customer service standards for each employee of the agency whose duties include a significant level of contact with the public.

Publication of customer service standards

The bill requires an agency to post its customer service standards, and any revisions therein, on its web site or, if the agency does not maintain a web site, on the State Public Notice Web Site.¹²

Optional review of customer service standards

The bill also authorizes the Common Sense Initiative Office, upon the request of an agency, to review an agency's customer service standards and transmit any comments it has with regard to the standards to the agency.¹³

¹² R.C. 121.91(A) (third paragraph).

¹³ R.C. 121.91(A) (last paragraph).



Deadlines for developing initial customer service standards

If a state agency, on the effective date of the bill, has not developed its initial customer service standards, the agency must do so not later than December 31, 2013.¹⁴ A state agency that is created after the effective date of the bill must develop its initial customer service standards within six months after the effective date of the statute that creates the state agency.¹⁵

Entrepreneur in Residence Pilot Program

- Requires the Small Business Advisory Council to establish and operate an Entrepreneur in Residence Pilot Program.¹⁶

The bill requires the Small Business Advisory Council to establish and operate an Entrepreneur in Residence Pilot Program. The mission of the pilot program is to provide for better outreach by state government to small businesses, to strengthen coordination and interaction between state government and small businesses, and to make state government programs and functions simpler, easier to access, more efficient, and more responsive to the needs of small businesses.¹⁷

Participation in the pilot program

Not later than the first day of the seventh month after the effective date of the bill, the council must (1) select not fewer than three nor more than five state agencies that have programs or perform functions affecting small businesses to participate in the pilot program and (2) assign only one entrepreneur in residence to each state agency that is participating in the pilot program. The council must assign entrepreneurs in residence from among individuals who are representatives of small businesses and who are successful in their fields. The assignment of an entrepreneur in residence is for one year after the date on which the entrepreneur in residence was assigned to a state agency.¹⁸

The offices of Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Auditor of State, Treasurer of State, and Attorney General are not state agencies for purposes of participation in the Entrepreneur in Residence Pilot Program.

¹⁴ Section 5 of the bill.

¹⁵ R.C. 121.91(A) (first paragraph).

¹⁶ R.C. 107.63 and 107.631.

¹⁷ R.C. 107.631(A).

¹⁸ R.C. 107.631(B) (except for last paragraph).



Duties of entrepreneurs in residence

An entrepreneur in residence must do all of the following:

- (1) Facilitate meetings or forums to educate small business owners and operators about the programs or functions of the state agency that affect small businesses;
- (2) Facilitate in-service sessions with employees of the state agency on issues of concern to small business owners and operators;
- (3) Advise the state agency on how its programs and functions that affect small business might be improved to further the mission of the pilot program;
- (4) Provide technical assistance or mentorships to small businesses in accessing the programs or functions of the state agency that affect small businesses; and
- (5) Do any other things that further the mission of the pilot program.¹⁹

While an entrepreneur in residence is to report directly to the director or other head of the state agency,²⁰ the council is to monitor the work of entrepreneurs in residence during the pilot program. (A state agency is required to cooperate with the council to facilitate this monitoring.)²¹

An entrepreneur in residence is not entitled to compensation, but is entitled to reimbursement from the state agency of the actual and necessary expenses the entrepreneur in residence incurs in discharge of the entrepreneur in residence's duties.

Report by entrepreneurs in residence

Not later than the date that is one year after an entrepreneur in residence was assigned to a state agency, the entrepreneur in residence must prepare a report about the state agency. In the report, the entrepreneur in residence must make recommendations to the state agency that furthers the mission of the pilot program. In particular, the entrepreneur in residence must make recommendations to the state agency regarding all of the following:

- (1) Elimination of inefficient or duplicative programs or functions of the state agency that affect small businesses;

¹⁹ R.C. 107.631(C).

²⁰ R.C. 107.631(D) (first paragraph).

²¹ R.C. 107.631(B) (last paragraph).



(2) Methods of improving the efficiency of the programs or functions of the state agency that affect small businesses;

(3) Any new program or function affecting small businesses that should be established and implemented by the state agency; and

(4) Any other matter that will further the mission of the pilot program.

The entrepreneur in residence must provide a copy of the report to the Small Business Advisory Council and to the state agency.²²

Working groups of entrepreneurs in residence

During the pilot program, or upon its conclusion, the Small Business Advisory Council may convene an informal working group of entrepreneurs in residence to discuss best practices, experiences, and opportunities for and obstacles to operating small businesses, as well as the recommendations in the reports prepared by the entrepreneurs in residence.²³

Report on pilot program by Small Business Advisory Council

Upon conclusion of the pilot program, and after considering the reports of the entrepreneurs in residence and information learned from any informal working group of entrepreneurs in residence, the Small Business Advisory Council must prepare a report on the pilot program. In the report, the council must recommend whether the pilot program should be repeated with or without modifications, made permanent with or without modifications, or abandoned. The council must append the reports of the entrepreneurs in residence to its report. If the pilot program is repeated or made permanent, an individual who previously was assigned as an entrepreneur in residence is not eligible to be reassigned as an entrepreneur in residence.²⁴

The council must provide a copy of its report to the Common Sense Initiative Office. The office promptly must transmit a copy of the report to the Governor, the President and Minority Leader of the Senate, and the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.²⁵

²² R.C. 107.631(E)(1).

²³ R.C. 107.631(E)(2).

²⁴ R.C. 107.631(F) (first paragraph).

²⁵ R.C. 107.63 (first paragraph) and 107.631(F) (second paragraph).



Agency consideration of information learned at public hearing on proposed rule

- Requires a state agency to consider information learned at a public hearing on a proposed rule, and to prepare a hearing summary that analyzes the issues raised at the hearing.
- Requires a state agency to prepare a hearing report describing how information learned at the public hearing has led to modifications in the proposed rule.
- Requires a state agency to file the hearing report with JCARR when it files the proposed rule with JCARR for legislative review.

Rules proposed under the Administrative Procedure Act must be subjected to a public hearing at which any person affected by the proposed rule may appear and, among things, present the person's position, arguments, or contentions tending to show that the proposed rule, if adopted or implemented, will be unreasonable or unlawful. The state agency proposing the rule also may permit persons to present their positions, arguments, or contentions not only at the hearing but also before, after, or both before and after the public hearing.²⁶

The bill requires a state agency to consider the positions, arguments, or contentions presented at, or before or after, the public hearing on a proposed rule. The state agency next must prepare a hearing summary of the positions, arguments, or contentions, and of the issues raised by the positions, arguments, or contentions. The state agency then must prepare a hearing report explaining, with regard to each issue, how it is reflected in the proposed rule. If an issue is not reflected in the proposed rule, the hearing report must explain why the issue is not reflected in the proposed rule. The state agency must append the hearing summary to the hearing report.²⁷

When the proposed rule is filed with JCARR for legislative review, the state agency must file a copy of the hearing report along with the proposed rule. If the hearing report is not available when the proposed rule is filed with JCARR, the state agency must file the hearing report with JCARR when it becomes available. (This can happen, for example, if the state agency has not held its public hearing when the proposed rule is filed with JCARR.) The later filing of a hearing report does not constitute a revision of the proposed rule to which the report relates.²⁸

²⁶ R.C. 119.03(D) (first paragraph).

²⁷ R.C. 119.03(D) (fourth paragraph).

²⁸ R.C. 119.03(C).

Legislative invalidation of proposed and existing rules: procedure clarified

- Clarifies the procedure according to which concurrent resolutions invalidating proposed and existing rules are processed.²⁹

Under the Legislative Review of Rules Act and the Periodic Review of Rules Act, the Joint Committee on Agency Rule Review (JCARR) is authorized to recommend that the General Assembly adopt a concurrent resolution invalidating proposed rules or existing no change rules (see below) that were reviewed under those laws. The bill clarifies the procedure for processing these concurrent resolutions.

To recommend adoption of such a concurrent resolution, the Chairperson of JCARR, or another member of JCARR designated by the Chairperson, must prepare the recommendation of invalidation in writing. The recommendation must identify the proposed or existing rule, the agency that proposed or submitted the proposed or existing rule, and the finding that caused the joint committee to make the recommendation. The recommendation also must briefly explain the finding.

The Chairperson of JCARR must request the Legislative Service Commission to prepare a concurrent resolution to invalidate the proposed or existing rule according to the recommendation. The concurrent resolution must state the finding that caused JCARR to recommend invalidation of the rule.

The Chairperson of JCARR, or another member of JCARR designated by the Chairperson, must submit the concurrent resolution to the clerk of either house of the General Assembly. The recommendation of invalidation and a copy of the proposed or existing rule also must be submitted to the clerk along with the concurrent resolution.

Suspension of proposed rules upon recommended invalidation

- Declares that the rule-making proceedings pertaining to a proposed rule are suspended if the Joint Committee on Agency Rule Review (JCARR) recommends adoption of a concurrent resolution to invalidate the proposed rule.³⁰

The bill specifies that such a suspension begins when JCARR votes to recommend invalidation of the proposed rule and ends on the earlier of (1) the day that is six months after the day the vote was taken or (2) the day both houses have adjourned sine die. The bill also declares that rule-making proceedings may resume upon the ending of the suspension, unless a concurrent resolution invalidating the

²⁹ R.C. 106.04 and 106.041.

³⁰ R.C. 106.023.



proposed rule is adopted during the suspension, in which case the proposed or existing rule is invalid as provided in the concurrent resolution.

Legislative review December carry-over clause modified

- Specifies that a *revised* version of a proposed rule that is filed with JCARR in December is to be reviewed legislatively not later than the 30th day after the first day of the legislative session in the following January.³¹

Under the Legislative Review of Rules Act, when the original or a revised version of a proposed rule is filed with JCARR in December, the proposed rule is carried over for review in the following January and then reviewed as if it were the original version of the proposed rule and had been filed on the first day of the legislative session in that January. The effect is to allow 65 days for legislative review of proposed rule that has been carried over, regardless of the pre-carry-over status of the proposed rule as original or revised. The bill rather distinguishes original and revised versions of proposed rules for purposes of the carry-over clause. Under the bill, if the *original* version of a proposed rule is filed with JCARR in December, it will continue to be reviewed legislatively as specified in current law. If, however, a *revised* version of a proposed rule is filed with JCARR in December, it will be reviewed legislatively not later than the 30th day after the first day of the legislative session in the following January.

Electronic mail address to be provided in Rule Summary and Fiscal Analysis

- Requires a rule summary and fiscal analysis of a proposed rule to include the electronic mail address of an individual or office within the agency that is responsible for coordinating and making available information about the proposed rule.³²

Note: A rule summary and fiscal analysis (RSFA) is a form that is completed in the course of preparing a proposed rule. The RSFA is filed along with the proposed rule, and assists the public and JCARR in reviewing the proposed rule.

³¹ R.C. 106.02 (second paragraph).

³² R.C. 127.18.



Legislative review mandatory

- Clarifies that a proposed rule that is subject to legislative review cannot be adopted until the time for legislative review has expired without recommendation of a concurrent resolution to invalidate the proposed rule.³³

The bill clarifies that a proposed rule that is subject to legislative review cannot be adopted and filed in final form unless the proposed rule has been filed with JCARR and the time for JCARR to review the proposed rule has expired without recommendation of a concurrent resolution to invalidate the proposed rule.

Extension or revival of review time for proposed rule if later version rejected

- Extends or revives the time for legislative review of a proposed rule if JCARR rejected a later version of the proposed rule for noncompliance with business review procedures.³⁴

Under the Common Sense Initiative Act, JCARR can reject a proposed rule (just as it can a no change rule) if the rule is discovered to have adverse impact on businesses and the agency has not complied with the business review procedure. The bill revives or extends the time for legislative review of a proposed rule when the last previously filed version of a proposed rule, the filing of a later version of which has been rejected by JCARR, remains in JCARR's possession, and the time for legislative review of that previously filed version has expired, or fewer than 30 days remain before the time for legislative review of that previously filed version expires. In such a case, recommendation of a concurrent resolution to invalidate that previously filed version may be adopted not later than the 65th day after the day on which the filing of the later version was rejected. This deadline can be extended under the legislative review December carry-over clause (see above) that applies to proposed rules filed in December and that restarts their legislative review in the following January.

Operational duration of emergency rules increased

- Increases the period of time during which an emergency rule remains operative from 90 to 120 days.³⁵

³³ R.C. 106.023, 111.15(D), and 119.03(C) and (E).

³⁴ R.C. 121.83(B)(2).

³⁵ R.C. 111.15(B)(2) and 119.03(F).



Under both the Administrative Procedure Act and the abbreviated rule-making procedure,³⁶ an emergency rule remains in operational effect for 90 days. The bill increases this period of time to 120 days. The 120-day period of time allows time for an agency to adopt a rule under the regular, nonemergency rule-making procedure.

Procedural changes for adopting auditing rules

- Eliminates the special exception that authorized the Auditor of State not to prepare a rule summary and fiscal analysis of proposed auditing rules, and thereby brings the procedure for adopting auditing rules into conformity with general rule-making procedures.³⁷
- Authorizes the Auditor of State to send notices of the public hearing on proposed auditing rules and to transmit copies of proposed auditing rules by electronic mail.³⁸

Transition rules

- Specifies that rules pending before JCARR on the effective date of the bill are not subject to its revised and clarified legislative review procedures.³⁹

The bill specifies that its revised and clarified legislative review procedures do not apply to rules that are pending before JCARR on its effective date. The old law will continue to apply to these rules. The revised and clarified legislative review procedures of the bill therefore will apply to rules that are filed with JCARR on or after the effective date of the bill.

Transitional duties of Legislative Information Systems

- Requires Legislative Information Systems to program or reprogram the electronic rule filing system as necessary to enable electronic filing and other processing of rules as is required by the bill within six months after its effective date.⁴⁰

³⁶ R.C. 111.15 (abbreviated rule-making procedure) and 119.03(G) (Administrative Procedure Act). (Both of these sections are in the bill.)

³⁷ R.C. 111.15(D) and (F), 117.20(A)(2), and 127.18(F). The rule summary and fiscal analysis is explained in a note below.

³⁸ R.C. 117.20(A)(1)(a) and (b) and (B).

³⁹ Section 6 of the bill.

⁴⁰ Section 7 of the bill.



The bill requires Legislative Information Systems, in consultation with the Director of the Legislative Service Commission, the Executive Director of JCARR, CSIO, and any other person or agency involved in the electronic rule filing system, to program or reprogram the electronic rule filing system as necessary to enable electronic filing and other electronic processing of rules and rule-making documents as is required by the bill. Legislative Information Systems is to complete the programming or reprogramming as soon as reasonably possible after the effective date of the bill but not later than the day that is six months after that effective date. If, at the time a provision of the bill that contemplates electronic filing or other electronic processing of rules and rule-making documents takes effect, electronic filing or other electronic processing is not available, the provision is to be complied with manually until electronic filing or other processing is available.

Note: The electronic rule filing system is an electronic system that enables rules and rule-making and rule-related documents to be filed, and official responses to these filings to be made, exclusively by electronic means. The electronic rule filing system is operated and maintained by Legislative Information Systems.

Recodification of legislative review acts

- Relocates and otherwise reorganizes the Legislative Review of Rules Act and the Periodic Review of Rules Act to cure their inaccurate locations in the Revised Code.

The Legislative Review of Rules Act and the Periodic Review of Rules Act are inaccurately located as part of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA).⁴¹ This location is inaccurate because the two acts apply also to rules that are subject to the so-called abbreviated rule-making procedure.⁴² But rules subject to the abbreviated rule-making procedure are not subject to the APA, and vice versa.

Note: When an agency's rule-making is subject to the Administrative Procedure Act, the agency is required, among other things, to give notice of its intention to adopt a rule, to hold a public hearing on the proposed rule, and to make an effort to inform persons subject to the rule of its adoption. When, however, an agency's rule-making is

⁴¹ R.C. Chapter 119.

⁴² R.C. 111.15.



subject to the abbreviated rule-making procedure, the agency is not required to do any of these things, which is why the procedure is referred to as being abbreviated.⁴³

The bill relocates several provisions to cure their currently inaccurate locations.⁴⁴ The following tables outline the relocations.

In the first table, the left-hand column indicates the topic of the law that is being relocated, the middle column indicates the current location of the law, and the right-hand column indicates the proposed new location of the current law.

Topic	Current Location	Proposed New Location
Procedure for legislative review of proposed rules	R.C. 119.01 and 119.03(I)	R.C. 106.02, 106.021, and 106.022
Filing proposed rules that are being adopted under the Administrative Procedure Act for legislative review	R.C. 119.03(H)	R.C. 119.03(C)
Procedure for periodic review, at five-year intervals, of existing rules	R.C. 119.032	R.C. 106.03 and 106.031

The following table presents the same information as the previous table, but the middle column indicates the new location of the law that is proposed to be relocated from the location indicated in the right-hand column.

Topic	Proposed New Location	Current Location
Procedure for legislative review of proposed rules	R.C. 106.02, 106.021, and 106.022	R.C. 119.01 and 119.03(I)
Filing proposed rules that are being adopted under the Administrative Procedure Act for legislative review	R.C. 119.03(C)	R.C. 119.03(H)
Procedure for periodic review, at five-year intervals, of existing rules	R.C. 106.03 and 106.031	R.C. 119.032

Except as explained in this analysis, current law that is relocated is continued at the new location with only stylistic improvement.

⁴³ Compare R.C. 119.03(A), (D), and (E) with R.C. 111.15(B). Both of these sections are in the bill.

⁴⁴ Section 4 of the bill.



- Adjusts cross-references to make them reflect the relocated provisions they are referring to.⁴⁵

References to "119.032 review dates"

- Specifies that references to the "119.032 review date" of a rule are to be read as if they referred to the sections providing for periodic review under the bill.⁴⁶

The date by which the periodic review of an existing rule is to be completed has been referred to as its "119.032 review date." That number is the number of the Revised Code section under which periodic review of existing rules was carried out before the substance of the section was relocated by the bill (see above). Because of that relocation, periodic review of existing rules will be carried out, not under R.C. 119.032, but under R.C. 106.03 and 106.031. The bill therefore specifies that a reference to the "119.032 review date" of an existing rule is to be read as if it referred to periodic review of the rule under R.C. 106.03 and 106.031.

The bill recommends that the date by which the periodic review of an existing rule is to be completed be referred to as its "periodic review date."

Miscellaneous improvements

- Repeals obsolete provisions,⁴⁷ repeals surplus provisions,⁴⁸ and cures other technical defects⁴⁹ in rule-making and rule review procedures.

HISTORY

ACTION	DATE
Introduced	02-12-13
Reported, S. State Gov't Oversight & Reform	---

s0003-rs-130.docx/ks

⁴⁵ R.C. 101.35, 103.0511, 111.15, 119.03, 119.04, 121.39, 121.73, 121.81, 121.82, 127.18, 1531.08, 3319.22, 3319.221, 3333.021, 3333.048, 3737.88, 3746.04, 4117.02, 5103.0325, 5117.02, 6111.31, and 6111.51.

⁴⁶ Section 6 of the bill.

⁴⁷ R.C. 111.15, 119.01, 119.031, 119.04, 4141.14, and 5703.14.

⁴⁸ R.C. 121.74, 4141.14, and 5703.14.

⁴⁹ R.C. 103.0511 and 111.15.

