

*A Professional Association*  
 3200 Minnesota World Trade Center  
 30 East Seventh Street  
 St. Paul, Minnesota 55101  
 612/290-8400

**TABLE OF STATE RULEMAKING REFORMS  
 (1995-2000)**

<b><u>STATE</u></b>	<b><u>REFORM MEASURES</u></b>
Alabama	In 1998, Governor Fob James signed executive order encouraging agencies to develop or implement mediation procedures in order to work positively with citizens. <sup>1</sup>
Alaska	No apparent reform measures.
Arizona	In 1995, the Legislature passed a resolution requesting that the United States Congress place a moratorium on the issuance of new environmental rules; that Congress allow for the continued operation of current contracts notwithstanding existing environmental laws until long-term solutions to the environmental concerns facing the nation were formulated; and that Congress allow timber harvests and sales in national and tribal forests to forward up to the maximum quantities specified in current forest plans notwithstanding existing environmental laws. <sup>2</sup>
Arkansas	In 1995, the Legislature amended existing law, which required a financial impact study for each proposed rule to require that the financial impact study specifically examine both the estimated cost of complying with the rule and the estimated cost for the agency to implement the rule. <sup>3</sup> The Legislature also enacted a 30 day notice requirement for rulemaking. <sup>4</sup>
California	In 1996, the Governor issued an executive order requiring the formation of a regulatory review task force to conduct public meetings and make specific recommendations to reform the regulatory process. <sup>5</sup>  In 1997, the Governor issued another executive order addressing over half of the recommendations from the task force. These recommendations included a one-time sunset review of all existing regulation; a consolidated regulatory program that expands the annual regulatory calendar to include information on the estimated costs of all proposed regulations; a review of all existing statutes and administrative provisions to help adjust the severity of fines for minor violations of regulations that do not endanger public health or safety; and customer service surveys implemented by each agency to ensure continuous feedback from the regulated community on how to improve the regulatory process. <sup>6</sup>
Colorado	In 1998, the Legislature enacted the Environmental Leadership Program. The Program allows for self-monitoring, self-reporting, self-certification, or third-party certification to demonstrate compliance with environmental laws and permits. Also included in the Program's acceleration of review and processing of permit applications is single agency point of contact for all permitting, consolidation and simplification of reporting and monitoring requirements and extension of terms of environmental permits up to the maximum authorized under the relevant environmental laws. <sup>7</sup>
Connecticut	No apparent reform measures.
Delaware	No apparent reform measures.
Florida	Upon his inauguration in 1995, Governor Chiles signed two executive orders that directed all agencies to conduct a page by page review of all rules and to eliminate and revise them as necessary. He identified two primary goals for the reform effort: 1) to reduce rules and regulations by 50 percent within two years; and 2) to reduce the inflexibility of roles by increasing agency discretion in the rule-making process. <sup>8</sup>

<b><u>STATE</u></b>	<b><u>REFORM MEASURES</u></b>
	<p>Governor Chiles then vetoed a legislative bill that sought to reform Florida’s Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”). The reforms included additional legislative oversight of rulemaking, limitations on rulemaking authority, the expansion of public notice and participation in rulemaking, additional and more detailed economic impact information, and other technical requirements to adopt rules. The Governor’s veto message indicated that he supported reform, but rejected the addition of more technical procedures to the “rules-dominated system.”</p> <p>Legislative amendments revamping the former APA passed after the Governor’s veto include less rigorous amendments in 1995 which contain provisions holding agencies more accountable for the economic impact of regulations. Also included is a least cost alternative subject to judicial and internal review, limitations on agency rule-makings, a sunset provision for existing rules, and a waiver provision to allow agencies to grant exceptions to rules where the rule creates a “substantial hardship,” or when the purpose of the statute can be achieved by “other means.”<sup>9</sup></p> <p>In 1997, the Legislature, as part of an ongoing effort to encourage economic development, put in place an expedited permit review process.<sup>10</sup> The goal of the amendment is one of streamlining, in order to encourage economic growth while keeping intact regulatory protections.<sup>11</sup></p> <p>In June 1999, another set of APA amendments were signed into law providing that agencies may only adopt rules that “implement or interpret the specific powers and duties granted by the enabling statute.” Agencies are required to once again review all reviews for compliance with new standards.<sup>12</sup></p>
Georgia	<p>In 1999, pursuant to an initiative by the Governor, amendments were made to the open records law. These amendments accomplished two major changes. First, the definition of what constitutes a public record was broadened and second, it is now mandated that records must be made available for public inspection within three business days of the request.<sup>13</sup> There were also significant legislative changes to the open meetings law in 1999. There is now a requirement that agendas be posted two weeks prior to each meeting and that for any closed meeting, an affidavit attesting that the closed meeting was devoted to matters legally discussable at closed meetings be filed with the official minutes.<sup>14</sup></p>
Hawaii	<p>No apparent reform measures.</p>
Idaho	<p>In April of 2000, a bill was enacted relating to the Administrative Procedures Act and amending Section 67-5229 to specify the material that may be incorporated by reference into agency rules and repealing rules of the agency that do not have legislative approval.<sup>15</sup></p>
Illinois	<p>In 1998, the then Secretary of State George H. Ryan (now Governor Ryan) proposed a new codification of the administrative rules to make the administrative code easier to use by the public.<sup>16</sup></p>
Indiana	<p>In 1995, the Legislature amended existing law to allow the Indiana Economic Development Council to examine the fiscal impact a proposed rule has on all businesses, not just small businesses.<sup>17</sup></p>
Iowa	<p>On February 8, 1999, Governor Vilsack launched an “initiative for quality and efficiency in government.” A task force was created to prepare and submit recommendations to the Governor on processes for reviewing and streamlining existing state regulations and the rule-making process.</p>

<b><u>STATE</u></b>	<b><u>REFORM MEASURES</u></b>
	<p>The task force has now completed five recommendations. The Governor has issued four executive orders adopting separate recommendations with the fifth recommendation still under consideration. The first executive order requires agencies within the next three years to review all existing rules and eliminate all unnecessary, outdated, redundant, overbroad, ineffective or unfair rules. For this purpose, each agency will be accountable to the Governor’s Administrative Rules Coordinator and will report to him/her and the public on progress in eliminating such rules.<sup>18</sup></p> <p>The second executive order requires state agencies to maintain rule-making dockets on its web site. Information is required to detail the proceeding so that members of the public can monitor, effectively participate and have a fair opportunity to influence the agency in the process before final adoption of the proposed rule. The Governor also ordered each agency to annually adopt and publish on its Web site (for easy public availability) the regulatory plans for the coming year indicating rulemaking or other regulatory actions it intends to commence.<sup>19</sup></p> <p>The third executive order requires that a Quality in Rule-Making Committee be created to educate agency rule-making personnel, on an on-going basis, to assist agencies.<sup>20</sup></p> <p>The final executive order requires agencies to adopt uniform procedures authorizing waiver of rules in individual cases where the application of an otherwise justified and sound rule would be unfair and otherwise unjustified.<sup>21</sup></p>
Kansas	No apparent reform measures.
Kentucky	<p>In 1995, the Legislature enacted additional requirements for the regulatory impact analysis, which must be submitted with every proposed rule. The analysis must now specifically include, to the extent available from public comments, the effect on the cost of living and employment, the effect on the cost of doing business, and the general economic impact in the geographical area where the rule will be implemented. The analysis must also include the source of the revenue to be used in the implementation and enforcement of the rule, as well as an assessment of the expected benefits of the rule.<sup>22</sup></p>
Louisiana	No apparent reform measures.
Maine	<p>In 1995, the Legislature created a two-tiered rule-making system providing for minimal procedures and oversight for “routine technical rules,” but requiring more significant procedures and oversight for “major substantive rules,” i.e., rules that (1) require significant agency discretion or interpretation in drafting, or (2) are reasonably expected to result in a significant increase in the cost of doing business, a significant reduction in property values, the loss or significant reduction of government benefits or services, or the imposition of state mandates or other serious burdens on local governmental units. After the agency proposes a rule, the agency must submit the rule to the Legislature for review, along with a concise summary and a statement of economic impact. A joint standing committee of the Legislature will then review the proposed rule and determine: whether the agency has exceeded the scope of authority; whether the propose rule conforms with legislative intent; whether the proposed rules conflicts with other provisions of law; whether the adopted rule is reasonable in light of the convenience of the general public or persons particularly affected by the rule; and whether the proposed rule could be made less complex or more easily understood. If the Legislature approves the proposed rule or fails to act, the agency must finally adopt the proposed rule within 60 days.<sup>23</sup></p> <p>The Legislature also imposed a 60 day stay on the operation of all rules that impose a more stringent standard than a corresponding federal statute or regulation. During the 60 day stay, interested persons could petition the Legislature to review those provisions of the proposed rule</p>

<b><u>STATE</u></b>	<b><u>REFORM MEASURES</u></b>
	<p>that are more stringent than their federal counterparts. After January 1, 1998, an agency proposing a rule is required to identify the portions of the proposed rule that are more stringent than their federal counterparts, and must provide a justification for the difference between the agency rule and the federal standard.<sup>24</sup></p>
Maryland	<p>In 1996, Governor Glendening signed an executive order regarding Regulatory Standards and Accountability. The purpose of the order is to stimulate private sector job growth through a customer-focused and competitive regulatory environment. The executive order requires that proposals to adopt regulations providing standards that are more restrictive or stringent than federal standards describe the restriction, identify whether or not it places an additional burden or cost on the regulated person or business and justify the need for more restrictive standards.<sup>25</sup></p> <p>A task force on regulatory reform was formed in November 1999. The task force will examine the present process for review of regulations and conduct a pilot examination of the Code of Maryland Regulations to clarify language, eliminate obsolete language, apply cost/benefit analysis, assess the impact of small business and identify standards which are more restrictive or stringent than an applicable federal standard.<sup>26</sup></p>
Massachusetts	<p>In 1996, Governor Weld signed an executive order to reduce unnecessary regulatory burdens. The executive order requires all state entities to “promptly” undertake a review of every regulation with a sunset provision for all regulations. Only those regulations that are mandated by law or essential to the health, safety, environment or welfare are to be retained or modified.<sup>27</sup></p>
Michigan	<p>In 1995, Governor Engler signed an executive order in which he proclaimed that the “regulatory process . . . should not impose costs on society that do not justify the benefits of regulation.” In order to address a situation where the Governor saw that rules were being adopted without a thorough examination and systematic analysis of their direct and indirect costs and their social and economic benefits, the executive order created the Office of Regulatory Reform within the Executive Office of the Governor and charged it to review proposed rules, coordinate the processing of rules by state agencies and work with agencies to streamline the rulemaking process and to improve public access, to review proposed rules and coordinate the processing of rules. The state is required to examine whether existing laws and regulations are contributing to the problem and whether those laws or regulations should be modified. The order also directs the Office of Regulatory Reform to perform a cost-benefit analysis that considers all viable alternatives to regulation, including non-regulatory, market-based solutions. Finally, the order commands each state agency to review its own rules to determine if any are duplicative or unnecessarily burdensome.<sup>28</sup></p> <p>The Office of Regulatory Reform was statutorily established in 2000 with the duties and powers described in Executive Order 1995-6.<sup>29</sup></p>
Minnesota	<p>In 1995, the Legislature enacted requirements that the agency solicit public comments at least 60 days before rulemaking is initiated; that the agency “make reasonable efforts” to notify persons who may be affected by proposed rules; that the agency identify the likely cost to state agencies to implement the rule; that the agency describe those persons who will bear the cost of the proposed rule, as well as those persons who will benefit from the proposed rule; that the agency determine whether there are less costly or intrusive alternatives of obtaining the rule’s objective; that the agency describe the probable costs of complying with the rule; and that the agency provide an explanation of the differences, if any, between the proposed rule and federal regulations. State agencies are also required to adopt rules within 18 months of the effective date of the authorizing legislation. Finally, agencies were required to annually review all rules, and submit to the Legislature a list of rules that were obsolete.<sup>30</sup></p>

<b><u>STATE</u></b>	<b><u>REFORM MEASURES</u></b>
	<p>In 1996, the XL Project was legislatively enacted allowing for single unified environmental permits – which allows for variances from requirements of other state and local agencies.<sup>31</sup></p> <p>In 1999, Chapter 129 was enacted authorizing the Governor to veto all or severable portions of a rule of an agency.<sup>32</sup></p>
Mississippi	<p>In 1995, the Legislature amended the rulemaking process to require the preparation of an economic impact statement with a description of the need for and benefits of the proposed rule; an estimate of the cost to the agency and any state and local government to implement and enforce the rule; an estimate of the cost or economic benefit to all persons directly affected by the proposed rule; an analysis on the impact on small business; a comparison of the costs and benefits of the proposed rule with the benefits of not adopting the proposed rule; a determination of whether less costly methods or less intrusive methods exist to obtain the objective of the proposed rule; a description of reasonable alternatives considered by the agency; and a detailed description of the data and methodology used to derive the foregoing estimates.<sup>33</sup></p>
Missouri	<p>In 1995, the Legislature consolidated the rulemaking procedures for the various state agencies into a single, uniform rulemaking procedure to be used by all agencies.<sup>34</sup></p> <p>The Legislature then passed Senate Bills No. 386 and 372 regarding rule-making authority. The enactment makes any agency rule or regulation invalid if there is an absence of statutory authority for the rule, if the rule is in conflict with state law, if the rule is so arbitrary and capricious as to create substantial inequity or to be unreasonably burdensome on persons affected, or if the rule exceeds the purpose or is more restrictive than is necessary to carry out the purpose of the statute. Agencies are required to propose rules based on substantial evidence and a finding that the rule is necessary and will adopt procedures through formal rule making by which a determination on whether or not the rule is necessary can be made.<sup>35</sup></p> <p>In 1999, the Legislature enacted an amendment to Chap. 620 of Mo. Rev. Stat. to provide for administrative review of agency rules affecting small businesses.<sup>36</sup></p>
Montana	No apparent reform measures.
Nebraska	No apparent reform measures.
Nevada	<p>In 1995, the Legislature enacted additional requirements for rulemaking: each adopted rule must include a summary of the public’s participation in the rulemaking process; if the rule is largely duplicative of, or similar to, a federal rule, the agency must identify what provisions of the regulation are more stringent than the federal rule; and the notice of the rulemaking proceeding must include a statement of the estimated economic impact of the rule, and the estimated cost to the agency for enforcement of the proposed rule.<sup>37</sup></p>
New Hampshire	<p>In 1994, the Legislature amended the state APA to require that a fiscal impact statement be prepared when a new rule is proposed; the fiscal impact statement must include: an estimate of the costs and benefits to the state’s citizens and political subdivisions; an estimate of the cost or benefit to the state general fund; an explanation of the federal mandate for the rule, if one exists; a comparison of the cost of the proposed rule with the cost of the existing rule, if one exists; and an analysis of the general impact of the proposed rule on independently owned businesses.<sup>38</sup></p>
New Jersey	<p>In 1995, the Legislature amended the state APA to require a statement indicating whether the proposed rule contains any standards or requirements that exceed federal law. Such a statement must include a discussion of the policy reasons and a cost-benefit analysis justifying the imposition of the stricter standard or requirement.<sup>39</sup></p>

<u>STATE</u>	<u>REFORM MEASURES</u>
New Mexico	In 1998 and 1999, the Legislature enacted a separate statute that establishes the basic process for appealing an administrative action to the district court. <sup>40</sup>
New York	<p>In 1995, Governor Pataki placed a 90 day moratorium on proposed rules and directed each state agency to identify for modification, rescission, withdrawal those rules that have unduly burdened the State’s economy and caused job losses, or that are more demanding than required to meet legislative goals.<sup>41</sup> Governor Pataki later signed another executive order extending the moratorium until June 30, 1995, and indicating his administration would continue to review all proposed rules to ensure that they are no more demanding than required to meet legislative goals.<sup>42</sup></p> <p>In 1995, the Legislature passed a reform measure requiring an agency, in addition to identifying rules that overlap or conflict with federal rules and regulations, to also identify all efforts taken to resolve or minimize the impact on regulated persons, including seeking waivers and exemptions of, or amendments to the rules or legal requirements creating the conflict or duplication.<sup>43</sup></p> <p>In late 1995, Governor Pataki established the Governor’s Office of Regulatory Reform (GORR) as the central office to review the effects of proposed regulatory activities.<sup>44</sup> In addition to establishing GORR, the order requires that proposed regulations be clearly written, analyze cost versus benefits and favor market-oriented solutions.</p> <p>In 1997, Governor Pataki established a permit-reform initiative to eliminate unnecessary permits and to simplify those that remain as of December 1998.<sup>45</sup> The Program was quickly dubbed the “One-Stop Permitting Initiative.” In all, the agencies involved had eliminated or proposed eliminating 18 permits. The program includes streamlining the application and renewal processes.</p> <p><i><u>Legal challenge to Governor’s Office of Regulatory Reform</u></i></p> <p>The New York State Court of Appeals in May of 1999 rejected a constitutional challenge to Governor Pataki’s Office of Regulatory Reform (GORR). The Court of Appeals did not reach a decision on the merits but based their decision on the question of standing. Plaintiffs sought declaratory relief claiming that the authority placed in GORR violated the separation of powers doctrine. The constitutional challenge in <i>Rudder v. Pataki</i>, was brought after GORR rejected a Health Department regulation that would have required social work departments in urban hospitals be headed by a director with a master’s degree in social work. The Court of Appeals Judge Carmen Beauchamp Ciparick affirmed the lower court’s dismissal of this suit, finding that none of the plaintiff organizations had alleged a cognizable harm to their members that would give them standing. The Supreme Court (lower court), however, had held that the executive order did not violate the separation of powers doctrine and did not conflict with the State Administrative Procedure Act. Decided May 6, 1999.<sup>46</sup></p>
North Carolina	In 1995, the Legislature passed amendments reforming the APA. These amendments included increased notice requirements, proposed rule veto power by the Rules Review Commission and the creation of a sixteen member oversight committee reporting directly to the Legislature and empowered to review and investigate any aspect of administrative law. <sup>47</sup>
North Dakota	In 1995, the Legislature amended the APA to require a specific determination by the agency of whether the proposed rulemaking is expected to have an impact on the regulated community in excess of \$50,000. <sup>48</sup>

<b><u>STATE</u></b>	<b><u>REFORM MEASURES</u></b>
Ohio	No apparent reform measures.
Oklahoma	No apparent reform measures.
Oregon	In 1997, Green Permits were enacted allowing for a single point of contact and enforcement discretion. The focus is on system-wide improvements and modifications to regulation requirements, e.g., streamlined reporting, expedited or flexible permitting, and other regulatory incentives specific to the needs of the facility. <sup>49</sup>
Pennsylvania	In 1997, the Legislature enacted an amendment providing for independent oversight and review of regulations and the creation of an independent regulatory review commission providing for its powers and duties and making repeals. <sup>50</sup>
Rhode Island	In 1995, the Legislature increased the notice period for promulgating rules from 20 to 30 days. <sup>51</sup>
South Carolina	No apparent reform measures.
South Dakota	No apparent reform measures.
Tennessee	No apparent reform measures.
Texas	No apparent reform measures.
Utah	In 1998, the Legislature amended the Utah Administrative Rule Making Act to allow the reauthorization legislation to sunset a section of a rule and require that the rules committee meet on a monthly basis. <sup>52</sup>
Vermont	No apparent reform measures.
Virginia	<p>In 1995, the Legislature amended the APA to require that the Department of Planning and Budget, which must prepare an economic impact statement for each proposed rule, include the impact of the rule on the use and value of private property in its economic impact statement. The legislation also requires that the agency publish in the Virginia Register, along with the notice of opportunity to submit comments, a statement of the estimated impact and identity of any localities, businesses or entities particularly affected by the proposed rule.<sup>53</sup></p> <p>In 1998, Governor Gilmore signed an Executive Order setting forth his requirements for rule making. Included in these requirements are certain principles that are to guide agencies in carrying out the executive order and to ensure that the residents of Virginia are not burdened by unnecessary and excessive regulation. Accordingly, regulatory activities are to be undertaken with the least possible interference in the private sector and must be essential to protect the health, safety and welfare of citizens or for the efficient and economical performance of an important governmental function. Regulations cannot be promulgated if there are less burdensome or less intrusive alternatives. Furthermore, regulations should not be considered perpetual and will be subjected to periodic reevaluation. Regulations must be written in plain language. Public participation must be strictly followed.<sup>54</sup></p> <p>The Governor signed into effect a second executive order in 1998. This Executive Order addresses a review of emergency regulations proposed by state agencies and requires that agencies desiring to propose emergency regulation must prepare a regulatory review package to be submitted by the Secretary and to Department of Planning and Budgets with advice from the Attorney General. The Governor must also approve the package.<sup>55</sup></p> <p>In 1999, legislative amendments to Virginia's Freedom of Information Act were enacted to promote openness and access. The amendments expand the definition of "public record" to include new technology of information storage, makes clearer the procedure for requesting</p>

<b><u>STATE</u></b>	<b><u>REFORM MEASURES</u></b>
	public records, clarifies and narrows exceptions to disclosure, and requires specific notice requirements for meetings. <sup>56</sup>
Washington	<p>In 1995, the Legislature amended the APA to require that the agency proposing a rule prepare a small business economic impact statement, unless the agency has completed pilot project for compliance with the rule. If the agency finds that there is a disproportionate impact on small business, the agency must attempt to identify methods to reduce the costs on small businesses, including reducing substantive regulatory requirements; simplifying or eliminating record keeping and reporting requirements; reducing the frequency of inspections; delaying compliance timetables; and/or reducing or modifying fine schedules.<sup>57</sup> The Legislature also strengthened legislative oversight of the rulemaking process by allowing any person to petition the Joint Administrative Rules Review Committee of the Legislature to suspend a rule and granting “whistleblower” immunity to any state employee who submits rules to the committee for review.<sup>58</sup></p> <p>Governor Locke issued Executive Order 97-01 in 1997, requiring all executive branch agencies to participate in the rules review process.<sup>59</sup></p> <p>Also in 1997, a second executive order was signed, the purpose of which was to ensure that state regulations having significant impact on labor consumers, businesses and the environment are reviewed on an open and systematic basis and to ensure that the regulations meet standards of need, reasonableness, effectiveness, clarity, fairness, stateholder involvement, coordination among regulatory agencies, and consistency of legislative intent and statutory authority. The order commands state agencies to begin a review of their rules. It also creates a subcabinet on management improvement and results to oversee the regulatory review process. The subcabinet consists of the heads of the following agencies: Office of Financial Management, Department of Labor and Industries, Department of Ecology, Department of Social and Health Services, Department of Revenue, Department of Employment Security, and Department of Health. The tier of the subcabinet is the Governor’s Deputy Chief of Staff. Responsibilities of the subcabinet are to study and make recommendations to the Governor for statutory, administrative, organizational changes and for special pilot projects that result in regulatory improvements; to oversee the regulatory review process established by the executive order; to assist the Office of Financial Management in the preparation of legislative reports; and to convene work groups and other special committees for the purpose of assisting the subcabinet in the development of recommendations and reports required by this executive order. Membership of these groups may include representatives from business, labor, environmental organizations, state agencies, local government, non-profit organizations, citizens and other interests.<sup>60</sup></p> <p>The final executive order signed in 1997 was specific to quality improvement. This executive order commands each agency to develop and implement a program to improve the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of the public services it provides through quality improvement, business process redesign, employment involvement, and other quality improvement techniques.<sup>61</sup></p>
West Virginia	No apparent reform measures.
Wisconsin	No apparent reform measures.
Wyoming	No apparent reform measures.

1 Alabama Exec. Ord. No. 42 (1998).

2 Ariz. House Concurrent Resolution 2005.

3 1995 Ark. Acts No. 1104 (codified at Ark. Code § 25-15-204(d)(1)).

4 1995 Ark. Acts No. 884 (codified at Ark. Code § 25-15-204(a)).

5 California Exec. Ord. No. W-131-96 (1996).

6 California Exec. Ord. No. W-144-97 (1997).

7 H.B. 98-1058, effective May 26, 1998 (codified at Co. Rev. Stat. 25-6.7-101 to –110).

8 Florida Exec. Ord. No. 95-74 and 95-256 (1995).

9 Florida Stat. §120.54 (2) (1996). *See also* Jim Rossi, *1996 Revised Florida Administrative Procedure Act: A Rule-Making Revolution or Counter-revolution*, 49 Admin. L. R. 362 (1996).

10 Act effective Oct. 1, 1997, Ch. 97-28, §2, 1997 Fla. Laws 170, 173 (amending Fla. Stat. §403.973 (Supp. 1996)).

11 *See generally* Raepple, Carolyn, *Florida's Expedited Permit Review Process: Streamlining the Development of Florida's Economy*, 25 Fla. St. U. L. Rev. 301 (1998).

12 S.B. 206 (amending Florida Stat. §120.536).

13 1999 Ga. Laws 552; 1999 Ga. Laws 809; 1999 Ga. Laws 1222 (each codified at various sections of O.C.G.A. §§50-18-70 to 77 (1998 & Supp. 1999)).

14 O.C.G.A. §§50-14-1 to 4.

15 S.B. 1301, Session Law Chap. 203, signed into law on April 5, 2000 (amending Idaho Code §§ 67-5201, -5226, -5229).

16 22 Ill. Reg. 1991 (January 16, 1998).

17 Ind. Code. § 4-22-2-28.

18 Iowa Exec. Ord. No. 8 (1999).

19 Iowa Exec. Ord. No. 9 (1999).

20 Iowa Exec. Ord. No. 10 (1999).

21 Iowa Exec. Ord. No. 11 (1999).

22 Ky. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 13A.240.

23 1995 Me. Laws 463 (codified as Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. tit. 5, § 8071-8072).

24 1995 Me. Laws 347 (codified at Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. tit. 38, 341-5, sub-§§ 1-A to 1-B).

25 Maryland Exec. Ord. No. 01.01.1996.03 (February 1, 1996).

- 
- 26 Joint Resolution No. 9, Acts of 1999.
- 27 Massachusetts Exec. Ord. No. 384 (1996).
- 28 Michigan Exec. Ord. No. 1995-6.
- 29 Michigan Exec. Ord. 2000-1, and Act. No. 262 of the Public Acts of 1999, effective April 1, 2000.
- 30 1995 Minn. Laws Chapter 233 amending Minn. Stat. 1994, § 14.131.
- 31 Minn. Stat. § 114C.11.
- 32 Minn. Session Laws 1999, Chapter 129-H.F. No. 1905 amending Minn. Stat. 1998, § 14.05, by adding a  
subdivision 14.16, subd. 3; 14.26 subd. 3; 14.386; and 14.389, subd. 3. Also included is a sunset provision for  
Minn. Stat. § 14.05 subd. 6 to expire on June 30, 2001.
- 33 1995 Miss. Laws 499, § 1 (codified at Miss. Code Ann. §25-43-6).
- 34 1995 Mo. Laws 3 (codified at Chap. 536, R.S. Mo. (administrative procedures)).
- 35 The bills were rolled into H.B. 850 (codified at Mo. Rev. Stat. §§536.016, .021, .024 and .041).
- 36 S.B. 873 amending Chap. 620, Mo. Rev. Stat.
- 37 1995 Nev. Laws 106, 160 (codified at Nev. Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 233B.0603, 233B.066).
- 38 1994 N.H. Laws 412, § 1 (codified at N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 541-A:5).
- 39 1995 N.J. Laws 65 (codified at N.J. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 52:14B-1 et seq.).
- 40 N.M.S.A. Section 39-3-1.1.
- 41 N.Y. Exec. Ord. No. 2 (January 5, 1995).
- 42 N.Y. Exec. Ord. No. 7 (April 5, 1995).
- 43 1995 N.Y. Laws 628 (codified at N.Y. A.P.A. § 202-a).
- 44 N.Y. Exec. Ord. No. 20 (November 30, 1995).
- 45 *Permit Reform in New York State, a report to Governor George E. Pataki*, New York State Governor’s Office of  
Regulatory Reform.
- 46 *Cynthia Rudder, et al. v. George E. Pataki*, 3 No. 61, QDS:10107496 (May 6, 1999 N.Y. Ct. Appeals).
- 47 H.B. 230, Reg. Sess. (N.C. 1995) (codified at N.C. Stat. §§120.-70.100 to .103; ISOB-21.1 to .27).
- 48 N.D. Cent. Code § 28-32-02(4).
- 49 Oregon Rev. Stats. 468.501-521 (1997).
- 50 Senate Bill No. 7, Session of 1997 (Public Law 633, No. 181) (codified at PA Stat. 71 P.S. §745.2-.12).
- 51 1995 R.I. Laws 95-300 (codified at R.I. Gen. Laws § 42-35-3).

- 
- <sup>52</sup> Utah Code Title 63, Chapter 46(a) (1998), including changes made during the 1998 General Session.
- <sup>53</sup> 1995 Va. Laws 677, 717 (codified at Va. Code Ann. § 9-6.14:7.1).
- <sup>54</sup> Virginia Exec. Ord. 25-98 (1998).
- <sup>55</sup> Virginia Exec. Ord. 24-98 (1998).
- <sup>56</sup> Va. Code Ann. §2.1-340 to 343 (Ann. Supp. 1999).
- <sup>57</sup> 1995 Wash. Laws 403, §302 (codified at Wash. Rev. Code § 34.05.320).
- <sup>58</sup> 1995 Wash. Laws 403, §505 (codified at Wash. Rev. Code § 34.05).
- <sup>59</sup> Wash. Exec. Ord. 97-01 (1997).
- <sup>60</sup> Wash. Exec. Ord. 97-02 (1997).
- <sup>61</sup> Wash. Exec. Ord. 97-03 (1997).