

(Ne	w Draft of H.P. 154 (New Title) SECOND REGULAR S	∋)
ONE	HUNDRED AND TWELF	
Legislative Doc	ument	No. 2341
Government and Representative Gy	Representative Dillenback f printed under Joint Rule 2. wadosky of Fairfield. Cospe grange, Senator Andrews of	
	STATE OF MAI	INE
N	IN THE YEAR OF C INETEEN HUNDRED AND	
	o Amend Rule-making ne Administrative P	
Be it enacte follows:	d by the People of	the State of Maine as
	5 MRSA §8052, su 4, §4, is further a	ab-§5, as amended by PL amended to read:
adoption of ten statemen for the rule representati adopting any	any rule, the ager t explaining the fa . The agency shall ve comments and s	ed. At the time of acy shall adopt a writ- actual and policy basis specifically address state its rationale for proposed rule, or fail-
<b>Sec. 2.</b> 1985, c. 50	5 MRSA §8052, sub- 6, Pt. A, §2, furth	•§7, as amended by PL her amended to read:

1 7. Adoption of rule. The agency shall; in 2 adopting rules, be consistent with the terms of the 3 proposed rule, except to the extent it determines 4 necessary to address concerns raised in comments and 5 makes specific findings supporting such changes. No 6 rule may become effective unless:

- A. The agency adopts it within 120 days of the
  final date by which data, views or arguments may
  be submitted to the agency for consideration in
  adopting the rule; and
- 11B. This adopted rule is approved by the Attorney12General as to form and legality, as required by13section 8056, within 150 days of the final date14by which those comments may be submitted.
- 15 The final date for comments may be extended if notice 16 of doing so is published before that final date, in 17 the consolidated notice referred to in section 8053.
- 18 Sec. 3. 5 MRSA §8053-A, first ¶, as enacted by 19 PL 1985, c. 270, is repealed and the following en-20 acted in its place:

21 At the time of giving notice of rulemaking under 22 section 8053 or within 10 days following the adoption 23 of an emergency rule, the agency shall provide copies of the proposed rule to the Executive Director of the 24 25 Legislative Council. The Executive Director of the 26 Legislative Council or his designee shall refer the proposed rule to the appropriate joint standing com-27 28 mittee or committees of the Legislature for review.

29 Sec. 4. 5 MRSA §8053-A, sub-§1, as enacted by PL 30 1985, c. 270, is amended to read:

31 1. Additional information to be submitted. In 32 addition to providing the Legislative Administrative 33 **Birector** Executive Director of the Legislative 34 Council with a sufficient number of copies of a pro-35 posed rule for each member of the appropriate commit-36 tee or committees, the agency shall also provide to 37 the Legislative Administrative Director Executive Di-38 rector of the Legislative Council sufficient copies 39 of a fact sheet providing:

- 1 A. A citation of the statutory authority for the 2 adoption of the rule;
- 3 B. A concise statement of the principal reasons 4 for the rule;
- 5 C. An analysis of the rule; and

6

D. An estimated fiscal impact of the rule.

7 Sec. 5. 5 MRSA §8057, sub-§1, as amended by PL 8 1977, c. 694, §35, is further amended to read:

9 1. Rules; exception. Rules adopted in a manner 10 other than that prescribed by sections section 8052, 11 subsections 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 and by section 8053 and 12 8054 shall be void and of no legal effect, provided 13 that insubstantial deviations from the requirements 14 section 8053 shall not invalidate the rule subseof 15 quently adopted. Rules in effect prior to July 1, 1978, shall become void and of no legal effect on Ju-16 17 1979, unless originally adopted after notice ly 1, 18 published in a newspaper of general circulation in 19 some area of the State and opportunity for hearing or 20 unless adopted in accordance with chapter 375, sub-21 chapter II.

22 Sec. 6. 5 MRSA §8058, sub-§1, as amended by PL 23 1979, c. 669, §1, is further amended to read:

24 1. Judicial review. Judicial review of an agency 25 rule, or of an agency's refusal or failure to adopt a rule where the adoption of a rule is required by law, 26 27 may be had by any person who is aggrieved in an action for declaratory judgment in the Superior Court 28 29 conducted pursuant to Title 14, section 5951, et 30 seq., which provisions shall apply to such actions 31 wherever not inconsistent with this section. Insofar 32 as the court finds that a rule was improperly adopted 33 er exceeds the rule-making authority of the agency, or is void under section 8057, subsection 1 or 2, it shall declare the rule invalid. In reviewing any 34 or 35 In reviewing any 36 other procedural error alleged, the court may invali-37 date the rule only if it finds the error to be sub-38 stantial and related to matters of such central 39 relevance to the rule that there is a substantial likelihood that the rule would have been significant-40

ly changed if the error had not occurred. If the 1 2 court finds that the rule was properly adopted is not 3 procedurally invalid and not in excess of the agen-4 cy's rule-making authority, its substantive review of 5 that rule shall be to determine whether the rule is 6 arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion or otherwise not in accordance with law. The phrase "other-wise not in accordance with law" shall apply only to 7 8 9 the review authorized in the preceding sentence and shall not be construed so as to limit or replace in 10 11 any way section 8003. In the event that the court finds that an agency has failed to adopt a rule as required by law, the court may issue such orders as 12 13 14 are necessary and appropriate to remedy such failure.

15 Sec. 7. 5 MRSA §8059, as enacted by PL 1979, c.
16 669, §2, is repealed and the following enacted in its
17 place:

18 §8059. Inconsistent rules

19 When 2 rules are inconsistent or in conflict with 20 one another, so that compliance with both is impossi-21 ble, then compliance with either rule shall be deemed 22 to be in compliance with the other.

- 23 Sec. 8. 5 MRSA §10005 is enacted to read:
- 24 §10005. Decision and record

25 Any licensing decision not involving an adjudicatory proceeding, as defined in section 8002, subsec-26 tion 1, shall be made in writing and shall be made 27 28 only on the basis of evidence relevant to the case. When the requested license is denied, or only condi-29 tionally approved, the decision shall contain or re-30 31 flect the agency's reasoning, in a manner sufficient 32 to inform the applicant and the public of the basis 33 for the agency's action.

34Sec. 9. 5 MRSA §11006, sub-§1, ¶D, as enacted by35PL 1977, c. 551, §3, is repealed and the following36enacted in its place:

37 D. In cases where an adjudicatory proceeding
 38 prior to final agency action was not required,
 39 and where effective judicial review is precluded

1	by the absence of a reviewable administrative
2	record, the court may either remand for such pro-
3	ceedings as are needed to prepare such a record
4	or conduct a hearing de novo.
5	STATEMENT OF FACT
5	SIMILADAT OF THOS
~	
6	The rule-making provisions of the Maine Adminis-
7	trative Procedure Act, the Maine Revised Statutes,
8	Title 5, chapter 375, could be interpreted to require
9	courts to invalidate administrative rules for certain
10	technical, procedural errors, even though the rule is
11	substantively valid and all public participation re-
12	quirements of the Act have been met. This new draft
13	eliminates technical grounds for invalidating rules.
14	Judicial review of rules would measure a rule against
15	the agency's rule-making authority, examine its con-
16	sistency with the governing statute and review the
17	agency's compliance with procedures affecting public
18	notice and participation in the rule-making process.
19	Sections 1 and 2 of the new draft place greater
20	responsibility for rule-making decisions on the offi-
21	cials actually authorized to adopt rules. Present law
22	may prevent these officials from adopting any provi-
23	sion that was not either proposed by agency staff or
24	by persons commenting on the staff proposal. As re-
25	vised, the section would continue to protect against
26	arbitrary action by requiring rule-making officials
27	to respond to representative comments and state their
28	reasons for any changes from the proposed rule.
29	Sections 3 and 4 of the new draft amend the pro-
30	vision for legislative involvement in rulemaking to
31	accommodate emergency rules. It also makes clear
32	that legislative committees are to have notice of
33	rules at the time they are proposed, when comments
34	are being solicited, rather than later in the pro-
35	cess, as the existing language might be interpreted.
	as one onizoing inigange might be interpretent.
36	Sections 5 and 6 of the new draft limit the pro-
37	cedural grounds that automatically invalidate a rule.
38	Violation of those procedures affecting public par-
39 40	ticipation in the rule-making process, or the specif-
40	ic time limits for rulemaking, will still void a

rule. The Maine Administrative Procedure Act, Title 1 2 5, chapter 375, requirements concerning the effective 3 date of a rule, the basis statements, the agency's 4 response to representative public comments and refer-5 ence to underlying laws would provide grounds for in-6 validating a rule only if it is found that the error 7 had a substantial potential to affect the rule in a 8 significant way.

9 Section 7 of the new draft is for clarification 10 only.

11 and 9 of the new draft clarify the Sections 8 original intention of the Maine Administrative Proce-12 13 dure Act, Title 5, chapter 375, for judicial review 14 of those decisions where no administrative hearing is 15 required by the relevant statute. Section 8 makes 16 clear that written decisions are required and must be made only on the basis of relevant evidence. For most of these decisions, a written decision is al-17 18 19 ready required by the Maine Revised Statutes, Title 20 1, section 407.

21 Section 9 carries out the basis premise of the Maine Revised Statutes, Title 5, section 11006, by having judicial review of licensing decisions on the 22 23 24 basis of an administrative record. Where no review-25 able record is available to the court, for any rea-26 son, judicial review cannot proceed. The method of 27 recreating a record is left to the parties and the 28 court, but the existing law's reference to an admin-29 istrative hearing is deleted, since by definition li-30 censing decisions are ones that the Legislature has 31 authorized to be made without hearing.

7172040486

32