NOTE: As provided in LFC policy, this report is intended only for use by the standing finance committees of the legislature. The Legislative Finance Committee does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of the information in this report when used for other purposes.

The most recent FIR version (in HTML & Adobe PDF formats) is available on the Legislative Website. The Adobe PDF version includes all attachments, whereas the HTML version does not. Previously issued FIRs and attachments may be obtained from the LFC in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.

FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

SPONSOR: HJ	C	DATE TYPED:	03/20/03	HB	655/HJCS
SHORT TITLE: Air Quality Control Act Appeals			SB		
AN				ST:	Chavez

APPROPRIATION

Appropriation Contained		Estimated Additional Impact		Recurring or Non-Rec	Fund Affected
FY03	FY04	FY03	FY04		
	NFI		See Narrative		

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Office of the Attorney General Department of Environment (NMED)

SUMMARY

Synopsis of House Bill

The House Judiciary Committee Substitute for House Bill 655 amends various sections of the Air Quality Control Act to provide for appeals to the Environmental Improvement Board based on the record of a public hearing. The House Judiciary Committee Substitute for House Bill 655 provides for the following:

- Requires that among the regulations adopted by the environmental improvement board a provision be included that ensures that the public, adjacent landowners, affected governmental agencies, area Indian nations, tribes or pueblos and any other state whose air may be affected are provided notice;
- Requires that an opportunity for a public hearing before the department be among the provisions required for regulations adopted by the environmental improvement board or the local board:
- Allows for a person who participated in a permitting action before the department, or the local agency who is adversely affected by such permitting action, to file a petition for <u>re-</u> view before the environmental improvement board or hearing before the local board;

House Bill 655/HJCS -- Page 2

- Provides that unless a timely petition is made, the decision of the department or the local agency shall be final and not subject to judicial review;
- Requires the petition to 1) be in writing to the environmental improvement board or the local board within 30 days from the date notice is given of the department's or the local agency's action; 2) include a statement of the issues to be raised and the relief sought; and 3) be served on all other persons submitting evidence, data, views or arguments in the proceeding before the department or the local agency;

With regard to reviews by the environmental improvement board

- Requires the board to review the record compiled before the department including transcripts of any public hearing held on the application or draft permit and allows any party to submit arguments;
- Allows the board to designate a hearing officer to review the record and the arguments of the parties and recommend a decision to the board;
- Requires the board to consider and weigh only the evidence contained in the record in addition to the recommended decision if any and not be bound by the factual findings or legal conclusions of the department;
- Requires the board to keep a record of the review;
- Requires the board to sustain, modify, or reverse the action of the department based on the review of the evidence, arguments of the parties, and recommendations of the hearing officer is any;
- Requires the board to order that additional evidence, data, views or arguments be taken by the department if prior to the date set for review, the environmental improvement board determines that proposed additional evidence, data, views or arguments are relevant and there was good reason for the failure to present the evidence, data, views or arguments in the proceeding before the constituent agency;
- Allows the board to revise the decision based on the additional evidence;

With regard to reviews by the local board

- Requires the local board to hold a hearing on the petition;
- The local board may designate a hearing officer and recommend a decision to the board;
- All interested persons are required to be given a reasonable opportunity to submit evidence, data, views and arguments orally or in writing, and to examine witnesses testifying at the hearing;
- Any person submitting evidence, data, views or arguments is subject to examination at the hearing;

House Bill 655/HJCS -- Page 3

- Requires the environmental improvement board or the local board to notify the petitioner and all other participants in the review of the action taken and the reasons for the action;
- Provides for appeal of an administrative action to the district court instead of the court of appeals for actions other than the adoption of a regulation;
- States that a person adversely affected by a regulation may appeal the regulation with the court of appeals.

Significant Issues

Under current state regulations, most permitting actions of NMED under the Air Quality Control Act may be subject to a full evidentiary hearing before NMED. NMED final permitting actions can be appealed to the Environmental Improvement Board. Presently, even if there was a full evidentiary hearing on a permit before NMED, an appeal of the NMED permitting action takes the form of a *de novo* evidentiary hearing before the EIB. This can result in two full evidentiary hearings on the same permit. The committee substitute amends Section 74-2-7 of the AQCA to provide that an appeal of an NMED permitting action will be conducted as a record review by the EIB, instead of conducted as a *de novo* evidentiary hearing. The EIB will perform a review of the record created before NMED instead of conducting an entirely new hearing on the same permit.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

The committee substitute for House Bill 655 does not contain an appropriation. Enactment of HB 655 could have a positive administrative and fiscal impact on NMED, who currently is required to provide technical and legal staff for duplicative hearings.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

The committee substitute for HB 655 proposes a streamlined hearing process that would free additional staff resources to focus on core NMED statutory responsibilities, *i.e.*, permit issuance and oversight.

TECHNICAL ISSUES

The Office of the Attorney General reports the following technical issue:

HB 655 provides for appeal of an administrative action to the district court for actions other than the adoption of a regulation. However, HB 655's Section 1, subsection H, pages 8-9, states that unless a person adversely affected by a permitting action files a petition for review by the environmental improvement board or a local board, the board's action is not subject to judicial review. Although HB 655's Section 2, subsection A, page 12 states that an appeal of an administrative action may be taken to the district court pursuant to NMSA 1978, Section 39-3-1.1, consider clarifying that Section 39-3-1.1 provides for judicial review of *final* agency decisions.