REGULATORY REVIEW AND EVALUATION ACT

July 1, 2006
EVALUATION REPORTS FOR:

COMAR 10.01 PROCEDURES
COMAR 10.02 DIVISION OF REIMBURSEMENTS
COMAR 10.03 HEALTH STATISTICS
COMAR 10.04 FISCAL
COMAR 10.06 DISEASES

SUBMITTED BY:

Department of Health and Mental Hygiene
Office of Regulation and Policy Coordination
20l West Preston Street, Room 521
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
Phone: (410) 767-6499
Email: regs @dhmh.state.md.us

EXCEPTIONS FROM THE REVIEW PROCESS

In accordance with State Government Article, §§10-132-1, Annotated Code of Maryland, the Secretary of Health and Mental Hygiene has certified to the Governor and the AELR Committee that a review of the following chapters would not be effective or cost-effective and therefore are exempt from the review process based on the fact that they were adopted to implement a federally mandated or federally approved program (FM) or comprehensively amended (CA) during the preceding 8 years:

Subtitle 01 PROCEDURES

10.01.04 Fair Hearing Appeals Under the Maryland State Medical Assistance Program (FM)
10.01.05 Board of Review Procedures (CA 10/5/01)
10.01.06 Fair Hearing Appeals under the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, & Children (FM)
10.01.15 Exemption from Self-Referral Laws (CA 6/25/01)

Subtitle 02 DIVISION OF REIMBURSEMENTS

10.02.01 Charges for Services Provided through the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (CA 3/19/01)

Subtitle 06 DISEASES

10.06.01 Communicable Diseases and Related Conditions of Public Health Importance (CA 1/20/03)
10.06.02 Communicable Diseases—Rabies (CA 11/16/98)
10.06.04 School Health Services and Required Immunizations Before Entry into School (CA 11/24/05)
10.06.05 Meningococcal Vaccination Requirements for Students in Institutions of Higher Education (CA 11-12-01)
10.06.06 Comm. Disease Prevention —Handling, Treatment, & Disposal of Special Medical Waste (CA 9/1/ 04)

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.01.01

Chapter Name: Health Care Practitioner User Fee Collection

Authority: Health Occupations Article, §1-209, Annotated Code of Maryland

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: Last amended: November 6, 1995

Purpose: This chapter establishes the procedure for licensing boards to collect user fees payable to the Health Care Access and Cost Commission from applicants seeking an initial license or the renewal of a license to practice a health care profession.

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [X] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [X] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [ ] Yes [X] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [X] Yes [ ] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

The general public was invited to comment on this chapter. No comments were received.

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

The Health Care Access and Cost Commission was invited to comment on the regulations via e-mail sent May 25, 2006. No comments were received.

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;
(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

Posted a notice on DHMH's Office of Regulations and Policy Coordination's website – could also be accessed by going to "Quick Links" on the main DHMH website page.

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

No comments were received.

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

None

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

N/A

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

An internet search for similar user fee regulations was conducted on the federal government and the following states: Delaware, Pennsylvania, Virginia and West Virginia. None of these states have any Board or Commission similar to Maryland's Health Care Access and Cost Commission. Likewise the federal government doesn't have anything really similar to HCACC either.

8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

None

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act? Yes [ ] No [X]

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [X] Yes [ ] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

N/A

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

X no action

amendment

repeal

repeal and adopt new regulations

reorganization

Summary:

N/A

Person performing review:	Robin Bailey
Title:	Leg./Regs. Coord.

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.01.02

Chapter Name: Procedures for Public Hearings

Authority: Health-General Article, §2-104(b), Annotated Code of Maryland

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: September 13, 1993

Purpose: This chapter applies to hearings the Secretary conducts to gather information from the general public before making a decision or taking an action such as adopting a regulation or issuing a license, certificate, or permit.

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [X] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [X] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [ ] Yes [X] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [X] Yes [ ] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

The general public and members of DHMH were invited to comment but no responses were submitted.

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

See above

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;

(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;
(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

Through the DHMH website

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

None

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

None

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

None

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

Various State regulatory bodies such as the DHMH Health Care Commission are called upon to solicit public comments in certain circumstances. These regulations provide DHMH with a process for soliciting these types of public comments.

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

NA

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act? Yes [X] No [ ]

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [X] Yes [ ] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

These are the specific regulations required in order to solicit public comment on this type of issue.

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

XX no action
amendment
repeal
repeal and adopt new regulations
reorganization

Summary:

NA

Person performing review: Daniel OBrien

Title: AAG – Counsel

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.01.03

Chapter Name: Procedures for hearings before the Secretary of Health and Mental Hygiene

Authority: Health-General Article, §2-104(b) and State Government Article, §10-204

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: February 6, 1989 (16:2 Md. R. 158).

Purpose: This chapter applies to hearings which the Secretary is required to conduct by statute or regulation except for hearings under Health-General Article, §§12-114 and 12-120, and those hearings for which specific procedural regulations have been promulgated. The hearings do not apply to conferences, investigations, or to proceedings at which the general public has been assembled to provide comments and opinions regarding a permit or license proposed to be issued by the Department, or to hearings before the Department's Boards and Commissions

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [x] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [x] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [x] Yes [ ] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [x] Yes [ ] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

The general public and members of DHMH were invited to comment but no responses were submitted.

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

See above

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;
(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

Through the DHMH website

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

None

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

None

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

None

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

All agencies subject to the Administrative Procedure Act must adopt regulations for conducting contested case hearings. These provisions apply if more specific regulations have not been adopted to deal with the type of contested case pending before DHMH.

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

None

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act? Yes [ ] No [x]

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [x] Yes [ ] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

New legislative enactments dealing with a particular type of contested case proceeding will generally be subject to the procedural regulations adopted by the Office of Administrative Hearings when DHMH delegates decision – making authority to OAH. If legislation requires new procedural regulations for a specific area subject to its own contested case standards, these regulations would not apply. There is no new legislation that requires the immediate amendment of this material.

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

XX no action

amendment

repeal

repeal and adopt new regulations

reorganization

Summary:

Person performing review: Daniel OBrien

Title: AAG – Counsel

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.01.07

Chapter Name: Petitions for Adoption, Amendment, or Repeal of Regulations

Authority: State Government Article, §10-123; Health-General Article, §2-104; Annotated Code of Md

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: Last amended: December 20, 1993

Purpose: This chapter establishes the procedures for submitting petitions to the Department to promulgate, amend, or repeal a regulation over which the Secretary has rulemaking authority.

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [X] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [X] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [ ] Yes [X] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [X] Yes [ ] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

The general public was invited to comment on this chapter. No comments were received.

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

All DHMH units, Health Officers, and Facility Directors were invited to comment on the regulations via an email sent September 16, 2004. No comments were recommended.

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;

(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;
(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

Comments were solicited by the following methods:

September 30, 2005 - Published a public notice in the Maryland Register 32:20 Md.R. 1654
September 12, 2005 - Posted a notice on the Division of State Document's website.
September 13, 2005 – Posted a notice on DHMH's Office of Regulation and Policy Coordination's website – Could also be accessed by going to "Quick Links" on the main DHMH website page.

Comment period ended December 1, 2005.

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

No comments were received.

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

NONE

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

N/A

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

An internet search for similar Petition regulations was conducted on the federal government and the following States: Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, and North Carolina. As in Maryland, all of the queried states have provisions and established procedures in their regulations/codes to allow parties to petition the agency to request a change in an established regulation. Likewise, the Federal Government allows for petitions to be filed to change Department-specific regulations. The petitions are published in the Notice section of the Federal Register. While some processes were more involved than others, the basic concept was the same – give the public an opportunity to voice their opinion and change established regulations.

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

An internet search for Petition regulations was also conducted on other Departments/Units within the State. Out of 33 Titles of COMAR, 24 specific cites were found under 16 Titles of COMAR. Surveyed regulations were all very similar in nature. All offered interested persons an opportunity to file a petition to adopt, amend, or repeal any regulation. As with COMAR 10.01.07, twenty (20) out of 24 regulations surveyed requires a response be made within 60 days of receipt of the petition for regulatory change. Other minor language differences occurred, but none were substantive or major in nature.

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act? Yes [ ] No [X]

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [X] Yes [ ] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

N/A

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

X no action

amendment

repeal

repeal and adopt new regulations

reorganization

Summary:

N/A

Person performing review: Michele A. Phinney

Title: Director, DHMH Office of Regulation and Policy Coordination

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.01.08

Chapter Name: Procedures for Access to Records

Authority: State Government Article §10-611 — 10-628; Health-General Article, §2-104(b)

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: Reg.04A amended effective Feb 18, 2002 (16:9 Md R220)

Purpose: This chapter establishes the procedures for requesting and gaining access to records and information of the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, its administrations, and its facilities.

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [X] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [X] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [ ] Yes [X] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [X] Yes [ ] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

The general public was invited to comment on this chapter. No comments were received.

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

All DHMH units, Health Officers, and Facility Directors were invited to comment on the regulations via an e-mail sent September 16, 2004. One comment was received.

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;

(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

Comments were solicited by the following methods:
September 30, 2005 – Published a public notice in the Maryland Register 32:20 Md.R 1654.
September 12, 2005 – Posted a notice on the Division of State Documents' website.
September 13, 2005 – Posted a notice on DHMH's Office of Regulations and policy Coordination's website – Could also be accessed by going to "Quick Links" on the DHMH website page.
Comment period ended December 1, 2005.

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

a. One unit's hours were incompatible with those listed. Unit also asked us to define a term.
b. Amended hours will be stated generically (during business hours). Term will be defined.

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

NONE

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

N/A

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

An internet search for similar records regulations was conducted on the federal government and the following States: Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, and North Carolina. As in Maryland, all the queried states have provisions and established procedures in their regulations /codes for the public to access records. Likewise, the Federal Government, under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) allows for the public to access records. While some processes were more involved than others, the basic concept was the same - give the public an opportunity to access the records of a government agency.

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

An internet search for records regulations was also conducted on other Departments/Units within the State. Out of 33 Titles of COMAR, approximately 48 specific cites were found that provide direction for access to a government unit's records. Surveyed regulations were somewhat similar in nature. Most units offered interested persons an opportunity to file a written request for copies of specific records for a fee.

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act

[ ] Yes [X] No

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [ ] Yes [X] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

N/A

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

- no action
- X amendment
- repeal
- repeal and adopt new regulations
- reorganization

Summary:

N/A

Person performing review:	Thomas Kravitz
Title:	DHMH Records Officer, Office of Regulation and Policy Coordination

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.01.09

Chapter Name: Procedures for Hearing Before the Hospital Appeal Board and Nursing Home Appeal Board

Authority: Health-General Article, §2-105, Annotated Code of Maryland

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: January 16, 1984

Purpose: Set out procedure for appeals before the Hospital Appeal Board and the Nursing Home Appeal Board of final cost settlements pursuant to COMAR 10.09.06.07, COMAR 10.09.10.11 and COMAR 10.09.11.11.

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [x] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [x] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [x] Yes [ ] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [x] Yes [ ] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

Lawrence Ageloff, Executive Director, Hospital and Nursing Home Appeal Board: Added clarifying language
Hospitals and Nursing Homes (through public comment): No comments
Mark Leeds, Director, Long Term Care & Community Support Services (Medicaid): Stylistic changes
Wayne Brooks, Deputy Director of Operations, Office of Administrative Hearings – No comments

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

N/A

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;
(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

Notice published in the 11/14/05 Maryland Register; posted on the Medical Care Programs and DSD websites; mailed copy of regulations to the Executive Director, Hospital and Nursing Home Appeal Boards and Deputy Director of Operations, Office of Administrative Hearings and appropriate Medicaid staff.

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

Update cross-references and citations, and add clarifying regulation language. All comments were evaluated and a determination was made to amend the regulations. Proposed regulations will be submitted.

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

None

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

None

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

None

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

None

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act? Yes [X] No [ ]

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [x] Yes [ ] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

NA

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

	no action
X	amendment
	repeal
	repeal and adopt new regulations
	reorganization

Summary:

COMAR 10.09.09 was adopted effective January 16, 1984. The current regulations have been reviewed by all appropriate parties. All comments received would bring the regulations up-to-date with regard to citations, cross-references and current regulation language.

Person performing review: Kathleen Wissmann

Title: Regulations Coordinator

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.01.10

Chapter Name: Pavment for Off-Grounds Medical Services

Authority: Health-General Article, §2-104(b)

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: December 20. 1993

Purpose: To establish accounts for the purpose of payment of off-grounds medical services for clients in DHMH facilities who receive services from private medical providers.

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? ■ Yes ☐ No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? ■ Yes ☐ No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? ☐ Yes ■ No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? ■ Yes ☐ No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

In April, 2005, MHA posted a notice on its web site inviting any interested stakeholders to provide any comments or suggestions regarding the above-referenced chapter.

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

Developmental Disabilities Administration, Medical Assistance, and Community Health Administration

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;
(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

Posted on the Mental Hygiene Administration (MHA) website

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

a) No comments received b) No comments received

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

None

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

None

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

None

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

None

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act? ☐ Yes ■ No

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? ■ Yes ☐ No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

NA

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

- ■ no action
- amendment
- repeal
- repeal and adopt new regulations
- reorganization

Summary:

NA

Person performing review:	Stacey Diehl
Title:	Director, Office of Government, Public, & Consumer Affairs

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.01.11

Chapter Name: Correction or Amendment of Public Records

Authority: State Government Article §10-613(b) and 10-625; Health-General Article § 2-104(b);

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: Chapter revised effective December 20, 1993 (20:25 Md. R 1946)

Purpose: This chapter establishes the procedures for persons in interest who are authorized to inspect public records to request the correction or amendment of that public record in the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene under State Government Article §10-625, Annotated Code of Maryland..

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [X] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [X] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [ ] Yes [X] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [X] Yes [ ] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

The general public was invited to comment on this chapter. No comments were received.

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

NONE.

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;
(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and

(e) any public hearing held.

Comments were solicited by the following methods: September 30, 2005 – Published a public notice in the Maryland Register 32:20 Md.R 1654. September 12, 2005 – Posted a notice on the Division of State Documents' website. September 13, 2005 – Posted a notice on DHMH's Office of Regulations and policy Coordination's website – Could also be accessed by going to "Quick Links" on the DHMH website page. Comment period ended December 1, 2005.

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

No comments were received.

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

NONE

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

N/A

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

An internet search for similar regulations was conducted on the federal government and the following States: Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, and North Carolina. As in Maryland, the queried states have provisions and established procedures in their regulations /codes to allow authorized persons to request the correction or amendment of at least some of their public records. Likewise, the Federal Government allows for requests to be filed by certain individuals to correct or amend certain Federal records. While some processes were more involved than others, the basic concept was the same – to give the public an opportunity to correct or change information in records of government agencies.

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

An internet search of COMAR for correction or amendment of public records was also conducted on other Departments/Units within the State. Out of 32 Titles of COMAR, 13 specific cites were found that provided direction for correction or amendment of records. Surveyed regulations were similar in nature.

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act?

Yes [ ] No [X]

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [ ] Yes [X] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

N/A

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

X no action

amendment

repeal

repeal and adopt new regulations

reorganization

Summary:

N/A

Person performing review:	Thomas Kravitz
Title:	DHMH Records Officer, Office of Regulation and Policy Coordination

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.01.12

Chapter Name: Declaratory Ruling

Authority: State Government Article, § 10-301—10-305, Health General, 2-104(b)

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: Chapter revised effective April 11, 1994 (21:7 Md. R. 530).

Purpose: These regulations describe the process for seeking a "declaratory ruling" by a unit of DHMH. Such rulings are issued by the agency to explain the manner in which a DHMH regulation or statute would apply to a person or a property based on a given set of facts.

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [x] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [x] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [ ] Yes [x] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [x] Yes [ ] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

The general public and members of DHMH were invited to comment but no responses were submitted.

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

See above

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;

(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

Through the DHMH website

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

None

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

DHMH regulatory boards issue their own declaratory rulings in accordance with their own procedures.

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

None

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

Some state agencies provide more detail regarding the process for obtaining a declaratory ruling and also list reasons for declining to issue a ruling. See 15A NCAC 07J.0601, North Carolina Dpt. of Environment. Because these DHMH regulations deal with multiple subunits, such specificity is not needed in the same way.

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

None

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act? Yes [ ] No [x]

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [x] Yes [ ] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

NA

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

XX no action

amendment

repeal

repeal and adopt new regulations

reorganization

Summary:

NA

Person performing review:	Daniel OBrien
Title:	AAG - Counsel

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.01.13

Chapter Name: Procedures for Interagency Cooperation for Licensing Residential Child Care Facilities

Authority: Health-General Article, §§2-104(b) 7-714, 7-903, 8-403, 8-404, 10-204, 10-514—10-524, and 10-920—10-926, Annotated Code of Maryland

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: October 11, 1993 (20:20 Md. R. 1571).

Purpose: An applicant for a license for a residential child care facility or a residential child care program may seek a variance or waiver under this regulation. This chapter applies to licenses regulated by COMAR 10.22.03, 10.22.11, 10.22.14, 10.23.02, and 10.47.01 if the population of the facility is comprised of at least 90 percent children and if they are not regulated by the Health Resources Planning Commission

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [x] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [x] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [x] Yes [ ] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [x] Yes [ ] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

Consultation with other agencies responsible for placing children in child care facilities. In addition, the general public and members of DHMH were invited to comment but no responses were submitted.

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

Ongoing discussions with counsel for other agencies providing out of home child care services including DHR, DJS, Office for Children and Department of Disabilities. These discussions have been ongoing and have addressed interagency placements, licensing and confidentiality.

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;
(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

Through the DHMH website and interagency discussions.

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

None

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

Agencies responsible for making out of home placements have sought means of better coordinating licensing standards and survey procedures. The process for granting variances and waivers of specific regulatory standards is one aspect of this ongoing process.

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

None

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

New York and other states have adopted interagency review procedures to encourage the availability of safe child care programs.

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

None

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act?

Yes [x] No [ ]

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [X] Yes [ ] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

NA

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

	no action
XX	amendment
	repeal
	repeal and adopt new regulations
	reorganization

Summary:

Amendments of these regulations to modernize references to current interagency child care licensing standards would be appropriate.

Person performing review:	Daniel OBrien
Title:	AAG – Counsel

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.01.14

Chapter Name: Open Meetings Attendance and Recording, Photographing and Broadcasting of Session

Authority: State Government Article, §10-502(h) and Health-General Article, §2-104(b)

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: May 24, 1993 (20:10 Md. R. 851).

Purpose: These regulations describe the circumstances under which the general public may attend and observe an open session of a public body within or established by the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. The regulations also define the manner in which public participation may occur at such meetings.

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [X] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [X] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [X] Yes [ ] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [X] Yes [ ] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

The general public and members of DHMH were invited to comment but no responses were submitted.

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

See above

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:

(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;
(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

Through the DHMH website

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

None

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

None

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

Decisions and OAG advice regarding the Maryland Open Meetings Compliance Board were reviewed.

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

NA

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

NA

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act? Yes [x] No [ ]

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [x] Yes [ ] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

NA

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

no action

XX amendment

repeal

repeal and adopt new regulations

reorganization

Summary:

Amendments to comport with rulings issued by the Maryland Open Meetings Compliance Board need to be considered in updating these regulations.

Person performing review: Daniel O'Brien

Title: AAG - Counsel

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.02.02

Chapter Name: Abandonment or Abuse of Responsible Relatives by Recipients of Care

Authority: Health-General Article, §16-203, Annotated Code of Maryland

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: Last Amended January 17, 2005

Purpose: The purpose of this Regulation is to excuse a Legally Responsible Relative from contributing to the cost of inpatient care of a Recipient of Services if the Legally Responsible Relative has been abandoned by the Recipient of Services or if the Recipient of Services has committed certain actions against any Responsible Relative.

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [X] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [X] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [ ] Yes [X] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [X] Yes [ ] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

a) The Legal Aid Bureau – no response for this regulation
b) Maryland Disability Law Center – no response for this regulation

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

The Social Work Departments located at the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene inpatient facilities – no response was received for this regulation.

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;
(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

Public comment was solicited by publishing a Notice of this Regulatory Review in the Maryland Register on September 30, 2005.
A copy of the Regulatory Review Notice was mailed by first class, certified mail, return receipt requested, to The Legal Aid Bureau and the Maryland Disability Law Center. The Regulatory Review Notice and a copy of the Regulations were mailed by first class mail to the Directors of Social Work at all Department of Health and Mental Hygiene inpatient facilities. The Regulatory Review Notice was published on the Division of State Documents web site. A Notice of a Public Hearing soliciting comment was published in the Maryland Register on October 28, 2005. The Public Hearing was held on November 30, 2005 at 300 W. Preston Street, Room 409, Baltimore, Maryland 21201.

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

No comments were received for this regulation.

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

No interunit conflict exists.

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

None

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

None

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

None

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act? Yes [ ] No [X]

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [X] Yes [ ] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

X no action

amendment

repeal

repeal and adopt new regulations

reorganization

Summary:

The regulation reasonably complies with the legislative intent of the statute.

Person performing review: Paul B. Lohinski

Title: Special Counsel

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.02.03

Chapter Name: Appeal Hearings to the Division of Reimbursements

Authority: Health-General Article, §2-207 Annotated Code of Maryland

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: Last Amended June 28, 1999

Purpose: The purpose of this Regulation is to provide individuals with an opportunity for an informal or formal hearing whenever: a rate or charge is established or increased, an individual is aggrieved by a charge established or the manner of billing, or the individual is adversely affected by any other Division of Reimbursement policy, action or inaction.

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [X] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [X] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [ ] Yes [X] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [X] Yes [ ] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

a) The Legal Aid Bureau – no response for this Regulation

b) Maryland Disability Law Center – no response for this Regulation

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

The Social Work Departments located at the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene inpatient facilities – no response was received for this Regulation.

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;
(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

Public comment was solicited by publishing a Notice of this Regulatory Review in the Maryland Register on September 30, 2005.
A copy of the Regulatory Review Notice was mailed by first class, certified mail, return receipt requested, to The Legal Aid Bureau and the Maryland Disability Law Center. The Regulatory Review Notice and a copy of the Regulations were mailed by first class mail to the Directors of Social Work at all Department of Health and Mental Hygiene inpatient facilities. The Regulatory Review Notice was published on the Division of State Documents web site. A Notice of a Public Hearing soliciting comment was published in the Maryland Register on October 28, 2005. The Public Hearing was held on November 30, 2005 at 300 W. Preston Street, Room 409, Baltimore, Maryland 21201.

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

No comments were received for this Regulation.

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

No interunit conflict exists.

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

None

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

None

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

State Government Article, Subtitle 1, Administrative Procedure Act,
Annotated Code of Maryland

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act? Yes [ ] No [X]

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [X] Yes [ ] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

X no action

amendment

repeal

repeal and adopt new regulations

reorganization

Summary:

The Regulation reasonably complies with the legislative intent of the statute.

Person performing review: Paul B. Lohinski

Title: Special Counsel

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification:	10.03.01
Chapter Name:	Vital Records
Authority:	Health—General Article § 4-201—4-227; Family Law, § 5-3A-07 and Title 5, Subtitle 4B
Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended:	January 17, 2005
Purpose:	To govern the procedures for the guarding and issuing of Maryland's vital records including birth, death and marriage certificates and divorce verifications.

A. Review Criteria (State Government Article, § 10-130—10-139, Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 10.03.01)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? _X_ Yes ___ No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? X__ Yes __No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? ____ Yes __X_ No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose?__X__ Yes _____ No

B. Outreach and Research (State Government Article, § 10-130—10-139, Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 10.03.01)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

All Maryland organizations involved in Maryland's birth and death registration process were invited to review the regulations. The organizations were all Maryland hospitals and funeral. homes. No comments were received.

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

None.

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment including:
(a) Any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) Any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;
(c) Any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) Any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) Any public hearing held.

Published in the Maryland Register; posted on the Vital Statistics' website; posted on the Division of State Documents website; Vital Records mailing to organizations involved in Maryland's birth and death registration process.

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) All comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) The adopting authority's responses to those comments.

(a) Two comments received—neither had to do with regulation changes, but were related to questions on obtaining vital records. (b) No comments received.

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

None

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

None

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

None

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

None

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act? _____ Yes _X__ No

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? ____ Yes __X__ No

Provide explanations of the above responses as needed.

See Summary below.

D. **Action Needed.** (State Government Article, § 10-130—10-139) (check all that apply)

_____ No action
__X_ Amendment
_____ Repeal
_____ Repeal and Adopt New Regulations
_____ Reorganization

Summary: As noted above, no comments regarding a change to regulations or policy regarding Vital Records were received. There have also been no changes in federal law or policy requiring a rewrite of Maryland's laws and regulations as they exist now.

The Division of Vital Records is working with the Department of Human Resources in revising records available to adoptees and biological parents of adoptees in accordance with Chapter 464 (2005 Legislation), SB 710 Permanency for Families and Children Act of 2005. Once this is finalized, the policy and procedures will be submitted for review, approval, and adoption into COMAR.

Person performing review: Geneva Sparks

Title: State Registrar and Deputy Director, Vital Statistics Administration

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.03.02

Chapter Name: Release of Confidential Info. in the Maternal and Child Health and Children's Medical Services

Authority: Health-General Article, §§4-102 and 15-125, Annotated Code of Maryland

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: Last Amended: December 20, 1993

Purpose: This chapter describes what information within the Maternal and Child Health and the Children's Medical Services Programs is to be considered confidential. The chapter also prescribes the manner in which the confidential information must be maintained and the circumstances whereby this information may be released.

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [X] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [X] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [X] Yes [ ] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [ ] Yes [X] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

The general public was invited to comment. No comments were received.

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

Representatives from the Family Health Administration, MD Bd. of Physicians, Mental Hygiene Administration, Vital Statistics, OHCQ, the Medical Assistance Program, Office of Inspector General, and the Office of Attorney General were invited to comment on the regulations. The comments received are discussed below.

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;
(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

Comments from the public were solicited by publishing a public notice in the Maryland Register, 32.17 Md.R. 1438
Comment period ended September 19, 2005.

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

The Office of the Attorney General advised that this regulatory chapter should be retained with some revisions to modernize some of the chapter's outdated aspects. In some respects, the chapter is broader than that which is addressed by HIPAA. For example, the chapter applies not only to the confidentiality of medical information but also to maintaining the security of personal facts and circumstances and financial resources, and therefore should be retained.

FHA's Center for Maternal and Child Health recommended that the name of the FHA offices referred to in the chapter should be modernized. References to the Division of Maternal and Child Health and the Division of Children's Medical Services are outdated.

The Office of the Inspector General suggested that FHA should consider expanding this chapter's provisions to conform more closely with the broader confidentiality provisions set forth in Health-General Article, §§ 4-301 thru 4-309, Ann. Code of MD (Confidentiality of Medical Records).

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

NONE.

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

N/A

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

A search was conducted of other State and federal laws relevant to the confidentiality of health records and information. All States have medical confidentiality laws. At the federal level, the Health Insurance Portability Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) was established to provide national standards for the security and privacy of health data. COMAR 10.03.02 is in conformity with HIPAA.

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

A search was conducted on other DHMH Departments/Units within the State. Various COMAR cites address the confidential release of health information, including COMAR 10.14.01.05 (confidentiality of cancer reports) and 10.52.10.07 (local health depts./HIV testing). These regulatory provisions are similar in nature to COMAR 10.03.02 and address the confidential nature of identifying patient information and the permissible disclosure of aggregate medical information. Health-General Article, §§4-301 thru 4-309, Ann. Code of MD, deals with the confidentiality of medical records and addresses numerous circumstances for the disclosure of records not addressed under COMAR 10.03.02.

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act? Yes [ ] No [X]

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [X] Yes [ ] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

N/A

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

no action

XX amendment

repeal

repeal and adopt new regulations

reorganization

Summary:

Revise this chapter in a manner that addresses the suggestions listed in the answer to Question (4) above.

Person performing review: Jamie Perry, M.D.

Title: Medical Dir., OGCSHCN

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.04.01

Chapter Name: Fiscal Administration of Local Health Operations, and Related Matters

Authority: Health-General Article 2-104 (a), 2-105, 2-301-2-305

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: May 22, 1995

Purpose: The purpose of these regulations is to explain the mechanism for the distribution of State and local matching funds for Core Health Services provided to local health departments in the State.

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [X] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [X] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [X] Yes [ ] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [ ] Yes [X] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

Local Health Officers, other Administrations such as Family Health Administration, Office of Budget Management, AG's office participated in reviewing the regulations. Comments were sought and suggestions were included.

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

NA

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;
(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

A presentation was made to the local health officers at the Policy Round Table to inform health officers abt the review process. Two committees from MACHO (MD Association of County Health Officers) were set up to review the regulations. Suggestions and comments were received from these committees on the entire Chapter.

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

Comments were received from MACHO via email and a letter. The majority of the comments were about "local matching percentages" ,the definition of "need" and "local funding effort". After much discussion on each of these areas, language is being drafted to address all concerns and issues.

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

No inter-unit conflicts.

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

Data on the amounts distributed to each county in the last few years, the local matching percentages, the data necessary to run the formula such as Statewide population and statewide YPLL (Years of Productive Lives Lost) to determine the distribution amounts to each county were reviewed.

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

No relevant information gathered. from other states or the federal govt.

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

NA

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act? Yes [ ] No [X]

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [X] Yes [ ] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

	no action
	amendment
	repeal
X	repeal and adopt new regulations
	reorganization

Summary:

The decision to repeal and adopt new regulations was made based on extensive changes that are needed to be made. It has been decided to simplify the distribution of State and local matching funds for Core Local Health Services. After many discussions with local health officers and a detailed review process, the Administration has decided to propose new regulations to reflect current practices and come up with a formula that is easy to understand and follow. Other factors that have been taken into consideration are the availability of data that support the formula, the administrative process for local health departments to transmit budgets and plans to the Department.

Person performing review: Sharmi Das

Title: Director, Office of Env. Health Coordn, and Reg Affairs

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.04.02

Chapter Name: Establishment and Payment of In-Patient Charges by Recipients of Services, etc.

Authority: Health-General Article, §§16-201 – 16-407, Annotated Code of Maryland

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: Last Amended October 15, 2001

Purpose: The purpose of this Regulation is to determine the ability of Recipients of Services, Responsible Relatives, and other Chargeable Persons to pay for the cost of care received by individuals in State-operated facilities.

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [X] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [X] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [X] Yes [ ] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [X] Yes [ ] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

a) The Legal Aid Bureau – no response for this Regulation

b) Maryland Disability Law Center – Maryland Disability Law Center participated in the review process by e-mailing a letter to the Division of Reimbursements that contained comments on Reimbursements billing and suggestions for additions to this Regulation.

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

The Social Work Departments located at the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene inpatient facilities – no response was received for this Regulation.

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;
(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

Public comment was solicited by publishing a Notice of this Regulatory Review in the Maryland Register on September 30, 2005.
A copy of the Regulatory Review Notice was mailed by first class, certified mail, return receipt requested, to The Legal Aid Bureau and the Maryland Disability Law Center. The Regulatory Review Notice and a copy of the Regulations were mailed by first class mail to the Directors of Social Work at all Department of Health and Mental Hygiene inpatient facilities. The Regulatory Review Notice was published on the Division of State Documents web site. A Notice of a Public Hearing soliciting comment was published in the Maryland Register on October 28, 2005. The Public Hearing was held on November 30, 2005 at 300 W. Preston Street, Room 409, Baltimore, Maryland 21201.

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

(a) The Maryland Disability Law Center ("MDLC") in its letter stated that it believes it is contrary to public policy to make a spouse or adult child legally responsible for the cost of psychiatric care of an individual with a mental illness. It further believes that it is contrary to public policy to charge a person for involuntary treatment. MDLC states that it realizes that such changes could only be effected through statutory amendment. MDLC further recommends adding a definition of representative payee of an individual's social security benefits and adding a new paragraph in .03 stating that if the Secretary of the Department is appointed the representative payee, the Secretary or his or her designee shall determine the expenses associated with the individual's release; determine the expenses, including housing costs, associated with discharge; and reduce the monthly rate by the amount needed for the individual's recovery, release and discharge.

(b) The Division of Reimbursements mailed a letter to MDLC that confirmed the receipt of their suggestions for amendment to the Regulations, advised them that DHMH management is still considering the changes that need to be made to the Regulations and that Reimbursements will notify them in the future of the proposed changes.

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

No interunit conflict exists.

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

None

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

20 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §§404.2001 – 404.2065, Social Security Regulations outlining the Representative Payee Program.

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

a) Social Security Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA)
b) Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all urban consumers
c) C. G. A. v State; Jousa (Ida) v State and C. G. A.; Alaska 1992, 824 P.2d 1364.

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act? Yes [ ] No [X]

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [X] Yes [ ] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

no action

X amendment

repeal

repeal and adopt new regulations

reorganization

Summary:

1) No action is planned for MDLC's suggestion for a definition of representative payee for social security benefits and accompanying list of responsibilities. In as much as federal regulations have preempted this subject, it renders any State regulations on this matter superfluous.

2) Regulation 10.04.02.04.C. (8) – Base Monthly Deductions, needs to be amended to reflect the current cost of living amounts and to provide for automatic yearly adjustments.

Person performing review: Paul B. Lohinski

Title: Special Counsel

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.04.03

Chapter Name: Standards for Audits of Grants and Contracts with Providers and Local Health Departments

Authority: State Finance and Procurement Article, §7-404; Annotated Code of Md

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: Last amended: March 6, 1989

Purpose: This chapter prescribes the standards, policies, and procedures for the auditing of grants and contracts of the Department with vendors, providers of service, and local health departments.

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [X] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [X] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [ ] Yes [X] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [X] Yes [ ] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

The general public was invited to comment on this chapter. No comments were received.

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

All DHMH units and Health Officers were invited to comment on the regulations via an email sent December 22, 2005. No comments were recommended.

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;

(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

Comments were solicited by the following methods: December 23, 2005 - Published a public notice in the Maryland Register December 23, 2005 - Posted a notice on the Division of State Document's website. December 22, 2005 – E-mailed to all DHMH human services private providers. Comment period ended February 1, 2006.

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

No comments were received.

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

NONE

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

N/A

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

An internet search for similar regulations was conducted on the federal government and the following States: Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, District of Columbia, and New Jersey. Nothing came to our attention during this review that would warrant changing our regulations.

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

An internet search for regulations was also conducted on other Departments/Units within the State. Surveyed regulations were all very similar in nature. Minor language differences occurred, but none were substantive or major in nature.

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act? Yes [ ] No [X]

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [X] Yes [ ] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

N/A

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

X no action

amendment

repeal

repeal and adopt new regulations

reorganization

Summary:

N/A

Person performing review: Charles Thomas

Title: Audit Division

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.04.04

Chapter Name: Human Services Agreement s Manual

Authority: Health – General, § 2-104(b); State Government Article, § 10-110; Annotated Code of Md

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended:

Purpose: This Chapter establishes the requirements and procedures with which a vendor must comply when entering into an agreement with the Department to provide human services.

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [X] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [X] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [ ] Yes [X] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [X] Yes [ ] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

The general publics as well as those organizations which currently provide human services for the Department were invited to participate in the review. No comments were received.

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

All DHMH Local Health Departments and Central Office Units were invited to comment via email sent December 22, 2005. One comment was received.

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;

(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

Comments were solicited by the following methods: December 23, 2005 – Published a public notice in the Maryland Register December 23, 2005 – Posted a notice on the Division of State Documents website. December 22, 2005 – Email to all DHMH human services private providers. Comment period ended February 1, 2006.

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

One comment was received related to convening a work group to update the HSAM or develop a new manual to replace the HSAM. A response was sent thanking the stakeholder for their response and agreeing to look into the possibility of forming a work group in the future.

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

None

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

N/A

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

N/A

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

An internet search for regulations of other Departments within the State was conducted, but no substantive or major differences were noted.

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act? Yes [ ] No [X]

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [X] Yes [ ] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

N/A

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

X no action

amendment

repeal

repeal and adopt new regulations

reorganization

Summary:

N/A

Person performing review: Robert J. Cassidy

Title: Chief, DHMH Division of General Accounting

Regulatory Review and Evaluation Act
Evaluation Report Form
2003 – 2011

Chapter Codification: 10.04.05

Chapter Name: Community Residential Services

Authority: Health-General Article §2-104(b), Annotated Code of Maryland

Date Originally Adopted or Last Amended: March 14, 1994

Purpose: The purpose of this chapter of regulations is to identify criteria for selecting, expanding, or renewing contracts for community residential services.

A. Review Criteria. (State Government Article, §10-132(1)(i), Annotated Code of Maryland; COMAR 01.01.3002.20E)

(1) Do the regulations continue to be necessary for the public interest? [X] Yes [ ] No

(2) Do the regulations continue to be supported by statutory authority and judicial opinion? [X] Yes [ ] No

(3) Are the regulations obsolete or otherwise appropriate for amendment or repeal? [ ] Yes [X] No

(4) Are the regulations effective in accomplishing their intended purpose? [X] Yes [ ] No

B. Outreach and Research. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(i)–(viii), Annotated Code of Maryland)

(1) List any stakeholders invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

Notice soliciting comments was posted on the unit's website. No comments were received.

(2) List any other affected agencies that were invited to review the regulations and provide a summary of their participation in and input into the review process.

N/A

(3) Describe the process used to solicit public comment, including:
(a) any notice published in the Maryland Register;
(b) any notice published in newspapers of general circulation;

(c) any notice posted on the unit's website or on a Statewide website created for units to post notices of regulation review;
(d) any mailing by the adopting authority; and
(e) any public hearing held.

Notice soliciting comments was posted on the DDA website

(4) Provide summaries of:
(a) all comments received from stakeholders, affected units, or the public; and
(b) the adopting authority's responses to those comments.

No comments were received

(5) Describe any interunit conflict reviewed and the resolution or proposed resolution of that conflict.

There is no inter-unit conflict

(6) Provide a summary of any relevant scientific data gathered.

N/A

(7) Provide a summary of any relevant information gathered related to the regulations of other states or the federal government.

N/A

(8) Provide a summary of any other relevant information gathered.

N/A

C. Under COMAR 01.01.2003.20E(3), does the agency have any existing policy statements, guidelines, or standards being applied or enforced which should be promulgated as regulations, in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act? Yes [ ] No [X]

Has the agency promulgated all regulations required by recent legislation? [X] Yes [ ] No

Provide explanations of the above responses, as needed:

D. Actions Needed. (State Government Article, §10-135(a)(2)(ix) – (xi), Annotated Code of Maryland) (check all that apply)

X no action

amendment

repeal

repeal and adopt new regulations

reorganization

Summary:

These regulations continue to be necessary.

Person performing review: Peter deFreis

Title: DDA, Asst. Dir. Ops.