



- 2.1            (ii) intended outcomes;
- 2.2            (iii) the cost to state and local government and the private sector; and
- 2.3            (iv) the relationship of the rule to other local, state, and federal rules;
- 2.4            (2) assess the pros and cons of alternative approaches to implementing water-related
- 2.5 programs, policies, and permits, including local, state, and regional-based approaches;
- 2.6            (3) identify inconsistencies and redundancy between local, state, and federal rules;
- 2.7            (4) identify means to coordinate rulemaking and implementation so as to achieve
- 2.8 intended outcomes more effectively and efficiently;
- 2.9            (5) identify a rule assessment and evaluation process for determining whether each
- 2.10 identified rule should be continued or repealed;
- 2.11            (6) rely on scientific, peer-reviewed data, including the studies of the National
- 2.12 Academy of Sciences; and
- 2.13            (7) evaluate current responsibilities of the Pollution Control Agency, Department of
- 2.14 Natural Resources, Board of Water and Soil Resources, Environmental Quality Board,
- 2.15 Department of Agriculture, and Department of Health, for developing and implementing
- 2.16 water-related programs, policies, and permits and make recommendations for reallocating
- 2.17 responsibilities among the agencies.
- 2.18            (c) The commissioner of administration must submit the study results and make
- 2.19 recommendations to agencies listed under paragraph (a) and to the chairs and ranking
- 2.20 minority party members of the senate and house of representatives committees having
- 2.21 primary jurisdiction over environment and natural resources policy and finance no later
- 2.22 than January 15, 2012.