CONFIDENTIAL

LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2015

Bill Number: H.489, Sec 22b **Name of Bill:** An act relating to revenue

Agency/ Dept: ANR/DEC **Author of Bill Review:** Megan O'Toole

Date of Bill Review: May 19, 2015 **Related Bills and Key Players:** _____

Status of Bill: (check one): _____Upon Introduction _____As passed by 1st body x As passed by both

Recommended Position:

X Support _____Oppose _____Remain Neutral _____Support with modifications identified in #8 below

Analysis of Bill

1. **Summary of bill and issue it addresses.** *Describe what the bill is intended to accomplish and why.* This bill will allow for the registration of air contaminant sources, as specified by rule, that emit less than 5 tons of air contaminants per year.

2. **Is there a need for this bill?** *Please explain why or why not.* Yes. This bill will create more fairness and equity in the permitting and registration programs by requiring some small sources that emit potentially harmful contaminants to pay an annual fee.

3. **What are likely to be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for this Department?** This bill could provide an estimated $20,000 in additional fee revenue following adoption of regulatory amendments to require registration of several source categories that currently emit less than 5 tons per year.

4. **What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for other departments in state government, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?** This bill is unlikely to impact any other departments in state government.

5. **What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for others, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?** (*for example, public, municipalities, organizations, business, regulated entities, etc)* Small air contaminant sources that would become subject to the new registration requirement may object to the $500 annual fee that will be imposed on these sources.

6. **Other Stakeholders:**

   6.1 Who else is likely to support the proposal and why? Sensitive populations and those interested in cleaner air, better emissions data and oversight of smaller sources that emit toxic contaminants.

   6.2 Who else is likely to oppose the proposal and why?

7. **Rationale for recommendation:** *Justify recommendation stated above.* This change would help the Air Quality and Climate Division administer its programs more effectively, account for the resources spent on some types of small sources, and improve air quality.

Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word document to laura.gray@state.vt.us and jessica.mishaan@state.vt.us

8. **Specific modifications that would be needed to recommend support of this bill:** *Not meant to rewrite bill, but rather, an opportunity to identify simple modifications that would change recommended position.*

9. **Gubernatorial appointments to board or commission?**

Commissioner has reviewed this document: _____ ***Date:*** 5/20/15

Secretary has reviewed this document: _____ ***Date:*** 5-20-15

Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word document to laura.gray@state.vt.us and jessica.mishaan@state.vt.us