

CONFIDENTIAL
LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2013

Bill Number: H.142 Name of Bill: An act relating to repealing certain requirements for forestlands in the Use Value Appraisal Program

Agency/Dept.: Forests, Parks & Recreation Author of Bill Review: Steven Sinclair

Date of Bill Review: 1/31/13 Status of Bill (check one):

Upon Introduction As passed by 1st body As passed by both bodies Fiscal

Recommended Position:

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 proposes to repeal 10 V.S.A. § 2750(b), thereby removing a directive that the Commissioner of Forests, Parks and Recreation require, for the lands in the Use Value Appraisal Program, preapproval of whole-tree harvesting and compliance with forest health guidelines.

2. Is there a need for this bill? *Please explain why or why not.* Yes, and no. Yes, provisions regarding harvesting guidelines and procurement standards in the recently passed Act 170 need to be amended, but this bill doesn't deal with all the necessary revisions. We prefer H.131, and do not support this bill.

3. What are likely to be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for this Department?

This bill attempts to amend only one of section within the harvesting guidelines and procurement standards- dealing with lands enrolled in UVA. It doesn't provide additional time for the department to develop voluntary guidelines, and doesn't fix the ambiguity in the BGS language regarding procurement of 'wood products'. The

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? The ambiguity in the procurement language will be an issue for BGS.

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.)*

Act 170 had many detractors and this bill will do little at alleviate their fears and concerns. Enrollees in the UVA program will be happy that the provisions regarding UVA lands has been removed.

6. Other Stakeholders:

6.1 Who else is likely to support the proposal and why?

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

Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word document to Drusilla.roessle@state.vt.us

7. **Rationale for recommendation:** *Justify recommendation stated above.* H.131 does a much better job in addressing all the needed changes in Act 170.

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.*

Commissioner has reviewed this document: Michael C. Snyder Date: 2/3/13

Secretary has reviewed this document: Debra M. A. Date: 2-13-13