CONFIDENTIAL

LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2016

Bill Number:___**s.230**_____ **Name of Bill:**__ : Conservation and development; natural resources; land use; Act 250; 6 sport shooting ranges _____

Agency/ Dept:_**Vt Fish and Wildlife/NRB**____ **Author of Bill Review: Commissioner Louis Porter**_____

Date of Bill Review:__**1/7/16**_____ **Related Bills and Key Players** _____

Status of Bill: (check one): _**X**___**Upon Introduction** _____ **As passed by 1st body** _____**As passed by both**

Recommended Position:

____**Support** _____**Oppose** _____**Remain Neutral** __**X**__**Support with modifications identified in #8 below**

Analysis of Bill

1. **Summary of bill and issue it addresses.** *This bill would exempt shooting range upgrades from Act 250 review if the work was related to improving safety, noise concerns or environmental protection.*

2. **Is there a need for this bill?** *Yes. Needed shooting ranges are being prevented from improving their operations by the demands of Act 250 review. That results in people shooting in backyards, gravel pits and other locations, some of which may be unsafe.*

3. **What are likely to be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for this Department?** FWD has had a hard time getting grants to ranges out the door because they are mired in Act 250 review. If the department is required to certify the need for range improvements that will require additional staff and resources. However, we would recommend striking that provision.

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?** A slight decrease in Act 250 fees, however, the attendant work required would also decrease.

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) Municipalities, which frequently work to shut down ranges in their jurisdictions, will oppose. So will neighbor groups which seek to prevent their operation.*

6. **Other Stakeholders:**

   6.1 Who else is likely to support the proposal and why? Sen. Sears, Rep. Brennan, Vermont Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, Evan Hughes, Vermont Traditions Coalition, other shooting and hunting advocates.

Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word document to Jahala.Dudley@vermont.gov & Jessica.Mishaan@vermont.gov

6.2 **Who else is likely to oppose the proposal and why?** Municipalities, neighbors of shooting ranges.

7. **Rationale for recommendation:** *Safe and secure shooting ranges are a necessity. Given that shooting in backyards and fields is legal, a continued decline in shooting ranges in Vermont will result in more shooting in unregulated places not built for the activity. Some of those places are likely unsafe.*

8. **Specific modifications that would be needed to recommend support of this bill**: *There is no need to have the FWD certify the need for the upgrades, something the Department does not have regulatory oversight of, staff to do or expertize in. Instead, an engineer or consultant working on the project can certify the need or purpose of the upgrade.*

9. **Will this bill create a new board or commission AND/OR add or remove appointees to an existing one? If so, which one and how many? No.**

1/12/16

Secretary/Commissioner has reviewed this document: ***Date:*** 1-13-16

Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word document to Jahala.Dudley@vermont.gov & Jessica.Mishaan@vermont.gov