

CONFIDENTIAL
LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2016

Bill Number: H.514 Name of Bill: Fish and wildlife; hunting; fishing; wildlife management and conservation stamp

Agency/ Dept: Fish and Wildlife Author of Bill Review: Commissioner Louis Porter

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

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

Recommended Position:

Support Oppose Remain Neutral Support with modifications identified in #8 below

Analysis of Bill

1. **Summary of bill and issue it addresses.** *Bill establishes a \$20 fee on hunting and fishing licenses to support invasive species control, clean water projects and wildlife*
2. **Is there a need for this bill?** *No. VFW and ANR overall already undertakes many programs and projects to deal with these issues. Those programs are already paid for largely by hunters, anglers and trappers.*
3. **What are likely to be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for this Department?** *This bill would likely cause a significant decline in hunting and would likely result in enough of a decline in participation that it would in fact cost money rather than make it. It is also in conflict with federal aid requirements, putting more than \$6 million a year in federal funds in jeopardy. Federal aid (fish and wildlife conservation funding) supplies roughly one third of VFW annual budget. Federal aid rules (based on the laws that govern these funds) require that revenue from the sale of licenses for fishing, hunting and trapping go to specific purposes outlined for the benefit of wildlife (and fish) and for the benefit of sportsmen and women. They also require that use of such funds be controlled by the wildlife agency (and its director/commissioner). This proposal would appear to violate all of those requirements.*
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?** *If the VFW revenue declines, other departments and agencies would likely have to take over work in wildlife management, wildlife law enforcement, regulatory review, education and other programs.*
5. **What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for others, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?** *Fewer of the services listed above provided to Vermonters. Less protection and management of wildlife in the state. Decline in tourism and wildlife based recreation. Decline in tourism and wildlife based recreation revenue to the state and Vermont businesses.*

6. Other Stakeholders:

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

6.1 Who else is likely to support the proposal and why? David Deen, as sponsor. Perhaps organizations more concerned with water quality than wildlife management.

6.2 Who else is likely to oppose the proposal and why? Those who care about wildlife, wildlife based recreation and the economic impact of that sector of the economy.

7. Rationale for recommendation: See above. Could result in a significant impact to wildlife management and wildlife based recreation, as well as a significant decline in revenue to the state and Vermont businesses.

8. Specific modifications that would be needed to recommend support of this bill: Basic premise of the bill is flawed.

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: 1-13 Date: 1-13-16

