

CONFIDENTIAL
LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2016

Bill Number: S.172 Name of Bill: Motor vehicles; colored lights; fire department vehicles; EMS vehicles

Agency/Dept: Vermont State Police Author of Bill Review: Lt. Garry Scott

Date of Bill Review: 01/12/2016 Related Bills and Key Players: Fire and EMS agencies

Status of Bill: (check one)

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

Recommended Position:

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

Analysis of Bill

1. **Summary of bill and issue it addresses.** This bill proposes to authorize the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles to issue a permit for the use of one blue light on a Fire department EMS vehicles, provided the light is mounted so as to be visible primarily from the rear of the vehicle.
2. **Is there a need for this bill?** No, historically in Vermont, police vehicles are permitted to use a blue light and EMS vehicles are permitted to use a red light, which the public is accustomed to. There is no statistical data to show an increase in crashes involving Fire and EMS vehicles to warrant the change, in fact the number of crashes decreased from 33 in 2013 to 25 in 2014. In 2015, 80 police vehicles were involved in motor vehicle collision while Fire trucks were involved in 16 and EMS 9. Clearly, Blue lights are not a deterring factor.
3. **What are likely to be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for this Department?** Most Fire and EMS agencies are struggling to meet budgetary needs and requiring agencies to purchase new lights would be an added burden. Vermont would have inconsistency between agencies which would create confusion for the motor public.
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 VT DMV, who issues permits, would incur a cost to change forms and their computer tracking program.
5. **What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for others, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?** The members of the public will experience a period of time in which they will need to become familiar with the new light options on Police, Fire and EMS vehicles. Municipalities, depending on size(s) would also face cost(s) associated with upgrading/changing out lights on vehicles.
6. **Other Stakeholders:**

6.1 Who else is likely to support the proposal and why? Members of Fire Departments, EMS Agencies as well as members of Police Departments. The support/opposition of this bill is going to vary and depend upon the opinion/personal preference of the individuals responsible for the respective agencies affected by this bill. These opinions are going to vary.

6.2 Who else is likely to oppose the proposal and why? Members of Fire Departments, EMS Agencies as well as members of Police Departments. The support/opposition of this bill is going to vary and depend upon the opinion/personal preference of the individuals responsible for the respective agencies affected by this bill. These opinions are going to vary.

7. Rationale for recommendation:

The rationale for not supporting this bill is as follows,

1. In reviewing the proposed bill, there is no requirement mandating or making this the new standard across Vermont, rather saying the change(s) may be authorized. **Therefore there is going to be a lack of consistency across the state which could lead to issues.**
2. Data doesn't show an increase in crashes involving Fire and EMS vehicles. In fact there has been a decline from 33 in 2013 to 25 in 2014. (Per VTrans)
3. The State Police would strongly disagree with blue lights on civilian/personal vehicles used to respond to emergency situations.

8. Specific modifications that would be needed to recommend support of this bill: None, the Vermont State Police Opposes this Bill.

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? None.

Secretary/Commissioner has reviewed this document



Date: 2/1/16