

Page 4-14, 4.1.3 Stakeholder Feedback:

Stakeholders had mixed opinions about the need for a noise standard in Vermont statute or in the VPIM. Generally, feedback was against the need for a noise standard in statute or in the VPIM, due to the difficulty of implementing a noise standard and concerns about allocation of limited resources for enforcement. Stakeholder responses included: Observations that noise is not a high priority for the stakeholder's constituents. Concerns about the need to dedicate limited resources to noise enforcement that would be better spent on other traffic safety issues such as excessive speed or DUI enforcement There was concern about the legal implications of law enforcement discretionary stops based on noise.

Table 3: Summary of Local Noise Ordinances in Vermont Locality Summary

- Burlington Muffler required in good working order. Modifications to exhaust system unlawful if vehicle would "make a louder noise than it would have in its original condition".
- Bennington Muffler required in good working order. No removal, damage to muffler allowed - no cutouts or bypasses allowed
- Woodstock Enosburg Falls Same text as Bennington Similar text to Bennington / Woodstock
- Alburgh Williston Muffler required which "effectively prevents loud or explosive noises"
- Same text as Alburgh West Windsor Prohibits "abnormal engine, exhaust, or tire noise" Putney Prohibits "discharge into the open air of the exhaust". Muffler required which will "effectively prevent loud or explosive noises".
- Rutland Prohibits modifications that increase the sound level above the original manufacturer
- Springfield Same text as Alburgh St. Albans Muffler required in good working order. Unlawful to have a cutout, exhaust whistle, or no muffler if the vehicle is plainly audible at 50 feet.