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Alternatives to Current Relinquished Firearms Storage Arrangements in Vermont:
A Feasibility Study

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study explores the feasibility of alternative storage arrangements for firearms relinquished by persons subject to Relief From Abuse (RFA) orders in Vermont. Establishing alternative firearms storage arrangements would alleviate current storage burdens for law enforcement agencies, allow for more consistent law enforcement and judicial responses to RFA defendants with firearms, and reduce concerns about potential access to these firearms by abusers when firearms are relinquished to friends and relatives, as commonly occurs.

I first examined the statutes and procedures for the three states contiguous to Vermont: Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and New York. Massachusetts has moved from a system of firearms storage by law enforcement to one of routinely transferring firearms to federally and state licensed, bonded firearms dealers (FFLs) for storage. In New Hampshire, relinquished firearms are stored by law enforcement agencies if a defendant does not make alternative arrangements. New Hampshire does not permit friends, relatives or other persons to store firearms or ammunition for a defendant, however. Although New York statutes stipulate only that protection orders specify the place where firearms are to be relinquished, as well as the date and time, sheriffs departments routinely store relinquished firearms.

To acquire information about current storage arrangements for relinquished firearms in Vermont and to document the extent of any associated burdens on law enforcement as well as proposed solutions, I surveyed police chiefs, sheriffs and Vermont State Police (VSP) station commanders. Fifty-seven surveys were completed on line or returned by mail, yielding a response rate of 72 percent. Of the 57 respondents, 33 (58 percent) indicated that their department or station currently stores firearms for individuals subject to RFA orders. Of the 24 respondents who do not currently store relinquished firearms, 13 have done so in the past. Insufficient space was the reason most frequently given for not storing relinquished firearms, followed by concerns about liability.

An estimated 540 relinquished firearms were being stored by law enforcement agencies at the time of the survey. Nearly three-quarters currently store fewer than 20 relinquished firearms, with the largest number of stored firearms falling in the range of 80-100. The percentage of storage space filled by all firearms (including firearms stored as evidence) was 60 percent or higher for more than half of respondents, and 80 percent or higher for more than one-third of respondents. The lack of storage space some agencies face appears to be partly due to firearms not being picked up when RFA orders expire, yet only four departments have a policy stipulating that firearms must be picked up or forfeited after a certain length of time.

Eighty percent of respondents view lack of space as problematic, and more than 75 percent of respondents were at least somewhat concerned about liability issues related
to maintaining the condition of firearms. Asked about their overall level of satisfaction with current firearms storage arrangements, 36 percent of all respondents were extremely dissatisfied and an additional 30 percent were somewhat dissatisfied.

Most respondents (78 percent) are receptive to exploring the possibility of using FFLs to store relinquished firearms. Three-quarters would be at least somewhat supportive of state-constructed storage facilities. Currently, no police or sheriff’s department or VSP station charges a fee for storing firearms, but 82 percent of respondents would support doing so. Nearly half of all respondents said the Vermont Department of Public Safety should oversee any new storage facilities; another 26 percent of respondents think sheriffs should be responsible. Forty-one percent of respondents said that a storage facility is most needed in Central Vermont (includes Burlington), while 26 percent said Southern Vermont has the greatest need, followed by Northwestern Vermont (18 percent) and Northeastern Vermont (14 percent; multiple responses permitted).

I also sought input from judges by emailing a four-question survey to all trial judges, but only seven of 30 judges responded and only five of them hear relevant cases. While the responses of these judges indicate that they are aware of the storage problems facing law enforcement agencies, unfortunately their small number precludes generalizing to all trial judges.

I then examined five relinquished firearms storage alternatives: private storage by FFLs, storage at Vermont National Guard armories, state-constructed regional storage facilities, state-constructed county storage facilities, and state-constructed storage space at individual law enforcement agencies.

To determine the feasibility of using FFLs to store relinquished firearms in Vermont, I surveyed 180 FFLs about their level of interest in such an arrangement and their ability to accommodate firearms from law enforcement. Eleven FFLs indicated an interest in the possibility of storing firearms for law enforcement. Of these, five said their business is operated from a residence, while the remaining six have commercial storefronts. Using FFLs to store relinquished firearms would provide a low or no cost storage option to law enforcement agencies and relieve them of the liability associated with maintaining their condition of firearms, provided FFLs have appropriate security. Unless more FFLs develop an interest in storing firearms for law enforcement, FFLs could likely serve only as backup for some law enforcement agencies. Therefore, it is unlikely that this option would alleviate storage constraints for all agencies.

Using National Guard armories to store relinquished firearms also does not appear feasible. Lt. Colonel Schumacher, Director of Operations for Military Support for the Vermont National Guard, does not see the utility or appropriateness of storing relinquished firearms at armories, and doing so would likely present a new set of logistical problems. Civilian firearms would have to be kept separate from the military’s, and the National Guard could not provide security or any courier service that might be
required. For these reasons, the option of storing relinquished firearms at National Guard armories was eliminated from further consideration.

Regional, county and individual (agency) storage facilities were also considered and cost estimates obtained for prefabricated and locally constructed storage vaults, as well as the addition/expansion of interior rooms. Costs will depend on the number, size and desired features of storage facilities, and whether additional administrative personnel or courier service are needed. Regional storage would create transportation burdens for law enforcement agencies unless courier service is provided. Adding storage space to dozens of individual agencies would be extremely expensive. A more practical solution would be to negotiate with county sheriffs to operate state constructed storage facilities at their departments. Sheriffs have a close working relationship with the courts, and firearms could be relinquished directly to them for storage. This would eliminate transportation burdens and alleviate storage responsibilities for other law enforcement agencies.

In addition to the recommendation that the Department of Public Safety negotiate with sheriffs to operate state-constructed firearms storage facilities, this report recommends initiating policies/statutes that permit charging storage fees to help offset operating expenses; allow destruction of firearms if fees are delinquent by 90 days or (if fees are not charged) firearms are not retrieved 90 days after RFA orders expire; hold law enforcement agencies harmless for maintaining the condition of stored firearms provided due care is taken; and discontinue the practice allowing storage of relinquished firearms by friends and relatives of offenders, something that should not be necessary if law enforcement’s storage space is adequate.

Current storage arrangements for relinquished firearms are untenable in Vermont. The majority of the state’s sheriffs, police chiefs, and VSP station commanders are dissatisfied with current arrangements, primarily because of space constraints and liability concerns. Some agencies have opted out altogether, increasing the burden for those who continue to store firearms. If space constraints are not addressed, this will likely maintain the status quo in terms of inconsistent judicial and law enforcement responses to RFA defendants who own firearms.
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The Violence Against Women Act of 1994 stipulates that it is a crime for anyone under a restraining order to possess firearms or ammunition. Vermont statutes do not address the issue of firearms seizure, but the Vermont Supreme Court has interpreted 15 V.S.A. Section (c) as allowing seizure of firearms when a final Relief From Abuse (RFA) order is issued. When firearms are surrendered under this statute, they must be stored until an RFA order has expired or a defendant has been convicted of an offense that would make him/her a prohibited person under the federal Gun Control Act. In the latter case, firearms cannot be returned to the offender, so must be disposed of in some other way.

Vermont does not have a systematic method of storing firearms relinquished by persons subject to RFA orders. When judges order the surrender of firearms, they stipulate to whom the firearms must be relinquished. Although firearms are often turned over to local police, state police or sheriffs by order of the courts, law enforcement agencies do not always have space or appropriate conditions in which to store them. Moreover, storage constraints may encourage judges to order offenders to store firearms with relatives or friends. Although this is legal in Vermont, provided individuals are not prohibited from possessing firearms, it raises concerns about offenders’ potential access to firearms and the safety of domestic violence victims.

Establishing additional firearms storage in Vermont would alleviate current storage burdens for law enforcement agencies, and reduce concerns about potential access to these firearms by abusers when relatives and friends store relinquished firearms. This study explores the feasibility of alternative storage arrangements for firearms relinquished by persons subject to RFA orders.

Gun Storage Procedures in Other States

The time and cost to conduct research on the gun storage procedures in all states would be prohibitive, so I examined the statutes and procedures for the three states contiguous to Vermont: Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and New York.

Massachusetts has moved from a system of firearms storage by law enforcement to one of routinely transferring firearms to federally and state licensed, bonded firearms

---

1 This research was funded by a Project Safe Neighborhoods grant from the U.S. Department of Justice to the Vermont Department of Public Safety. The Vermont Center for Justice Research is a sub-grantee. The author thanks all those who completed surveys and otherwise contributed to this research.
2 See Benson v. Muscari 172 Vt. 1 (2001), which held that the general authorization in 15 V.S.A. Section 1103 (c) stating “If the court finds that the defendant has abused the plaintiff and that there is danger of further abuse, the court shall make such orders as it deems necessary to protect the plaintiff, the children or both …” is sufficiently broad to allow the court to prohibit the defendant from possessing firearms.
3 Under 18 U.S.C. Section 922 (g)(8), prohibited persons include convicted felons and persons convicted of a misdemeanor crime of violence or threat with a deadly weapon if the convicted person was the victim’s current or former spouse, live-in partner, parent or guardian.
dealers (FFLs) for storage (excluding firearms that may be evidence in a criminal case). Transferring firearms to FFLs for storage alleviates the space, liability, and some administrative responsibilities that characterize current storage arrangements in Vermont. The owner of the firearms is responsible for administrative, transfer and storage costs. Owners may also transfer ownership to a licensed dealer of their choice, or another person legally permitted to own firearms, for up to one year after surrendering their firearms.

The Village Vault in Northborough Massachusetts provides detailed information on its website about the mechanics of this type of storage arrangement (www.villagevault.com). Village Vault employees pick firearms up from law enforcement agencies, inventory them at the agency, analyze the firearms for safety, individually box and label each firearm and store them in a climate controlled safe. The Village Vault sends a written notice to the firearms’ owner, administers the transfer, and collects associated fees from the owner, including a monthly storage fee.\(^4\) Firearms are forfeited if fees are not paid after 90 days. In such cases, title is transferred to the FFL, the firearms are sold, and after deducting any unpaid fees remaining proceeds are given to the owner. Firearms can only be returned to their owner by court order (see Massachusetts General Law Chapter 140, Section 129D in Appendix A). If firearms are not disposed of in the manner described, Massachusetts law permits the auctioning of unclaimed firearms by the state police one year after surrender, but according to Lt. Lundborn of the Truro police department, such firearms are destroyed rather than auctioned.

I spoke with Lt. Lundborn about the extent to which law enforcement agencies use FFLs for storage and whether this arrangement is satisfactory. He indicated that most departments store relinquished firearms at FFL warehouses now. Newer police departments have more on-site storage, but it fills up quickly (e.g., Truro has a new building with an armory that holds about 100 firearms, including those owned by the police). About 30 days after receiving firearms owned by persons subject to RFA orders, the department transfers them to a FFL, first notifying the owner in writing (see Appendix B for a copy of the letter and associated department policies). I asked Lt. Lundborn if storage at FFLs was a burden for the police in any way, or if there were any associated costs to the state. “No, it’s great—there’s no liability or cost,” he said.

**New Hampshire** statutes permit defendants to store firearms at FFLs, but the court must approve this arrangement. In these cases, firearms must be relinquished to a law enforcement agency first (judges specify to which agency firearms are to be relinquished), and the agency then turns them over to the designated FFL. Sergeant Cemorelis of the Keene police department said that it’s rare for defendants to store firearms with FFLs. More often, they will turn them over to an FFL to sell. New Hampshire does not permit friends, relatives or other persons to store firearms or ammunition for a defendant. If a defendant does not make alternative arrangements,

\(^4\) The Village Vault charges fifty cents per day per firearm (payable every 30 days); a handling fee of $15 per firearm; an administrative fee of $45 (for all firearms, not each); and a transfer fee of $20 per firearm, if applicable.
relinquished firearms are stored by law enforcement agencies. According to Sergeant Aucoin of the New Hampshire State Police, law enforcement would only store firearms at FFLs if they were unusually expensive or dangerous. State police do not store firearms at barracks for more than a few days. They are transferred to the state lab, or to the armory in Concord if they are to be destroyed.

The amount of space agencies have varies—newer facilities are most likely to have adequate space, per Sergeant Cemorelis. Keene has a new 25,000 square foot police building with two secure rooms for firearms (cement block walls and floor and poured cement ceiling), one room for cleaning and one for storage. The facility also has an eight by twelve foot caged, locked corner of its evidence storage area in which confiscated firearms are stored (this also has a cement block floor and walls, but with a secure dry wall ceiling). This is similar to the area depicted in Appendix C.

New Hampshire statutes allow law enforcement agencies to charge a fee for storage (not to exceed the actual cost of storage), but this is not done per Sergeants Cemorelis and Aucoin. Statutes stipulate that law enforcement agencies are not liable for damage or deterioration of confiscated firearms, provided due care is taken. Relinquished firearms may be retrieved only by court order, and only after court personnel run a background check. As with relinquishments, law enforcement officers rather than defendants retrieve firearms stored by FFLs. If a petition for return of firearms is denied, the defendant and law enforcement agency determine an alternative means of disposal, such as transferring ownership to an individual who is legally qualified to own firearms. Statutes do not address disposal of firearms that remain unclaimed (see Chapter 14 of New Hampshire statutes in Appendix D).

New York statutes stipulate that when firearms are ordered surrendered, the protection order shall specify the place where they are to be relinquished, as well as the date and time. Specifics about storage arrangements are not addressed, but I learned from the Plattsburgh Police Department that New York sheriffs store firearms owned by persons subject to RFA orders. A telephone call to the Clinton County sheriff’s department confirmed this. Sheriff David Favro indicated that this procedure has been followed for as long as he can remember, and it is appropriate because of the close working relationship between sheriffs and the courts (which also characterizes Vermont). In New York, defendants are not charged for firearms storage, and a court order is required for their return.

Law Enforcement Survey

Survey Methods

To acquire information about current storage arrangements for relinquished firearms in Vermont and to document the extent of any associated burdens on law enforcement as well as proposed solutions, I surveyed police chiefs, sheriffs and Vermont.

---

5 The Keene, New Hampshire, facility was built by Baybutt Construction Company of Keene at a cost of $5 million or $200 per square foot.
State Police (VSP) station commanders. A cover letter asking individuals to complete a web-based survey was emailed to these constituents by Brett van Noordt, President of the Vermont Police Chiefs Association, Roger Marcoux, President of the Vermont Sheriff’s Association, and Captain Ed Ledo, Chief Criminal Investigator, Vermont State Police. The initial response to the survey was poor, in part because some people had difficulty accessing the survey. Consequently, I mailed a copy of the survey with a return envelope to each agency. Amy FitzGerald, Assistant Attorney General, and I also made follow-up phone calls encouraging individuals to complete the survey (see Appendix E for a copy of the cover letter and survey).

Respondents

Fifty-seven surveys were completed on line or returned by mail from 30 police chiefs (of 51), 13 sheriffs (of 14), and nine Vermont State Police station commanders (of 14). Another five respondents did not identify their employment position (see Table 1, Appendix F). This yielded a response rate of 72 percent. Of those who identified the area of Vermont in which they work, 38.5 percent were located in Southern Vermont, 30.8 percent in Central Vermont (includes Burlington), 13.5 percent in Northwestern Vermont, and 17.3 percent in Northeastern Vermont. Nearly all respondents (88 percent) had 16 or more years of policing experience.

Prevalence of Relinquished Firearms Storage

Of the 57 respondents, 33 (57.9 percent) indicated that their department or station currently stores firearms for individuals subject to RFA orders. Of the 24 respondents who do not currently store relinquished firearms, 13 have done so in the past (Table 2, Appendix F). Insufficient space was the reason most frequently given for not storing relinquished firearms (90 percent), followed by concerns about liability (60 percent), insufficient staff time for associated paperwork (50 percent), and an inability to maintain the condition of firearms (40 percent; multiple responses permitted). Two respondents also indicated that the lack of statutes/court orders surrounding the relinquishment and return of firearms owned by persons subject to RFA orders is another reason for not storing firearms.

Table 3 in Appendix F provides information about the numbers and percentages of relinquished firearms stored by the 33 agencies that currently store them. Nearly three-quarters currently store fewer than 20 firearms. This percentage was slightly higher for police departments (80 percent) and slightly lower for sheriffs departments (60 percent). The largest number of relinquished firearms stored fell in the range of 80-100. Asked what percentage of all stored firearms (including firearms stored as evidence) this number represents, responses were most likely to fall in the lowest (10-19 percent) and highest (80-100 percent) categories, each representing about one-third of respondents. This pattern held across all three groups (police chiefs, sheriffs, and VSP station commanders).
The percentage of storage space filled by all firearms was 60 percent or higher for more than half of respondents (56.3 percent), and 80 percent or higher for more than one-third of respondents (34.4 percent). This also characterized each of the three types of law enforcement agencies. Conversely, between 40 and 50 percent of police chiefs, sheriffs, and VSP station commanders reported that their storage space was not currently more than half full. Recall, however, that 13 agencies no longer store relinquished firearms primarily because of space constraints and are not included in these figures.

Characteristics of Relinquished Firearms

Additional characteristics of relinquished firearms are shown in Table 4 (Appendix F) for respondents who currently store or have ever stored them. Sixty-three percent of all respondents, and between 50 and 80 percent of those in each of the three areas of law enforcement store relinquished firearms for less than one year on average (typically 6-11 months). Approximately one-fourth of all respondents, and one-fourth of police chiefs, store firearms for an average of one to two years, while ten percent of sheriffs and 50 percent of VSP station commanders do so. Twelve percent of respondents—mostly police chiefs—reported average storage times of more than two years.

Most respondents indicated that individuals ordered to relinquish firearms turn over between one and four firearms, on average. Asked for the largest number of firearms relinquished by one person, the most common response was 5-9 for all respondents and for police chiefs, and 10-14 for sheriffs and VSP station commanders. Two respondents reported having received 30-39 firearms from one person, another, 40-49. One police chief received 75 firearms from a single individual. The greatest dollar value of a relinquished firearm was most commonly $500-$999, but one respondent reported a value of $5,000 for a single firearm.

The lack of storage space some agencies face appears to be partly due to firearms not being picked up when RFA orders expire. As shown in Table 5 of Appendix F, two-thirds of respondents indicated that firearms are not always picked up promptly. This percentage ranged from 50 percent of sheriffs to 87.5 percent of VSP station commanders. One sheriff said that he has stored 12 firearms that have not been claimed by their owner for three years. Despite this problem, only four departments have a policy stipulating that firearms must be picked up or forfeited after a certain length of time.

Another issue not directly addressed by the survey but raised by some respondents is that Vermont does not require a court order for law enforcement to release firearms when RFA orders expire, as do Massachusetts and New Hampshire and New York. Currently, Vermont law enforcement agencies run a National Crime Information Center (NCIC) check before returning firearms to determine whether the owner is a prohibited person. This does not alleviate concerns on the part of some law enforcement officers about liability or the safety of victims or the public, however, as these comments indicate:
At the end of the RFA period, what liability falls back on the police should the defendant claim his guns and later use them in a crime? This needs to be dealt with legislatively.

Since firearms are taken away by judge’s order then they only should be “released” by a judge’s order and not because a temporary/final order expires.

The process of taking, holding and securing firearms of an offender is an action initiated by the courts. They should have a responsibility to track this inventory and actually manage the proper release of the firearms because no matter what the reason is, they possess the information that accurately tells why a firearm(s) can be released to someone. There is a disconnect from the court once the order is issued and the physical work is placed upon law enforcement.

When individuals are permanently prohibited by federal law from possessing firearms because they were convicted of a misdemeanor domestic violence offense or a felony (of any kind), between 50 percent (state police) and 90 percent (sheriffs) of respondents indicated that the most common method of disposing of firearms is for the offender to sell or give them away. This raises safety concerns for some respondents:

[When] the person subject to the order assigns ownership to another who comes to claim the gun, where is the control preventing the defendant from obtaining guns?

Clarification is needed as to what should happen with firearms. I don’t think the owner should be able to “transfer” them to others. The owner would likely still have access.

If the person is deemed dangerous by virtue of a final RFA, shouldn’t the guns be forfeited and turned over to the state for destruction?

Eighteen percent of respondents, most often state police, said they destroy the firearms of prohibited persons. Vermont state statute 2305 allows delivery of unlawful firearms to the state treasurer who can sell them and return two-thirds of the proceeds to the municipality from which they came. According to Assistant Attorney General, Amy FitzGerald, this is not done because of concerns that the firearms might subsequently be used in a crime.

Clearly, uniform policies surrounding the release and timely collection of firearms by those whose RFA orders have expired would help ease storage burdens for some agencies. Some law enforcement officers are also concerned about the disposition of firearms when persons are permanently prohibited from possessing firearms.
Perceptions of the Extent of Storage Problem and Satisfaction Levels

Survey respondents were asked to what extent lack of space, inability to maintain the condition of firearms, and associated administrative work is a problem (see Table 6, Appendix F). Slightly more than one-third of respondents view lack of space as a major problem and another 43.2 percent consider it to be somewhat of a problem. Sheriffs were the least likely of the three groups to indicate that firearms storage is a major problem, but were most likely to say it is somewhat of a problem, while the reverse was true for VSP station commanders. Police chiefs were evenly divided, with 39 percent indicating that storage is a major problem and 39 percent saying it is somewhat of a problem. About one-third of respondents also see an inability to maintain the condition of firearms as a major problem (only 28 percent of respondents have a climate controlled storage area). Half of respondents view this as somewhat of a problem. Related to this, more than three-fourths of respondents across all groups were at least somewhat concerned about liability issues related to maintaining the condition of firearms.

Additional administrative work was most likely to be seen as somewhat of a problem by all respondents, and by police chiefs and VSP stations commanders. Sheriffs were more inclined to say that administrative work is not a problem at all. Finally, asked about their overall level of satisfaction with current firearms storage arrangements, 36.4 percent of all respondents were extremely dissatisfied (ranging from 20 percent of VSP station commanders to 43.5 percent of police chiefs). An additional 29.6 percent of respondents were somewhat dissatisfied—ranging from 20 percent of sheriffs to 37.5 percent of VSP station commanders.

Improving Firearms Storage Arrangements

A number of survey questions asked for opinions related to possible changes to current storage arrangements (responses shown in Table 7, Appendix F). About one-third of respondents (total and within groups) would be highly supportive of using FFLs to store firearms owned by persons subject to RFA orders, as is done in Massachusetts. Another 43 percent (similar percentages across groups) would be somewhat supportive of storage by FFLs. Thus, most respondents (78 percent) appear receptive to exploring this possibility.

Thirty-four percent of all respondents would be highly supportive, and another 39.6 percent said they would be somewhat supportive of state-funded construction. Taking these two responses together, 66 percent of VSP station commanders were somewhat or highly supportive of this type of construction, compared to 72.4 percent of police chiefs and 75 percent of sheriffs.

Currently, no police or sheriff’s department or VSP station charges a fee for storing firearms belonging to persons subject to RFA orders, but 82 percent of respondents would support doing so. Sheriffs were most supportive of this idea (92.3 percent), and VSP station commanders, least supportive (66.7 percent). Several respondents wrote:
We do need to be receptive to taking these firearms out of the hands of individuals who are involved in a domestic violence incident. I think it is time to make even the offender an active participant responsible to the custody and care of their firearms during the duration of their court order conditions or their conviction(s) and that needs to include costs.

The owner of the firearm should be responsible for any costs associated with the proper storage of their firearms. The state should not have to build a facility or staff it with “gun cleaners.” What would be next … alcohol storage depots, garages for cars that people can’t operate, etc… FFL dealers could charge for the storage of court mandated surrenders and are already in place with rules on who they can turn firearms over to based on Federal laws.

Asked which area of law enforcement should oversee any state-constructed firearms storage facilities, nearly half of all respondents said the Vermont Department of Public Safety (DPS). Approximately half of police chiefs and sheriffs responded in this way, but only 25 percent of VSP police commanders agreed, perhaps because state police headquarters is housed in the DPS and VSP respondents do not want to assume this responsibility. Another 26 percent of respondents think sheriffs should be responsible for storage facilities. Forty-two percent of sheriffs agreed, as did 63 percent of VSP station commanders. Interestingly, only 11 percent of police chiefs would prefer such an arrangement. As one respondent conveyed:

The APO [Abuse Prevention Order] is a Civil Order from Family Court, therefore this [firearms storage] should be a function of the Sheriff’s Department to follow through on any seized weapons per an APO, not the [respondent’s agency]. The Sheriff’s Departments handle civil process. We don’t mind serving APO’s that are issued after 1600 hours, weekends or holidays etc., as the Sheriff’s Departments are a Mon-Fri 0800-1700 operation but the storing of all these weapons is physically impossible for us.

Forty-one percent of respondents said that a storage facility is most needed in Central Vermont (includes Burlington), while 25.5 percent said Southern Vermont has the greatest need, followed by Northwestern Vermont (17.7 percent) and Northeastern Vermont (13.7 percent; multiple responses permitted). Not surprisingly, these responses were highly dependent on the location of the respondent. Respondents were most likely to say the need for storage facilities was greatest in the area in which they work. Thirty-five percent of respondents either said they don’t know where a storage facility should be located, or that more than one facility is needed—one in each county, VSP station or quadrant of the state.

Restricting responses to those 21 respondents who indicated that their firearms storage space is at 60 percent capacity or higher changed response patterns somewhat. Fewer selected Southern Vermont as the most critical location (11.1 percent compared to
25.5 percent when all respondents were included), and slightly more indicated that Central Vermont (44.4 percent) and Northeastern Vermont (16.7 percent) have the greatest need. The percentage selecting Northwestern Vermont was about the same as previously (17.7 percent).

Summary

Major findings of the law enforcement survey are highlighted below:

- Fifty-seven of 79 Vermont police chiefs, sheriffs, and VSP station commanders (72 percent) responded to a survey designed to assess current storage arrangements for firearms relinquished by persons subject to Relief From Abuse orders.

- Thirty-three respondents (57.9 percent) said their department or station currently stores relinquished firearms. An additional 13 said that have done so in the past but do not currently store relinquished firearms, primarily because of lack of space.

- Although three-quarters of the agencies that store firearms currently store fewer than 20 firearms and close to 20 percent store 20-39, these numbers must be put in the context of all firearms stored, including those stored as criminal evidence. The percentage of storage space currently filled is 60 percent or higher for more than half of respondents, and 80 percent or higher for about one-third of respondents.

- Storage of relinquished firearms typically lasts for 6-11 months, and individuals commonly surrender 1-4 firearms valued at between $500 and $999. Law enforcement respondents reported as many as 75 firearms being relinquished by one person, however, and the highest value of a single firearm was $5,000.

- Firearms are not always picked up when an RFA order expires, contributing to storage constraints, yet only four respondents indicated that they have a policy regarding time limits for retrieval. Initiating such a policy may reduce the number of stored firearms.

- Some law enforcement personnel would prefer that a court order be required for the return of relinquished firearms, as mandated by some other states.

- Approximately 80 percent of respondents said lack of firearms storage space is a problem. The same percentage view an inability to maintain the condition of firearms as a problem and are at least somewhat concerned about liability issues. Fewer are concerned about the administrative work associated with relinquished firearms storage. Overall, 66 percent are at least somewhat dissatisfied with current storage arrangements, with sheriffs being
considerably more satisfied and VSP station commanders being somewhat less satisfied than police chiefs.

- About three-quarters of respondents are at least somewhat supportive of the possibility of using Federal Firearms Licensees for relinquished firearms storage, as is done in Massachusetts.

- Respondents are equally supportive of the possibility of state-constructed storage space for relinquished firearms.

- No respondents said their department or station charges a fee for storing relinquished firearms, but 80 percent of respondents would support this.

- Almost half of respondents think the Department of Public Safety should oversee any state-constructed storage facility (this percentage was notably lower for VSP respondents). Another quarter think sheriffs should oversee such a facility. VSP station commanders are most supportive of sheriffs administering such a facility, followed by sheriffs themselves. Police chiefs were least supportive of this option.

- Forty-one percent of respondents said a storage facility is most needed in Central Vermont (includes Burlington), while 25.5 percent said Southern Vermont has the greatest need, followed by Northwestern Vermont (17.7 percent) and Northeastern Vermont (13.7 percent). Respondents were most likely to say the need for storage facilities was greatest in the area in which they work. Thirty-five percent of respondents said they don’t know where a storage facility should be located, or that more than one facility is needed—one in each county, VSP station, or quadrant of the state.

**Judges Survey**

I sought input from judges by emailing a four-question survey to all trial judges via the Court Administrator’s Office. I asked if current relinquished firearms storage arrangements and associated space limitations have affected their ability to conduct their job in any way; whether they could suggest alternatives to the current system; whether, as some law enforcement officers suggest, a court order should be required to return relinquished firearms; and whether they have any additional experiences or concerns they wished to convey.

Only seven of 30 judges responded. One is not assigned to a court that does not hear domestic violence cases, and another hears few RFA cases and “has not had any problems with firearms storage.” The five remaining respondents were aware that law enforcement agencies face limitations and that some will not store firearms. One respondent said that in a recent case, s/he told the parties that because of space limitations s/he would hesitate to order firearms held unless they were evidence in a criminal case. The defendant’s lawyer then agreed to lock them in the law firm’s safe while the RFA
was in effect. Another judge said that because of storage problems, s/he orders firearms held by law enforcement only when there is a high level of threat, but otherwise feels obligated to have a relative or other third party hold them. S/he noted, “This is far from ideal since the defendants are likely to be able to get access to their firearms when held by relatives. If we had a dedicated storage facility, I would order all firearms to go there routinely for the life of the order.”

With regard to suggestions for alternative arrangements, one judge said s/he would like to have a list of the law enforcement agencies that accept firearms, and that a single repository in the county would be helpful. Another judge indicated that although informal arrangements (e.g., with a relative) are less susceptible to oversight, s/he is not aware of any instances where such an arrangement has resulted in problems. The judge in whose court a lawyer offered to store firearms pointed to this as an alternative, but recognized that it is not an available option in every case. The remaining judge suggested constructing a military style armory for storage, with the cost being offset by charging defendants $5 or $10 per month for storage.

Not surprisingly, with once exception, judges did not support the suggestion that a court order be required for firearms to be returned to defendants. Three of the five said this would place an additional burden on an already burdened court system, and/or that it is simply unnecessary. Another said that such concerns can be addressed upon request, but the judge was not certain whether this ad hoc approach is sufficient or if a statewide protocol is needed. The fifth thinks it would be a good practice, eliminating any doubt or mistakes.

One judge suggested that rules be instituted to limit the time firearms will be held after expiration of an order. S/he has heard anecdotally that some defendants—particularly those from out of state—never return to retrieve their firearms. Another judge thinks the storage concerns are valid, and should be dealt with legislatively. “It seems that within some grant or legislation involving domestic violence (which is being studied by the legislature right now) some sort of facility could be arranged for this purpose.”

While responses indicate that these judges are aware of the storage problems facing law enforcement agencies, unfortunately their small number precludes generalizing to all judges.

**Alternatives to Current Storage Arrangements**

In this section, five alternative storage arrangements are considered: private storage by FFLs, storage at Vermont National Guard armories, state-constructed regional armories, and dedicated storage facilities.

---

6 Based on an interview with District Court Judge Mark Keller about this issue, then Vermont Law School student, Judith Cutler writes: “If there is a problem with a firearm in a domestic situation, the main frustration faced by a judge, says Keller, is who will ultimately be responsible for removing the gun…no one wants the responsibility and no one is required by law to do it.” See *Guns in the Green Mountains* by Judith L. Cutler, no date (circa 2004).

7 Formula grants through the Violence Against Women Act have a 15 percent discretionary component.
storage facilities, state-constructed county storage facilities, and state-constructed storage space at individual law enforcement agencies.

**Private Storage by Federal Firearms Licensees (FFLs)**

To determine the feasibility of using FFLs to store relinquished firearms in Vermont, I surveyed 180 FFLs about their level of interest in such an arrangement and their ability to accommodate firearms from law enforcement (Appendix G contains cover letter and survey). 8 Eleven respondents indicated an interest in the possibility of storing firearms for law enforcement. Of these, five said their business is operated from a residence, while the remaining six have commercial storefronts. The FFLs are located around the state: Northwest—two (one residence, one commercial); Northeast—two (one residence, one commercial); Central—five (two residences, three commercial); South—two (one residence, one commercial). Although the FFLs who expressed interest in storing relinquished firearms were fairly evenly dispersed around the state, their small number means that they would not be conveniently located for all law enforcement agencies. Perhaps at least some FFLs could provide pick-up and delivery service.

Obviously, security is a major issue in using private storage. The FFLs with commercial storefronts appear to have better (although not necessarily sufficient) security than those operating from a residence. FFLs with commercial storefronts are also more likely to have appropriate climate controlled storage areas. Asked how many additional firearms they could accommodate, the total for the six FFLs with commercial storefronts is approximately 700 firearms. Using the midpoints of response categories in the law enforcement survey questions (Table 3 of Appendix F), an estimated 540 relinquished firearms were stored at the time of the survey. This number is constantly changing, however.

Of the five FFLs without storefronts, two do not currently have storage space at all. The remaining three estimated that they could accommodate a total of 300 firearms, but it seems unlikely that residences would serve as appropriate firearms storage facilities. While commercial storefronts may provide a preferable storage venue to residences, the ability of storefronts to accommodate the number of firearms requiring storage would have to be determined if this alternative is pursued. Security requirements would have to be established since there are currently no federal or Vermont State security requirements for FFLs. All FFLs do not have climate-control systems, which may be of concern even if they assume liability for the firearms.

Using FFLs for firearms storage has the benefit of providing a low or no cost storage option to law enforcement. Storage by FFLs would relieve law enforcement of the burden of storing relinquished firearms, as well as the liability associated with

---

8 I obtained the names and addresses of all 377 Vermont FFLs from the Burlington office of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. I mailed surveys only to the 180 FFLs that appeared to have gun shops, gunsmith or sporting goods businesses. I excluded those that did not list a business name, or had an unrelated business, such as a barbershop, general store, hardware store, or plowing and excavating business. I also excluded Wal-Mart and K-Mart stores.
maintaining their condition. FFLs could also be used by law enforcement selectively rather than routinely, when storage space nears capacity or firearms are especially valuable.

Although New Hampshire statutes allow law enforcement to store firearms at FFLs, this does not appear to occur routinely, as it does in Massachusetts. New Hampshire statutes also allow defendants to store firearms at FFLs with court approval (New Hampshire does not permit storage by friends and relatives). In both states, firearms must be relinquished to and retrieved by a law enforcement agency designated by the court.

Few FFLs expressed interest in exploring the possibility of storing firearms, and fewer still may maintain an interest if monetary investments are required to meet state specifications. On the other hand, some FFLs might develop an interest in storing firearms if the State moves toward establishing such an arrangement. Storage would provide a source of revenue to FFLs via storage and administrative fees, so some may be willing to make any necessary capital investments. Unless more FFLs develop an interest in storing firearms for law enforcement, FFLs could likely serve only as backup rather than as a substitute for law enforcement agencies. While this would alleviate some pressures on law enforcement agencies, it is likely that pressures would remain for others (e.g., for those who are not in close proximity to a FFL approved for storage).

Two of the Vermont FFLs who were not interested in storing firearms offered other suggestions. One proposed rendering all firearms inoperable, “removing the bolt actions-firing pin from others-cylinder from revolvers-and other small parts. Storage of these parts would take little space, and a gunsmith could do this for a small fee.” This raises the question of whether an offender could simply buy replacement parts and regain the operability of a firearm. Captain Ed Ledo, Chief Criminal Investigator for the Vermont State Police, indicated that these parts are easy to obtain and he does not recommend pursuing this option. Another FFL suggested storing firearms at the Vermont National Guard armories, and I gathered information on this possibility.

National Guard Armories

I spoke with Lt. Colonel Ludwig “Sonny” Schumacher, Director of Operations for Military Support for the Vermont National Guard about the possibility of storing civilian firearms at some of the 22 National Guard armories located throughout the state. Although the military does store some nonmilitary items, military regulations require that civilian firearms be stored in a vault separate from those housing military firearms. In addition, the military could not assume responsibility for the items or administer a storage program. Lt. Colonel Schumacher said that, “although there may be some legal way to take a piece of equipment and place it in an armory, I don’t see the connection and utility

---

9 One commercial storefront FFL said that he would require $100 per firearm upfront, and charge $10 per firearm per month for storage. It may be unreasonable to expect offenders to pay this amount. As another respondent pointed out, at some point storage fees may exceed the value of the firearm, but the offender could decide whether to pay storage or sell the firearm.
of doing so.” Most of the armories are full. Those with the most available space are in Chittenden County, which may not provide accessible storage for law enforcement in other parts of the state. Providing a courier service (which the military would not do) provides another layer of paperwork when firearms change hands. Some centralized (remote) administrative unit could conceivably address this issue, he suggested. Lt. Colonel Schumacher indicated that the state owns other property that would provide more appropriate locations. “We always enjoy partnering with our law enforcement friends, but I would want it to be a good, long-term solution.”

I also contacted Brattleboro and Burlington police chiefs, about the possibility of using the armories acquired by these two cities. Chief John Martin responded that Brattleboro’s armory is used as a recreation building and a Senior Center, which would not be compatible with firearms storage. Similarly, Chief Thomas Tremblay of Burlington said that the plan for the newly acquired Goss Court Armory is to convert it to a recreation/youth facility. Thus, the idea of using armories, whether state or municipally owned does not appear feasible. Lt. Colonel Schumacher does not see the utility or appropriateness of storing relinquished firearms in National Guard armories, and doing so would likely present a new set of logistical problems. For these reasons, the option of storing relinquished firearms at National Guard armories is eliminated from further consideration.

Regional Storage Facilities

Regional storage facilities could be constructed on/within unused state property, or added to existing law enforcement agencies. The size of any new storage units would have to be determined by the number of firearms requiring storage, their distribution throughout the state, and the number of storage units to be constructed. As previously indicated, an estimated 540 relinquished firearms were being stored at the time of the law enforcement survey, although some agencies did not respond to the survey. While it seems likely that agencies that did not respond to the survey do not view RFA firearms storage as a serious problem, this cannot be assumed.

Based on survey responses, more than half of relinquished firearms are stored in southern Vermont alone. 10 Should additional storage become available, judges would probably be more inclined to order firearms relinquished. On balance, instituting a storage fee and/or time limits after RFA orders have expired may help reduce the number of firearms requiring storage. Not knowing how these forces will play out suggests that any investment in new storage facilities should overestimate storage requirements. Although the size of regional storage facilities need not be uniform across regions, purchasing larger units for all regions would permit transfer of overflow from one facility to another if necessary.

10 Using the midpoint of response categories, 310 firearms (57.4 percent) were being stored in Southern Vermont at the time of the survey, 55 (10.2 percent) in Central Vermont, 50 (9.3 percent) in Northeastern Vermont, and 45 (8.3 percent) in Northwestern Vermont.
Determining the size and number of regional storage facilities must also take into consideration the transportation burdens too few facilities would place on law enforcement agencies. Vermont’s mountainous terrain and limited interstate system make travel difficult—particularly east and west, and during the winter months. At a minimum, two regional storage facilities would likely be needed (southern and central), but four—southern, central, northeast and northwest—would be more appropriate. With two storage facilities, and even with four or six, travel will be an obstacle for some agencies unless courier service is provided. A courier service would add to operating expenses, and add another layer of administrative work since transfers to a courier must be documented.

Firearms storage vaults can be purchased as pre-fabricated units, or constructed locally. Armag Corporation manufactures self-contained arms vaults, suitable for exterior placement, ranging in size from 8’ x 8’ x 8’ to 44’ x 27’ x 10’ (http://www.armagcorp.com). These vaults include heating, air conditioning, wiring, plumbing, and many other standard features (see Appendix H1). A ten-foot ceiling accommodates double-stacked gun racks, utilizing space more efficiently (shown in Appendix H2).

A 40’ x 12’ x 10’ unit (which might be appropriate for two regional storage units) costs $77,195, excluding freight, offloading and installation. Gun racks manufactured by Crane NSWC cost approximately $1,500 each (less expensive alternatives might be available). With 78 double-stacked gun racks (an additional $117,000), this vault could hold 1,560 rifles and 1,248 handguns (configuration can change with different rack inserts). Thus, two units of this size would cost approximately $400,000. If four or six regional storage facilities were established, a smaller unit may be appropriate at least for some regions. A 20’ x 10’ x 10’ unit with 18 gun racks can store 360 rifles and 288 handguns (can be configured differently). The cost of this size unit is $42,865, excluding freight, offloading and installation. Eighteen gun racks would add approximately $27,000 to the cost, so each unit would cost approximately $70,000. Thus, four regional units of this size would cost approximately $280,000, and six units would cost approximately $420,000, excluding freight, offloading and installation.

Storage vaults can also be constructed locally. I obtained cost estimates from DeWolfe Engineering Associates in Montpelier for construction of a concrete vault using specifications obtained from the Vermont National Guard. A 20’ x 20’ x 10’ vault would cost approximately $40,000 to construct. Seventy-eight gun racks would add $117,000 plus shipping, for a total cost of approximately $160,000 (two units for $320,000). A 20’ x 10’ x 10’ vault would cost approximately $28,000. Eighteen gun racks would cost approximately $27,000, for a total cost of $55,000 (four units for $220,000).

A locally constructed vault may be less expensive than an Armag vault, but it does not include any additional features such as air conditioning, heating and electricity. Armag vaults are also built specifically for firearms storage, so may be superior in other ways (other pre-fabricated vault manufacturers should also be considered). Both prefabricated Armag and locally constructed vaults would require installation of gun
racks to make efficient use of available space and to organize inventory. These estimates are also exclusive of any land acquisition costs (presumably state-owned property could be used), additional administrative costs, and security or courier costs that might be associated with operating regional storage facilities.

**County Storage Facilities—Sheriffs Departments**

To eliminate the transportation burdens associated with regional storage, storage facilities could be established in each county. Vermont has one sheriff per county and sheriffs have a close working relationship with the courts. Relinquished firearms could be turned over directly to sheriffs departments for storage. Sheriffs are located in close physical proximity to courthouses, and sheriffs transport defendants and deliver court orders, so storing relinquished firearms is consistent with the duties of Vermont sheriffs. All sheriffs may not be receptive to such an arrangement (seven do not currently store firearms, and some that do are nearing storage capacity), but with appropriate financial support (e.g., construction of any needed space), this alternative may be acceptable.

Among survey respondents, sheriffs stand out as being most likely to be at least somewhat satisfied with current storage arrangements (60 percent) and to say that they should administer any state-funded storage facilities (42 percent). In contrast, only seven percent of police chiefs thought that police departments should administer storage facilities and no VSP station commanders expressed interest in doing so (see Tables 6 and 7 in Appendix F). Although respondents were most likely to support DPS administration of storage facilities, it is not clear who within that department would assume responsibility for this. I discussed the possibility of sheriffs storing relinquished firearms with Lamoille County Sheriff, Roger Marcoux, President of the Vermont Sheriffs Association, and he was receptive to the possibility of negotiating such an arrangement with the State, but emphasized that the State would have to provide necessary support.

If a storage vault were purchased for each of 14 counties, smaller units might suffice. A 10’ x 10’ x 10’ Armag vault costs approximately $28,000 exclusive of gun racks, freight and off-loading. Twelve gun racks, which could hold 240 rifles and 192 handguns (or some other combination of the two), would cost approximately $18,000 plus shipping. Fourteen units, at approximately $46,000 per unit, would cost roughly $650,000.

Some savings might be realized with locally built concrete vaults, but this would have to be calculated more closely taking into account the specifications of each type of unit. The initial estimate for a 10’ x 10’ x 10’ locally constructed concrete vault without any finish work, such as electricity and ventilation, is $20,000 (based on plans provided by the Vermont National Guard; see Appendix I). A cost reduction may be available if multiple units are constructed. With finish work and gun racks, costs might approach $40,000 without a quantity discount, or roughly $600,000 for 14 units. This estimate also does not include any additional supports that might be required if vaults are not placed directly on the ground.
Constructing or expanding evidence rooms at sheriffs departments could also be considered, and would likely cost a minimum of $200/square foot. Not knowing how many departments would require this type of construction or renovation makes estimating costs difficult, but at $200/square foot, a 10’ x 10’ room would cost approximately $20,000. If all 14 sheriffs departments require this amount of space, the cost would approach $300,000, plus the cost of any gun racks that may be required. Land acquisition costs would likely be minimal (required only if departments do not own land on which to add storage space). If storage fees are initiated, this could help cover any administrative or additional security or insurance costs.

**Individual Storage Units**

Another storage option is to purchase or construct storage vaults for individual law enforcement agencies, or to expand the size of their evidence rooms to increase storage capacities. The size of any new storage area or vault would be based on past storage needs and currently available space.

One approach to adding storage space to individual agencies is to target agencies with the greatest need, beginning with the 11 that are at 80-100 percent of their firearms storage capacity. Eight more are at 60-79 percent capacity (these estimates include firearms stored for evidence as well as relinquished firearms). In addition, 24 of the 57 survey respondents do not currently store firearms, primarily because of lack of space. Assuring adequate space for each individual agency would likely require more than simply installing a vault or secure area within an existing building, however. Some buildings do not have the space in which to place a vault or to expand an evidence room, and adding on may not be an option for buildings that are constrained by surrounding structures. Existing buildings may also not have the structural supports that concrete vaults require, but this would not be an issue if evidence rooms were used for storage.

Adding storage space to dozens of agencies would undoubtedly be the most expensive option. In addition to being costly, the storage burden would continue to rest with individual agencies. Adding space to agencies with the greatest current need may also not address the possibility that different agencies may experience storage limitations in the future. For example, if a single defendant relinquishes 50 firearms, this would likely exceed the available space of nearly any agency. Another configuration might be to identify “partnerships,” where by agencies with available space partner with nearby agencies in need of space. This would cause an increased workload for the receiving departments, but perhaps this would be acceptable if agencies are permitted to charge defendants storage fees.
Summary of Pros/Cons and Costs Associated with Various Options

*Private Storage by Federal Firearms Licensees (FFLs)*

**Pros:**
- Low cost alternative.
- Storage, administrative and liability burdens assumed by FFL.

**Cons:**
- Only 11 of 180 FFLs surveyed expressed interest in this option, and five of them operate out of a residence.
- FFLs would likely not be able to accommodate all relinquished firearms, so law enforcement agencies would still have to provide some storage.
- Law enforcement agencies would likely have to accept and release firearms stored at FFLs, as is the practice in Massachusetts.
- FFL security and storage requirements must be established.
- Firearms will have to be transported by law enforcement agencies unless FFLs provide this service.

**Costs:**
- No new costs to law enforcement, other than the time required to establish FFL storage arrangements, protocols, and monitoring.

*Regional Storage Facilities*

**Pros:**
- Shifts storage burden from many individual agencies to fewer regional facilities.
- Provides space to accommodate all relinquished firearms.

**Cons:**
- Requires capital investment, either new construction or expansion of storage area in an existing facility.
- Requires identifying appropriate sites and negotiations to acquire them.
- Requires identifying existing agency or establishing independent entity to oversee facilities.
- Requires law enforcement to travel to storage facility unless courier service is provided by state (travel becomes less burdensome as number of facilities increases).
- Requires operating costs (e.g., administrative, security, utilities, insurance), but these could be at least partially offset by charging defendants a storage fee.
Costs:

- The cost of constructing new regional storage facilities will depend on their number, location, and size. Two 40’ x 12’ x 10’ prefabricated Armag vaults (http://www.armagcorp.com), each with 78 gun racks, would cost approximately $400,000 (less expensive gun racks may be available). Four 20’ x 10’ x 10’ unit costs, each with 18 gun racks, would cost approximately $280,000 (six units would cost approximately $420,000).
- Montpelier based, DeWolfe Engineering Associates, estimated the cost of two 20’ x 20’ x 10’ concrete vaults with reinforced flooring at $80,000. Adding 78 gun racks to each vault would bring the cost of two units to $320,000. Four 20’ x 10’ x 10’ vaults, each with 18 gun racks, would cost approximately $220,000.
- The cost of expanding storage facilities in existing buildings would depend on current and desired building configuration and materials, as well as the amount of space needed. New construction would likely cost approximately $200/square foot, and renovations would likely cost more.

County Storage Facilities—Sheriffs Departments

Pros:

- Shifts responsibility of relinquished firearms storage to one agency, alleviating other agencies of the burdens associated with current storage practices.
- Consistent with close working relationships between sheriffs departments and the courts.
- Sheriffs appear most receptive of any type of law enforcement agency to the possibility of assuming responsibility for storing relinquished firearms if adequate support is provided by the State.
- Firearms can be turned over by defendants to sheriffs directly, eliminating the need for other agencies to transport relinquished firearms.

Cons:

- Requires capital investment, either new construction or expansion of storage area in existing buildings.
- May require State to contribute to operating costs if cannot be absorbed by sheriffs departments, but this could be at least partially offset by charging defendants a storage fee.

Costs:

- Cost will depend on available space at sheriffs departments, but most if not all departments will likely require construction of additional storage space.
- The cost of adding a prefabricated 10’ x 10’ by 10’ storage vault with 12 gun racks to each of 14 sheriffs departments would cost around $650,000 (less expensive gun racks may be available).
• The cost of adding a locally constructed 10’ x 10’ by 10’ concrete storage vault with 12 gun racks to 14 sheriffs departments would likely cost approximately $600,000 but quantity discount may be available.
• The cost of adding a 10’ by 10’ by 10’ interior evidence room to 14 sheriffs departments would likely cost a minimum of $280,000. Twelve gun racks per room would add $252,000 to the cost for a total of approximately $530,000.
• May be some additional operating costs, but these can be at least partially offset by charging storage fees.

**Individual Storage Units**

**Pros:**
- Individual agencies would have autonomy with regard to firearms storage.
- Minimal transportation of firearms to other locations.
- Would likely not require additional staff for administration or security.

**Cons:**
- Burden of responsibility continues to rest with individual agencies. Burden would be reduced if storage space is adequate, but some law enforcement officers do not think it should be their responsibility to store relinquished firearms.
- Requires capital investment, either new construction or expansion of storage area in existing facilities.
- Would likely be the most expensive option, since many departments would require construction of a storage vault or an addition. Currently, 11 survey respondents said they are at 80-100 percent of storage capacity, and another seven are at 60-79 percent of capacity. Additional departments could near or reach capacity at any time if individuals relinquish large numbers of firearms.

**Costs:**
- The cost of constructing or expanding storage units at individual agencies will depend on the configuration of existing facilities, as well as the number of agencies requiring expanded storage space.
- The cost of a 10’ x 10’ x 10’ prefabricated vault with 12 gun racks is approximately $46,000 (less expensive gun racks may be available).
- The cost of a 10’ x 10’ x 10’ locally constructed concrete vault with 12 gun racks is approximately $40,000.
- The cost of adding a 10’ x 10’ x 10’ room would likely cost about $20,000 (new construction costs are around $200 per square foot, depending on desired features, but renovation costs tend to be higher).
Recommendations:

Based on the findings of this firearms storage feasibility study, the following recommendations are made to the Vermont Department of Public Safety:

- Place responsibility for firearms storage with one agency, and provide the financial support needed to construct and operate appropriate storage facilities. Negotiating with sheriffs to assume this responsibility appears to be the most feasible and logical alternative.
- The type of storage facilities to be constructed/purchased would have to be determined based on security standards and cost constraints.
- Initiate a firearms/ammunition storage fee to help offset operating costs of storage facilities (e.g., see N.H. Revised Statutes 173-B, Protocol 14-17).
- If storage fees are initiated, allow destruction of firearms if owner defaults on payment of storage fees after 90 days (e.g., see General Laws of Massachusetts, chapter 140, section 129D).
- If storage fees are not initiated, establish policy/statute to limit the amount of time defendants can store firearms after an RFA order expires, permitting destruction of firearms if not retrieved within 90 days.
- Establish policy/statute that holds law enforcement agencies harmless for maintaining condition of stored firearms provided due care is exercised (e.g., see N.H. Revised Statutes 173-B, Protocol 14-17).
- Although some law enforcement officers would prefer that a court order be required to release firearms when an RFA order expires, it is unlikely that judges would support such a requirement. Therefore, when RFA orders expire, the law enforcement agency responsible for storage should continue to follow their current practice of assuring to the best of their ability that defendants are not subject to any other protection orders and have not ever been convicted of a felony or a qualifying misdemeanor crime of domestic violence.
- Consider the possibility of discontinuing the practice allowing storage of relinquished firearms by friends and relatives of offenders, as New Hampshire has done (see N.H. Revised Statutes 173-B, Protocol 14-16). If adequate storage by law enforcement agencies is available, this should no longer be necessary.

Current storage arrangements for relinquished firearms are clearly untenable in Vermont. The majority of the state’s sheriffs, police chiefs, and VSP station commanders are dissatisfied with current arrangements, primarily because of storage pressures and
liability concerns. Some agencies have opted out altogether, increasing the burden for those who continue to store firearms. If space constraints are not addressed, this will likely maintain the status quo in terms of inconsistent judicial and law enforcement responses to RFA defendants who own firearms.

   Even when judges order that firearms be relinquished, the lack of available storage space at law enforcement agencies means that judges often permit storage by defendants’ friends and relatives. Victims’ rights advocates and some law enforcement officers raise concerns about Vermont’s practice of permitting this type of arrangement since victims are most vulnerable to retribution after they leave their abuser and there is no assurance that defendants can not gain access to their firearms. Providing adequate storage would alleviate the need for this practice and provide some increased sense of security to victims.
Chapter 140: Section 129D. Surrender of firearms and ammunition to licensing authority upon denial of application for, or revocation of, identification card or license; right to transfer; sale by colonel of state police; rules and regulations

Section 129D. Upon revocation, suspension or denial of an application for a firearm identification card pursuant to the conditions of section one hundred and twenty-nine B, or of any firearms license if said firearms identification card is not then in force or of any machine gun license, the person whose application was so revoked, suspended or denied shall without delay deliver or surrender, to the licensing authority where he resides, all firearms, rifles, shotguns and machine guns and ammunition which he then possesses unless an appeal is pending. Such person, or his legal representative, shall have the right, at any time up to one year after said delivery or surrender, to transfer such firearms, rifles, shotguns and machine guns and ammunition to any licensed dealer or any other person legally permitted to purchase or take possession of such firearms, rifles, shotguns and machine guns and ammunition which he then possesses and upon notification in writing by the purchaser or transferee and the former owner, the licensing authority shall within ten days deliver such firearms, rifles, shotguns and machine guns and ammunition to the transferee or purchaser and due care shall be observed by the licensing authority in the receipt and holding of any such firearm, rifle, shotgun or machine gun and ammunition.

The licensing authority, after taking possession of any firearm, rifle, shotgun, machine gun or ammunition by any means, may transfer possession of such weapon for storage purposes to a federally and state licensed dealer of such weapons and ammunition who operates a bonded warehouse on the licensed premises that is equipped with a safe for the secure storage of firearms and a weapon box or similar container for the secure storage of other weapons and ammunition; provided, however, that the licensing authority shall not transfer to such dealer possession of any weapon that is or may be evidence in any current or pending criminal case concerning a violation of any general or special law, rule or regulation governing the use, possession or ownership of such weapon. Any such dealer that takes possession of a weapon under the provisions of this section shall: (i) inspect such weapon; (ii) issue to the owner a receipt indicating the make, model, caliber, serial number and condition of each weapon so received; and (iii) store and maintain all weapons so received in accordance with such regulations, rules or guidelines as the secretary of the executive office of public safety may establish under this section. The owner shall be liable to such dealer for reasonable storage charges and may dispose of
any such weapon as provided under this section by transfer to a person lawfully permitted to purchase or take possession of such weapon.

Firearms, rifles, shotguns or machine guns and ammunition not disposed of after delivery or surrender according to the provisions of this section shall be sold at public auction by the colonel of the state police to the highest bidding person legally permitted to purchase and possess said firearms, rifles, shotguns or machine guns and ammunition and the proceeds shall be remitted to the state treasurer. Any such weapon that is stored and maintained by a licensed dealer as provided under this section may be so auctioned at the direction of: (i) the licensing authority at the expiration of one year following initial surrender or delivery to such licensing authority; or (ii) the dealer then in possession, if the storage charges for such weapon have been in arrears for 90 days; provided, however, that in either case, title shall pass to the licensed dealer for the purpose of transferring ownership to the auctioneer; and provided further, that in either case, after deduction and payment for storage charges and all necessary costs associated with such surrender and transfer, all surplus proceeds, if any, shall be immediately returned to the owner of such weapon.

The secretary of the executive office of public safety may make and promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.
I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS AND GUIDELINES

In order to better manage space in the Truro Police Department armory, the following policy will be used in order to achieve this goal. The owner of any seized weapon under the provisions of G.L. c. 209A and being held for safe keeping will be notified that the weapons are subject to G.L. c. 140 s. 129D regarding bonded firearms storage. The Truro Police Department will hold any such weapon for a period of thirty days to allow the opportunity to have a court hearing on the G.L. c. 209A matter. After that time, the weapons may be transferred to a bonded firearms warehouse or storage facility under the provisions of the law. The owner will be notified that he/she will be responsible for the fees associated with the transfer and storage.

II. POLICY

A. It is the policy of the Truro Police Department that:

1. Officers shall take and secure firearms that come into our possession
2. Department Armorers may cause firearms that come into our possession to be transferred to a bonded firearms facility after thirty days of possession where the owner of such firearm is known.
3. A report is generated every time a firearms in taken into our possession.
4. Firearms will be checked through NCIC, CJIS and other databases if available to ensure firearms are not stolen, wanted or used in a crime.
5. The Chief of Police, or his designee, determines the disposition of any firearm taken into our possession without a known owner.

6. We do not take possession of firearms for “safekeeping”.

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Domestic/Restraining Order Situation: Any situation in which a firearm is taken into Truro Police custody in accordance with the provisions of any restraining order, and/or provisions of G.L. c. 209A.

B. Found Property: When an Officer or a Citizen finds a firearm and causes the firearms to be taken into custody.

C. Storage Pending Transfer of Ownership: When a Citizen turns in a firearm they no longer don’t have a license for and they wish to transfer ownership to the police.

D. Storage Pending Destruction: When a firearm in our possession is no longer safe to use, cannot be sold or used, is in disrepair or has no identification numbers.

IV. PROCEDURES

A. Taking Firearms into Possession with Owners Known:

1. Responsibilities of Contact Officer:

   a. When an officer takes into possession a firearm:

      i. Check to ensure the weapon(s) are safe, unloaded and locked. Have another officer check to confirm.

      ii. Ensure that all contact (mastercard) information is obtained, and any relevant information about the firearm is obtained.

      iii. A log entry and incident report shall be made concerning the possession. Detailed information shall be entered concerning the firearm, owner, and circumstances of possession. ¹

¹ If the Truro Police come into possession of a firearm through any provision of G.L. c. 209A, a separate report does not need to be completed. Officers shall include the circumstances of the possession in the initial report from the incident.
iv. The firearm shall be entered into (PAMET) property record management system, and a label shall be printed.

v. The Telecommunicator on duty shall check NCIC, CJIS and other databases as needed to ensure that the firearm is not stolen, wanted or otherwise evidence of a crime.

1. If the firearm is found to be evidence of a crime, wanted, stolen, etc., said firearm will be treated as evidence and secured in a temporary evidence locker. See TPDM OPS - 7.02 Evidence Control, Custody and Submission.

vi. A property label shall be affixed to a paper tag found in evidence supplies, and secured to the firearm.

vii. Firearms shall immediate be taken to the armory where it shall be secured.

viii. The officer handling this transaction shall leave a printed copy of his/her generated report, including all relevant date concerning the firearm to the Armorer.

B. Taking Firearms into Possession with Owners unknown:

1. Responsibilities of the Contact Officer:

a. When an officer takes into possession a firearm:

i. Check to ensure the weapon(s) are safe, unloaded and locked. Have another officer check to confirm.

ii. Ensure that all contact (mastercard) information is obtained, and any relevant information about the firearm is obtained.

iii. A log entry and incident report shall be made concerning the possession. Detailed information shall be entered concerning the firearm, finder, potential owner(s) and circumstances of possession.

iv. The firearm shall be entered into (PAMET) property record management system, and a label shall be printed.
v. The Telecommunicator on duty shall check NCIC, CJIS and other databases as needed to ensure that the firearm is not stolen, wanted or otherwise evidence of a crime.

1. If the firearm is found to be evidence of a crime, wanted, stolen, etc., said firearm will be treated as evidence and secured in a temporary evidence locker. See TPDM OPS - 7.02 Evidence Control, Custody and Submission.

vi. A property label shall be affixed to a paper tag found in evidence supplies, and secured to the firearm.

vii. Firearms shall immediate be taken to the armory where it shall be secured.

viii. The officer handling this transaction shall leave a printed copy of his/her generated report, including all relevant date concerning the firearm to the Armorer.

C. Storage of Firearms and Custody:

1. Responsibilities of the Armorer(s):

   a. When the Armorer is notified of a firearm in police custody:

      i. Check to ensure the weapon(s) are safe, unloaded and locked.

      ii. Review reports and all contact (mastercard) information obtained, and any relevant information about the firearm.

      iii. If the owner is known, send the TPD Letter of Intent to Transfer Custody to the owner of the firearm. (See F below)

      iv. If the owner is unknown, storage shall be maintained at the Truro Police Department. The Chief of Police, or his designee, shall make a determination within a 12 month period of the disposition of the firearm.
D. Final Disposition of Firearms – Transfer of Custody

1. Responsibilities of the Armorer(s):

   a. After a period of thirty days has passed, the Armorer may, depending on certain variables, contact the bonded firearms storage facility to arrange for transfer of custody.

      i. Contact the bonded firearms facility and arrange for firearms transfer.

      ii. Notify the owner of the firearm of the transfer arrangements.

      iii. Cause the dispatcher on duty to record the property transfer in the (PAMET) computer system, and print a property transaction record.

      iv. At the time of transfer, ensure that a representative of the bonded firearms facility signs the property transfer record generated from (PAMET).

      v. A supplemental report shall be made under the original incident

E. Final Disposition of Firearms – Destruction

1. Responsibilities of the Armorer(s):

   a. After a period of twelve months, the Armorer shall consult with the Chief of Police or his designee to determine if such firearms should be destroyed. If the Chief of Police deems that the firearms should be destroyed:

      i. The Armorer will cause the firearm to be checked in NCIC, and other databases as necessary to ensure that the firearms is not evidence.
ii. The Armorer shall draft a letter to the Massachusetts State Police Ballistics Section for each firearm describing the firearm in detail, including all serial numbers and condition. The letter shall contain a reference that the firearm was checked in NCIC and that no record was found.

iii. The Armorer shall contact the Massachusetts State Police Ballistics Section at 508-358-3180.

iv. The Armorer will make transfer arrangements.

v. At the time of actual transfer, cause the dispatcher on duty to record the property transfer in the (PAMET) computer system, and print a property transaction record.

vi. At the time of transfer, ensure that a representative of the bonded firearms facility signs the property transfer record generated from (PAMET).

vii. A supplemental report shall be made under the original incident
F. Sample Letter 1

October 12, 2002

Mr. or Mrs. John Doe
2 Main Street
Truro, MA. 02666

Dear Sir or Madam:

Please be advised that the Truro Police Department has received your firearm, XXX Serial # XXXXXXXX and or ammunition as a result of

☐ Abuse Prevention Order (restraining order) whereby you are the listed defendant.
☐ A firearm we held for safe keeping

We are limited to the custody of your firearm for a maximum period of 30 days. Prior to the expiration of the 30 days, you must make arrangements for the transfer of your firearms to a licensed dealer or a bonded storage facility.

If you are unable to make the above arrangements, your firearms may be transferred to a bonded storage facility by this department. You will be billed directly from the facility for their service. If you need assistance in locating a dealer or bonded facility, please contact the Truro Police Department, 508-487-8730. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Very Truly Yours,

John J. Thomas
Chief of Police

Cc: Case File
    Armorer(s)
    Lt Lundborn
New Hampshire Statutes

Sec. 842. Order of protection.

An order of protection under section eight hundred forty-one of this part shall set forth reasonable conditions of behavior to be observed for a period not in excess of two years by the petitioner or respondent or for a period not in excess of five years upon

(i) a finding by the court on the record of the existence of aggravating circumstances as defined in paragraph (vii) of subdivision (a) of section eight hundred twenty-seven of this article; or
(ii) a finding by the court on the record that the conduct alleged in the petition is in violation of a valid order of protection.

Any finding of aggravating circumstances pursuant to this section shall be stated on the record and upon the order of protection. Any order of protection issued pursuant to this section shall specify if an order of probation is in effect. Any order of protection issued pursuant to this section may require the petitioner or the respondent:

(a) to stay away from the home, school, business or place of employment of any other party, the other spouse, the other parent, or the child, and to stay away from any other specific location designated by the court, provided that the court shall make a determination, and shall state such determination in a written decision or on the record, whether to impose a condition pursuant to this subdivision, provided further, however, that failure to make such a determination shall not affect the validity of such order of protection. In making such determination, the court shall consider, but shall not be limited to consideration of, whether the order of protection is likely to achieve its purpose in the absence of such a condition, conduct subject to prior orders of protection, prior incidents of abuse, extent of past or present injury, threats, drug or alcohol abuse, and access to weapons;

(b) to permit a parent, or a person entitled to visitation by a court order or a separation agreement, to visit the child at stated periods;

(c) to refrain from committing a family offense, as defined in subdivision one of section eight hundred twelve of this act, or any criminal offense against the child or against the other parent or against any person to whom custody of the child is awarded, or from harassing, intimidating or threatening such persons;

(d) to permit a designated party to enter the residence during a specified period of time in order to remove personal belongings not in issue in this proceeding or in any other proceeding or action under this act or the domestic relations law;

(e) to refrain from acts of commission or omission that create an unreasonable risk to the health, safety or welfare of a child;
(f) to pay the reasonable counsel fees and disbursements involved in obtaining or enforcing the order of the person who is protected by such order if such order is issued or enforced;

(g) to require the respondent to participate in a batterer’s education program designed to help end violent behavior, which may include referral to drug and alcohol counseling, and to pay the costs thereof if the person has the means to do so, provided however that nothing contained herein shall be deemed to require payment of the costs of any such program by the petitioner, the state or any political subdivision thereof; and

(h) to provide, either directly or by means of medical and health insurance, for expenses incurred for medical care and treatment arising from the incident or incidents forming the basis for the issuance of the order.

(i) to observe such other conditions as are necessary to further the purposes of protection.

The court may also award custody of the child, during the term of the order of protection to either parent, or to an appropriate relative within the second degree. Nothing in this section gives the court power to place or board out any child or to commit a child to an institution or agency. The court may also upon the showing of special circumstances extend the order of protection for a reasonable period of time.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section eight hundred seventeen of this article, where a temporary order of child support has not already been issued, the court may in addition to the issuance of an order of protection pursuant to this section, issue an order for temporary child support in an amount sufficient to meet the needs of the child, without a showing of immediate or emergency need. The court shall make an order for temporary child support notwithstanding that information with respect to income and assets of the respondent may be unavailable. Where such information is available, the court may make an award for temporary child support pursuant to the formula set forth in subdivision one of section four hundred thirteen of this act. Temporary orders of support issued pursuant to this subdivision shall be deemed to have been issued pursuant to section four hundred thirteen of this act.

Upon making an order for temporary child support pursuant to this subdivision, the court shall advise the petitioner of the availability of child support enforcement services by the support collection unit of the local department of social services, to enforce the temporary order and to assist in securing continued child support, and shall set the support matter down for further proceedings in accordance with article four of this act.

Where the court determines that the respondent has employer-provided medical insurance, the court may further direct, as part of an order of temporary support under this subdivision, that a medical support execution be issued and served upon the respondent’s employer as provided for in section fifty-two hundred forty-one of the civil practice law and rules.
Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, an order of protection, or temporary order of protection where applicable, may be entered against a former spouse and persons who have a child in common, regardless whether such persons have been married or have lived together at any time.


Sec. 842-a. Suspension and revocation of a license to carry, possess, repair or dispose of a firearm or firearms pursuant to section 400.00 of the penal law and ineligibility for such a license; order to surrender firearms.

1. Mandatory and permissive suspension of firearms license and ineligibility for such a license upon the issuance of a temporary order of protection.

Whenever a temporary order of protection is issued pursuant to section eight hundred twenty-eight of this article:

(a) the court shall suspend any such existing license possessed by the respondent, order the respondent ineligible for such a license, and order the immediate surrender of any or all firearms owned or possessed where the court receives information that gives the court good cause to believe that:

(i) the respondent has a prior conviction of any violent felony offense as defined in section 70.02 of the penal law;
(ii) the respondent has previously been found to have willfully failed to obey a prior order of protection and such willful failure involved

(A) the infliction of serious physical injury, as defined in subdivision ten of section 10.00 of the penal law,
(B) the use or threatened use of a deadly weapon or dangerous instrument as those terms are defined in subdivisions twelve and thirteen of section 10.00 of the penal law, or
(C) behavior constituting any violent felony offense as defined in section 70.02 of the penal law; or

(iii) the respondent has a prior conviction for stalking in the first degree as defined in section 120.60 of the penal law, stalking in the second degree as
defined in section 120.55 of the penal law, stalking in the third degree as defined in section 120.50 of the penal law or stalking in the fourth degree as defined in section 120.45 of such law; and

(b) the court may where the court finds a substantial risk that the respondent may use or threaten to use a firearm unlawfully against the person or persons for whose protection the temporary order of protection is issued, suspend any such existing license possessed by the respondent, order the respondent ineligible for such a license, and order the immediate surrender of any or all firearms owned or possessed.

2. Mandatory and permissive revocation or suspension of firearms license and ineligibility for such a license upon the issuance of an order of protection. Whenever an order of protection is issued pursuant to section eight hundred forty-one of this part:

(a) the court shall revoke any such existing license possessed by the respondent, order the respondent ineligible for such a license, and order the immediate surrender of any or all firearms owned or possessed where the court finds that the conduct which resulted in the issuance of the order of protection involved

   (i) the infliction of serious physical injury, as defined in subdivision ten of section 10.00 of the penal law,
   (ii) the use or threatened use of a deadly weapon or dangerous instrument as those terms are defined in subdivisions twelve and thirteen of section 10.00 of the penal law, or
   (iii) behavior constituting any violent felony offense as defined in section 70.02 of the penal law; and

(b) the court may, where the court finds a substantial risk that the respondent may use or threaten to use a firearm unlawfully against the person or persons for whose protection the order of protection is issued,

   (i) revoke any such existing license possessed by the respondent, order the respondent ineligible for such a license and order the immediate surrender of any or all firearms owned or possessed or
   (ii) suspend or continue to suspend any such existing license possessed by the respondent, order the respondent ineligible for such a license, and order the immediate surrender of any or all firearms owned or possessed.

3. Mandatory and permissive revocation or suspension of firearms license and ineligibility for such a license upon a finding of a willful failure to obey an order of protection. Whenever a respondent has been found, pursuant to section eight hundred forty-six-a of this part to have willfully failed to obey an order of protection issued by this court or an order of protection issued by a court of competent jurisdiction in another state, territorial or tribal jurisdiction, in addition to any other remedies available pursuant to section eight hundred forty-six-a of this part:
(a) the court shall revoke any such existing license possessed by the respondent, order the respondent ineligible for such a license, and order the immediate surrender of any or all firearms owned or possessed where the willful failure to obey such order involves

(i) the infliction of serious physical injury, as defined in subdivision ten of section 10.00 of the penal law,
(ii) the use or threatened use of a deadly weapon or dangerous instrument as those terms are defined in subdivisions twelve and thirteen of section 10.00 of the penal law, or
(iii) behavior constituting any violent felony offense as defined in section 70.02 of the penal law; or
(iv) behavior constituting stalking in the first degree as defined in section 120.60 of the penal law, stalking in the second degree as defined in section 120.55 of the penal law, stalking in the third degree as defined in section 120.50 of the penal law or stalking in the fourth degree as defined in section 120.45 of such law; and

(b) the court may where the court finds a substantial risk that the respondent may use or threaten to use a firearm unlawfully against the person or persons for whose protection the order of protection was issued,

(i) revoke any such existing license possessed by the respondent, order the respondent ineligible for such a license, whether or not the respondent possesses such a license, and order the immediate surrender of any or all firearms owned or possessed or
(ii) suspend any such existing license possessed by the respondent, order the respondent ineligible for such a license, and order the immediate surrender of any or all firearms owned or possessed.

4. Suspension. Any suspension order issued pursuant to this section shall remain in effect for the duration of the temporary order of protection or order of protection, unless modified or vacated by the court.

5. Surrender.

(a) Where an order to surrender one or more firearms has been issued, the temporary order of protection or order of protection shall specify the place where such firearms shall be surrendered, shall specify a date and time by which the surrender shall be completed and, to the extent possible, shall describe such firearms to be surrendered and shall direct the authority receiving such surrendered firearms to immediately notify the court of such surrender.

(b) The prompt surrender of one or more firearms pursuant to a court order issued pursuant this section shall be considered a voluntary surrender for purposes of subparagraph (f) of paragraph one of subdivision a of section 265.20 of the penal law.
The disposition of any such firearms shall be in accordance with the provisions of subdivision six of section 400.05 of the penal law.

(c) The provisions of this section shall not be deemed to limit, restrict or otherwise impair the authority of the court to order and direct the surrender of any or all pistols, revolvers, rifles, shotguns or other firearms owned or possessed by a respondent pursuant to this act.

6. Notice. (a) Where an order of revocation, suspension or ineligibility has been issued pursuant to this section, any temporary order of protection or order of protection issued shall state that such firearm license has been suspended or revoked or that the respondent is ineligible for such license, as the case may be. (b) The court revoking or suspending the license, ordering the respondent ineligible for such license, or ordering the surrender of any firearm shall immediately notify the statewide registry of orders of protection and the duly constituted police authorities of the locality of such action. (c) The court revoking or suspending the license or ordering the defendant ineligible for such license shall give written notice thereof without unnecessary delay to the division of state police at its office in the city of Albany.

(d) Where an order of revocation, suspension, ineligibility, or surrender is modified or vacated, the court shall immediately notify the statewide registry of orders of protection and the duly constituted police authorities of the locality concerning such action and shall give written notice thereof without unnecessary delay to the division of state police at its office in the city of Albany.

7. Hearing. The respondent shall have the right to a hearing before the court regarding any revocation, suspension, ineligibility or surrender order issued pursuant to this section, provided that nothing in this subdivision shall preclude the court from issuing any such order prior to a hearing. Where the court has issued such an order prior to a hearing, it shall commence such hearing within fourteen days of the date such order was issued.

8. Nothing in this section shall delay or otherwise interfere with the issuance of a temporary order of protection.


---

**Sec. 843. Rules of court.**

Rules of court shall define permissible terms and conditions of any order issued under section eight hundred forty-one, paragraphs (b), (c) and (d).

**History:** (L.1962, c. 686.)
Sec. 844. Reconsideration and modification.

For good cause shown, the family court may after hearing reconsider and modify any order issued under paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) of section eight hundred forty-one.

History: (L.1962, c. 686.)

Sec. 846. Petition; violation of court order.

Proceedings under this part shall be originated by the filing of a petition containing an allegation that the respondent has failed to obey a lawful order of this court or an order of protection issued by a court of competent jurisdiction of another state, territorial or tribal jurisdiction.

(a) Persons who may originate proceedings.

The original petitioner, or any person who may originate proceedings under section eight hundred twenty-two of this article, may originate a proceeding under this part.

(b) Issuance of summons.

(i) Upon the filing of a petition under this part, the court may cause a copy of the petition and summons to be issued requiring the respondent to show cause why respondent should not be dealt with in accordance with section eight hundred forty-six-a of this part. The summons shall include on its face, printed or typewritten in a size equal to at least eight point bold type, a notice warning the respondent that a failure to appear in court may result in immediate arrest, and that, after an appearance in court, a finding that the respondent willfully failed to obey the order may result in commitment to jail for a term not to exceed six months, for contempt of court. The notice shall also advise the respondent of the right to counsel, and the right to assigned counsel, if indigent.

(ii) Upon the filing of a petition under this part alleging a violation of a lawful order of this or any other court, as provided in this section, the court may, on its own motion, or on motion of the petitioner:

(A) hear the violation petition and take such action as is authorized under this article; or
(B) retain jurisdiction to hear and determine whether such violation constitutes contempt of court, and transfer the allegations of criminal conduct constituting such violation to the district attorney for prosecution pursuant to section eight hundred thirteen of this article; or
(C) transfer the entire proceeding to the criminal court pursuant to section eight hundred thirteen of this article.

(c) Service of summons.

Upon issuance of a summons, the provisions of section eight hundred twenty-six of this article shall apply, except that no order of commitment may be entered upon default in appearance by the respondent if service has been made pursuant to subdivision (b) of such section.

(d) Issuance of warrant.

The court may issue a warrant, directing that the respondent be arrested and brought before the court, pursuant to section eight hundred twenty-seven of this article.


---

**Sec. 846-a. Powers on failure to obey order.**

If a respondent is brought before the court for failure to obey any lawful order issued under this article or an order of protection issued by a court of competent jurisdiction of another state, territorial or tribal jurisdiction in a proceeding and if, after hearing, the court is satisfied by competent proof that the respondent has willfully failed to obey any such order, the court may modify an existing order to add reasonable conditions of behavior to the existing order of protection, make a new order of protection in accordance with section eight hundred forty-two, may order the forfeiture of bail in a manner consistent with article five hundred forty of the criminal procedure law if bail has been ordered pursuant to this act, may order the respondent to pay the petitioner’s reasonable and necessary counsel fees in connection with the violation petition where the court finds that the violation of its order was willful, and may commit the respondent to jail for a term not to exceed six months. Such commitment may be served upon certain specified days or parts of days as the court may direct, and the court may, at any time within the term of such sentence, revoke such suspension and commit the respondent for the remainder of the original sentence, or suspend the remainder of such sentence. If the court determines that the willful failure to obey such order involves violent behavior constituting the crimes of menacing, reckless endangerment, assault or attempted assault
and if such a respondent is licensed to carry, possess, repair and dispose of firearms pursuant to section 400.00 of the penal law, the court may also immediately revoke such license and may arrange for the immediate surrender and disposal of any firearm such respondent owns or possesses.

If the willful failure to obey such order involves the infliction of serious physical injury as defined in subdivision ten of section 10.00 of the penal law or the use or threatened use of a deadly weapon or dangerous instrument, as those terms are defined in subdivisions twelve and thirteen of section 10.00 of the penal law, such revocation and immediate surrender and disposal of any firearm owned or possessed by respondent shall be mandatory, pursuant to subdivision eleven of section 400.00 of the penal law.

May 1, 2007

Dear Police Chiefs and Sheriffs:

You should have received an email message from Chief Brett Van Noordt or Sheriff Roger Marcoux asking you to respond to a web-based survey pertaining to the storage of firearms relinquished by individuals subject to Relief From Abuse orders. Some individuals have not been able to connect to this website when clicking on the survey’s address http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=733603559145. You should be able to make this connection by copying and pasting the address into your web-browser. I have also included a printed copy and a return envelope so that you can respond in this way. If you have already completed the survey on line, please do not complete the mailed survey.

Your input is important. It will help the Department of Public Safety and the Vermont legislature better understand any challenges facing law enforcement in the area of firearms storage, and identify ways of improving the current system. Responses are confidential—information will be reported in aggregate form, and any quoted material will not be linked to potentially identifying information. To assure that your responses are included in the study’s findings, please complete the survey by May 25, 2007.

If you have questions, please contact the project coordinator, Dr. Marcia Bellas, at (802) 223-5158 (home); mbellas@vcjr.org, or Captain Ed Ledo, Chief Criminal Investigator, Vermont State Police, at (802) 241-5566 x5491; eledo@dps.state.vt.us. Thank you for your assistance with this research.

Sincerely,

Marcia Bellas, Ph.D.,
Research Associate
Vermont Center for Justice Research
LAW ENFORCEMENT FIREARMS STORAGE SURVEY

1. Are firearms owned by individuals subject to Relief From Abuse orders currently stored at your station or department?
   ___ No
   ___ Yes [if Yes, skip to Question 4]

2. If firearms owned by individuals subject to Relief From Abuse orders are not currently stored at your station or department, have you stored any in the past?
   ___ No [if No, skip to Question 4]
   ___ Yes

3. Please indicate why your station or department is unable or unwilling to store firearms for individuals subject to Relief From Abuse orders (check all that apply)? [skip to Question 21]
   ___ Insufficient space
   ___ Inability to maintain condition of stored firearms
   ___ Concerns about assuming liability for stored firearms
   ___ Insufficient staff time to complete accompanying paper work
   ___ Other; Specify ____________________________________

4. Of all the firearms currently stored at your station or department, approximately how many are owned by individuals subject to Relief From Abuse orders?
   ___ 0-9
   ___ 10-19
   ___ 20-29
   ___ 30-39
   ___ 40-49
   ___ 50-59

5. Approximately what percentage of all firearms currently stored at your station or department does this number represent? In other words, firearms owned by individuals subject to Relief From Abuse orders represent what percentage of all firearms currently stored at your station or department?
   ___ 0-9%
   ___ 10-19%
   ___ 20-29%
   ___ 30-39%
   ___ 40-49%
   ___ 50-59%

6. Considering all firearms currently stored at your station or department, what percentage of your available storage space is filled?
   ___ 0-9%
   ___ 10-19%
   ___ 20-29%
   ___ 30-39%
   ___ 40-49%
   ___ 50-59%
7. On average, for what length of time does your station or department store firearms for individuals who are subject to Relief From Abuse orders?

___ Less than one month ___ 6-11 months
___ 1-2 months ___ 12-17 months
___ 3-5 months ___ 18-24 months
___ More than two years

8. On average, how many firearms do individuals subject to Relief From Abuse orders relinquish?

___ 1-4 ___ 15-19
___ 5-9 ___ 20-24
___ 10-14 ___ 25 or more

9. What is the largest number of firearms relinquished to your station or department by a single individual subject to a Relief From Abuse order?

___ 1-4 ___ 30-34
___ 5-9 ___ 35-39
___ 10-14 ___ 40-44
___ 15-19 ___ 45-49
___ 20-24 ___ Other; Specify ________________
___ 25-29

10. What is your estimate of the greatest dollar value of a firearm relinquished to your station or department by an individual subject to a Relief From Abuse order?

___ Less than $100 ___ $1000-$1499
___ $100-$249 ___ $1500-$1999
___ $250-$499 ___ $2000-$2499
___ $500-$999 ___ $2500-$2999
___ Other; Specify ________________

11. Are firearms owned by individuals subject to a Relief From Abuse order stored in a climate-controlled area of your station or department?

___ Yes
___ No

12. To what extent has firearms storage at your station or department been a problem because of lack of space?

___ Storage space for firearms has not been a problem at all.
___ Storage space for firearms has been somewhat of a problem.
___ Storage space for firearms has been a major problem.

13. To what extent has firearms storage at your station or department been a problem because of an inability to maintain the condition of firearms?

___ Maintaining the condition of stored firearms has not been a problem at all.
___ Maintaining the condition of stored firearms has been somewhat of a problem.
___ Maintaining the condition of stored firearms has been a major problem.
14. To what extent have you been concerned about liability issues related to maintaining the condition of stored firearms at your station or department?

___ I have not been at all concerned about liability issues.
___ I have been somewhat concerned about liability issues.
___ I have been very concerned about liability issues.

15. To what extent has firearms storage at your station or department been a problem because of the administrative work associated with storing firearms (e.g., paperwork)?

___ The administrative work associated with storing firearms has not been a problem at all.
___ The administrative work associated with storing firearms has been somewhat of a problem.
___ The administrative work associated with storing firearms has been a major problem.

16. Overall, how satisfied are you with current storage arrangements for firearms belonging to persons subject to Relief from Abuse Orders?

___ Extremely satisfied
___ Somewhat satisfied
___ Somewhat dissatisfied
___ Extremely dissatisfied

17. Does your station or department charge a fee for storing firearms?

___ Yes
___ No

18. When Relief From Abuse orders expire and there has not been a domestic violence or a felony conviction, do owners of surrendered firearms always pick them up promptly?

___ Yes
___ No

19. Does your station or department have a policy that stipulates that firearms must be picked up within a certain length of time after Relief From Abuse orders have expired or they will be forfeited?

___ Yes
___ No

20. How does your station or department dispose of firearms when an individual is convicted of a domestic violence offense and therefore prohibited from ever possessing firearms?

___ Sold and owner receives proceeds
___ Sold and owner does not receive proceeds
___ Destroyed
___ Firearms are not returned to owner, but owner is responsible for arranging for transfer of ownership or disposal of firearms
___ Other; Specify ______________________
21. In some states, including Massachusetts, federal firearms dealers store firearms for individuals subject to Relief From Abuse orders, thereby alleviating storage, liability, and administrative concerns for police and sheriffs. To what extent would you support such an arrangement in Vermont?

___ I would not support firearms storage by federal firearms dealers.
___ I would be somewhat supportive of firearms storage by federal firearms dealers.
___ I would be highly supportive of firearms storage by federal firearms dealers.

22. To what extent would you support state funded construction of a firearms storage facility or facilities?

___ I would not support state funded construction of firearms storage facilities.
___ I would be somewhat supportive of state funded construction of firearms storage facilities.
___ I would be highly supportive of state funded construction of firearms storage facilities.

23. What area of law enforcement should oversee the operation of any storage facilities constructed by the state?

___ Department of Public Safety
___ Vermont State Police
___ Sheriffs
___ Police chiefs
___ Other; Specify ______________

24. In what part of the state is a firearms storage facility most needed? [multiple responses permitted]

___ Southern Vermont
___ Central Vermont (includes Burlington)
___ Northwestern Vermont
___ Northeastern Vermont
___ Other; Specify ______________

25. Would you support charging individuals subject to Relief From Abuse orders a fee for storing their firearms?

___ Yes
___ No

26. If you are aware of any states that have state run firearms storage facilities, please specify the state(s).

27. Please convey any additional concerns, experiences or ideas related to firearms storage.
The following questions will be used to identify response patterns only.

28. What is your current position?
   ___ Police chief
   ___ Sheriff
   ___ State police station commander
   ___ Other; Specify ___________________

29. In what area of the state is your primary work place?
   ___ Southern Vermont
   ___ Central Vermont (includes Burlington)
   ___ Northwestern Vermont
   ___ Northeastern Vermont
   ___ Other; Specify ___________________

30. How many years have you worked in policing?
   ___ 0-5
   ___ 6-10
   ___ 11-15
   ___ 16 or more

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY. If you would like a summary of the study’s findings when available, please email Dr. Marcia Bellas at mbellas@vcjr.org.
Table 1. Description of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Chief $^1$</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSP Station Commander</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Work Place:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern Vermont</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Vermont</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Vermont</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Vermont</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Policing:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Valid percentages are calculated after omitting any missing data.

$^1$ Three other officers responded for their police chiefs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Police Chiefs</th>
<th>Sheriffs</th>
<th>VSP Commanders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currently Store Firearms:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33 57.9%</td>
<td>15 50.0%</td>
<td>6 46.2%</td>
<td>8 88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24 42.1%</td>
<td>15 50.0%</td>
<td>7 53.9%</td>
<td>1 11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If No, Stored in Past:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13 59.1%</td>
<td>8 61.5%</td>
<td>4 57.1%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9 40.9%</td>
<td>5 38.5%</td>
<td>3 42.9%</td>
<td>1 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Why Do Not Store Firearms:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient space</td>
<td>9 90%</td>
<td>5 83.3%</td>
<td>2 66.7%</td>
<td>1 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to maintain condition</td>
<td>4 40%</td>
<td>2 33.3%</td>
<td>2 66.7%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns about liability</td>
<td>6 60%</td>
<td>3 50.0%</td>
<td>3 100.0%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient staff time</td>
<td>5 50%</td>
<td>3 50.0%</td>
<td>2 66.7%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 20%</td>
<td>1 16.7%</td>
<td>1 33.3%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Storage Capacity (only those that currently store RFA firearms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Number of RFA Firearms:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Police Chiefs*</th>
<th>Sheriffs*</th>
<th>VSP*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid %</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 or more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of all Firearms Stored:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Police Chiefs*</th>
<th>Sheriffs*</th>
<th>VSP*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid %</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-100%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Space Filled:</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Police Chiefs*</th>
<th>Sheriffs*</th>
<th>VSP*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid %</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-100%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Five respondents did not specify their occupational position, so numbers broken down by position may add to total number of respondents in left hand column.
## Table 4: Characteristics of RFA Firearms Stored (Current and Past Storage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Police Chiefs*</th>
<th>Sheriffs*</th>
<th>VSP*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid %</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Storage Time:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one month</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 months</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 months</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11 months</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-17 months</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 months</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than two years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Number Per Person:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Largest Number by One Person:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (75)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greatest Dollar Value:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-$249</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250-$499</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500-$999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000-$1,499</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500-$2,499</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500-$5,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Five respondents did not specify their occupational position, so numbers broken down by position may not add to total number of respondents in left hand column.
Table 5: Characteristics of Current Gun Storage Arrangements (among agencies that currently store RFA firearms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Police Chiefs*</th>
<th>Sheriffs*</th>
<th>VSP*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid %</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners Always Pick Up:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Related to Time Limit:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge Fee for Storage:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Firearms Cannot be Returned:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold &amp; Proceeds Given to Owner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold &amp; Proceeds Not Given to Owner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destroyed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Responsible for Transfer/Disposal</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not encountered this issue</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATF</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“They just sit here”</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Five respondents did not specify their occupational position, so numbers broken down by position may add to total number of respondents in left hand column.
### Table 6: Extent to Which Firearms Storage a Problem (currently store RFA firearms or have in past)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Police Chiefs*</th>
<th>Sheriffs*</th>
<th>VSP*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of Space:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a problem at all</td>
<td>9 (20.5%)</td>
<td>5 (21.7%)</td>
<td>2 (20.0%)</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat of a problem</td>
<td>19 (43.2%)</td>
<td>9 (39.1%)</td>
<td>5 (50.0%)</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major problem</td>
<td>16 (36.4%)</td>
<td>9 (39.1%)</td>
<td>3 (30.0%)</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inability to Maintain Condition:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a problem at all</td>
<td>7 (16.3%)</td>
<td>5 (22.7%)</td>
<td>1 (10.0%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat of a problem</td>
<td>22 (51.2%)</td>
<td>8 (36.4%)</td>
<td>8 (80.0%)</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major problem</td>
<td>14 (32.6%)</td>
<td>9 (40.9%)</td>
<td>1 (10.0%)</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concerns About Liability:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not concerned at all</td>
<td>8 (19.5%)</td>
<td>5 (21.7%)</td>
<td>2 (20.0%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat concerned</td>
<td>13 (31.7%)</td>
<td>6 (26.1%)</td>
<td>5 (50.0%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very concerned</td>
<td>20 (48.8%)</td>
<td>12 (52.2%)</td>
<td>3 (30.0%)</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Administrative Work:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a problem at all</td>
<td>15 (34.1%)</td>
<td>8 (34.8%)</td>
<td>6 (60.0%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat of a problem</td>
<td>25 (56.8%)</td>
<td>13 (56.5%)</td>
<td>4 (40.0%)</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major problem</td>
<td>4 (9.1%)</td>
<td>2 (8.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Level of Satisfaction:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>1 (2.3%)</td>
<td>1 (4.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>14 (31.8%)</td>
<td>6 (26.1%)</td>
<td>6 (60.0%)</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>13 (29.6%)</td>
<td>6 (26.1%)</td>
<td>2 (20.0%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely dissatisfied</td>
<td>16 (36.4%)</td>
<td>10 (43.5%)</td>
<td>2 (20.0%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Five respondents did not specify their occupational position, so numbers broken down by position may not add to total number of respondents in left hand column.
Table 7. Improving Firearms Storage Arrangements (all respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Police Chiefs*</th>
<th>Sheriffs*</th>
<th>VSP*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid %</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Support Storage by FFLs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not support</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat supportive</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly supportive</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would Support State Construction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not support</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat supportive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly supportive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Charging Fee for Storage:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Law Enforcement to Oversee:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Public Safety</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont State Police</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriffs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Chiefs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS and VSP</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney General's Office</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFLs/private group</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation and Parole</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vt. Buildings and General Services</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Facility Most Needed in (multiple responses permitted):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Vermont</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Vermont (includes Burlington)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Vermont</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Vermont</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each quadrant</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each county</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each VSP troop</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All areas</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 North/1 South</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East/west in Southern Vermont</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near court houses</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFLs throughout state</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Five respondents did not specify their occupational position, so numbers broken down by position may not add to total number of respondents in left hand column.
May 3, 2007

Dear Federal Firearms Licensee:

The Vermont Department of Public Safety has contracted with the Vermont Center for Justice Research to conduct a feasibility study pertaining to the storage of firearms belonging to persons subject to Relief From Abuse orders. These individuals may not possess firearms while Relief From Abuse orders are in effect, and are often ordered by the courts to relinquish them to local and state police stations or to sheriffs departments for storage. Police stations and sheriffs’ departments often do not have adequate space or appropriate climate controlled facilities to store these firearms. Consequently, we are examining alternative arrangements, including private storage options.

I am writing to ask you to complete the enclosed survey, which is designed to determine the level of interest among Federal Firearms Licensees in exploring the possibility of private storage of relinquished firearms, as is commonly done in Massachusetts. Responses to this preliminary survey do not in any way indicate an obligation on the part of any Federal Firearms Licensee who expresses interest in the possibility of such an arrangement, or an obligation on the part of the State of Vermont, to establish such an arrangement. At this stage, we are simply trying to determine whether private storage is an option.

Please take a few minutes to complete this brief survey and return it in the enclosed stamped envelope. To assure that your responses are included in the study’s findings, please complete the survey by May 31, 2007.

Responses are confidential—information will be reported in aggregate form, and any quoted material will not be linked to potentially identifying information. Should the State decide to explore the option of private firearms storage and you have expressed an interest in this possibility and have included your name on the survey, you may be contacted in the future.

Please direct any questions to the project coordinators, Dr. Marcia Bellas, at mbellas@vcjr.org, or Captain Ed Ledo, Chief Criminal Investigator, Vermont State Police, at eledo@dps.state.vt.us. Thank you for your assistance with this research.

Sincerely,

Marcia L. Bellas, Ph.D. Captain Ed Ledo
Research Associate Chief Criminal Investigator
Vermont Center for Justice Research Vermont State Police
1. Do you have any interest in exploring the possibility of storing firearms relinquished by individuals subject to Relief From Abuse orders?

___ Yes
___ No

IF NO, YOU NEEDN’T COMPLETE THE REST OF THE SURVEY, BUT PLEASE RETURN IT IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE. THANK YOU!

2. Do you operate your business from a residence or a commercial storefront?

___ Residence
___ Commercial storefront
___ Other; specify ________________

3. What best describes the physical location of your business?

___ Located along a road, but no other businesses or residences are nearby
___ Located among a cluster of businesses or residences along a road, but not within a village or town
___ Located within a village or small town
___ Located within a large town or city

4. Do you currently have a designated firearms storage area?

___ Yes
___ No [SKIP TO QUESTION 9]

5. What is the approximate square footage of your firearms storage area?

6. What is the approximate number of additional firearms that you could store in your current storage area, assuming that each additional firearm would be individually boxed and labeled?

7. Which of the following types of climate control mechanisms does your firearms storage area currently have (check all that apply)?

___ Heat
___ Air conditioning
___ Humidifier
___ Dehumidifier
___ Other; Specify _______________________________
8. Which of the following security measures does your firearms storage area currently have (check all that apply)?
   
   [ ] Deadbolt(s)
   [ ] Iron bars on windows
   [ ] Reinforced door(s)
   [ ] Motion detector
   [ ] Surveillance camera
   [ ] Electronic alarm system without connection to security company or police station
   [ ] Electronic alarm system with connection to security company or police station
   [ ] Security guard
   [ ] Other; Specify: __________________________

9. Are you bonded?
   
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No

10. In Massachusetts, firearms belonging to persons subject to Relief From Abuse orders are often stored at Federal Firearms Licensees (FFLs). FFLs carry out the administrative work associated with firearms storage, charge firearms owners an administrative and storage fee (the state does not pay FFLs), and follow state statutes regarding the return or forfeiture of firearms. To what extent would you be interested in adapting your current facility or building a new facility to meet the space, security and climate control specifications that would be required to store firearms for person subject to Relief From Abuse orders?
   
   [ ] very interested
   [ ] somewhat interested
   [ ] possibly interested, but not sure
   [ ] probably not interested, but not sure
   [ ] definitely not interested

11. Please convey any thoughts or ideas that you have related to firearms storage (use additional sheets if needed).

Contact information (optional) will be used to contact you if the State of Vermont wishes to explore private storage options and you are also interested. If you prefer, you may send your name and address separately from your completed survey.

Name: ______________________________
Address: ____________________________
                                    ____________________________
                                    ____________________________
Phone:    ____________________________

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY!
Armag Corporation manufactures totally self-contained arms vaults for use by US Military and government agencies. Armag arms vaults are quick, cost effective, approved and versatile. The arms can be sized and configured to your specific needs. Standard units just need to be offloaded, set in place, power and optional alarms hooked up, and unit is ready to use. Hundreds are in place and being used both domestically and overseas.

- Construction is based on Type 2 portable magazine design. Exterior wall is \( \frac{3}{4} \)" steel lined with insulation, two overlapping one inch layers of military grade hardwood, and finished with painted plywood and commercial grade tile floors.
- Design tested and approved by a certified DOD lab for forced entry and bullet resistance for explosives storage magazines. Portable armories (manufactured by Armag for Crane NSWC) are approved for the storage of Category II through IV arms by DoD 5100.76M, OPNAVINST 5530.13C, and AR 190-11.
- Sizes range from 8’ x 8’ x 8’ up to 44’ x 27’ x 10’. (Units over 15’ in width are shipped in two pieces for transportation purposes and bolted together on site, typical installation takes 4 – 6 hours.) Heights are usually 8’ and 10’, 10’ units allow you to double stack weapons racks for more efficient use of square footage.
- Armories are nicely appointed being fully wired and plumbed, interior and exterior lights, heating and cooling, painted and ready to use. Many options are available including additional doors, divider walls, IDS to match the post installed, weapons racks, work benches, storage cabinets, LAN and phone lines, supplemental dehumidifiers, and others.
- Easy acquisition because Armag armories are available exclusively through government to government transaction.

Further Details -

Available Exclusively through Government to Government Transaction

Armag manufactures arms vaults on an IDIQ contract exclusively for Crane NSWC to a specification designed by their government security engineers. Crane NSWC then distributes the armories throughout government activities by a government to government transaction. US government and military agencies are able to price and configure the arms vaults as needed through Crane NSWC. By going through Crane NSWC government activities can benefit from the discounts of existing contracts. The government then has only to provide the appropriate funding document such as a MIPR (Military Interagency Procurement Requisition) and purchase the armories at predetermined prices.
Armag Arms Vaults

- Optional equipment including IDS to match installations installed by government security technicians.

**Standard Equipment**

Heating and Air Conditioning
Wired and Plumbed (230V, Single Phase Std.) ½" conduit for electrical, ¾" for IDS
Security Door with NAPEC High Security Hasp
Steel Dutch Door with Issue Port
Exterior and Interior Lights, Electrical Receptacles, Emergency shut-off switch
Main Shunt Trip Disconnect 100 amp, exterior
Weatherproof Junction Box for IDS Entry
Aluminum Phone Box
Ground Rods and Brackets
Lifting Hooks
Painted Exterior, Walls, Ceiling
Commercial Grade Tile Floor

**Optional Equipment Installed**

Double Doors, Additional Single Doors, Door Relocation
Divider Walls – Standard, High Security, Expanded Metal (Separate Compartments)
IDS Systems to match Base System (Installed by government security technicians)
Customized Weapons Racks
Work Benches
Storage Cabinets
Supplemental Dehumidifiers
Standard 60hz, Foreign 50hz, Dual Electrical Power
Restrooms, Showers
LAN, Phone Lines
Parts Cleaners
Weather shields, anchor brackets, casters, jack blocks, etc.

Arms Vaults are customized to your specific needs, if you have requirements out of the ordinary please ask and we will see if we can accommodate your needs.

**Weapons Racks**

Available through Crane NSWC, lockable weapons cabinets can store a variety of weapons and can be reconfigured easily for different types of weapons by changing removable plastic inserts. Crane’s weapons cabinets store 50 – 100% more weapons in the same space than traditional racks. Specialty cabinets for longer weapons such as sniper rifles, Barrett 50 cal, Gau-16 & 17 are available.
Armag Arms Vaults

If you provide your weapons allotment, Crane NSWC can recommend a size and weapons rack configuration to suit your needs.

Placements and References

Armag arms vaults can be used either outdoors or indoors as temporary or permanent secure weapons storage. The armories can be easily moved with no loss of structural integrity. Their versatility has led to various uses as comm-sec huts, weapons repair facilities, weapons cleaning rooms, hardened fighting positions, billets, offices and other uses.

As previously stated, we have hundreds of arms vaults on order and in place both domestically and overseas. The best references we have are the repeat customers who have come back for additional units. A partial list of about 9 pages is available if desired and units have been placed with all branches of the military – USAR, ARNG, ANG, USA, USN, USAF, USMC, USCG, NSA, DOE, and Secret Service. We will be glad to provide more detail.

Armag Corporation

www.armagcorp.com
800-443-9994
(502) 348-3987
Bardstown, Kentucky