Journal of the House

Friday, March 27, 2015

At nine o'clock and thirty minutes in the forenoon the Speaker called the House to order.

Devotional Exercises

Devotional exercises were conducted by Alex Aldrich, Executive Director, Vermont Arts Council, Montpelier, Vt.

Memorial Service

The Speaker placed before the House the following name of member of past sessions of the Vermont General Assembly who had passed away recently:

F. Ray Keyser, Jr. Sessions of 1955, 1959, Speaker
Member from Chelsea 1959, Governor 1961-1962

Thereupon, the members of the House rose for a moment of prayer in memory of the deceased member. The Clerk was thereupon directed to send a copy of the House Journal to the bereaved family.

House Bills Introduced

House bills of the following titles were severally introduced, read the first time and referred to committee or placed on the Calendar as follows:

H. 493

By Reps. Quimby of Concord, Batchelor of Derby, Eastman of Orwell, Higley of Lowell, Lefebvre of Newark, Murphy of Fairfax, Sibilia of Dover, Strong of Albany and Young of Glover,

House bill, entitled
An act relating to solid waste management;
To the committee on Natural Resources & Energy.

H. 494

By Rep. Smith of New Haven,

House bill, entitled
An act relating to approval of the adoption and codification of the charter of the Town of Weybridge;
To the committee on Government Operations.
Senate Bill Referred

S. 60

Senate bill, entitled
An act relating to payment for medical examinations for victims of sexual assault

Was read and referred to the committee on Human Services.

Joint Resolution Referred to Committee

J.R.H. 12

Joint resolution supporting the Vermont citizens who filed the federal lawsuit related to the basing of F-35A military jets at the Burlington International Airport and the majority of the voters of the city of Winooski who voted on March 3, 2015 for the city to join the lawsuit

Offered by: Representatives Bissonnette of Winooski and Gonzalez of Winooski

Whereas, the U.S. Air Force’s decision to base F-35A military jets at Burlington International Airport (BTV), as a successor to the currently-based F-16 military jets, raises serious environmental and health issues, and

Whereas, half of Winooski, including all of the downtown area would be located in either the 65 decibel day-night average sound level contour zone, which is described as “generally not considered suitable for residential use,” or the crash zone area at the end of runways, and

Whereas, in September 2013, the U.S. Air Force distributed the final version of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) it drafted in preparation for a decision on where to base F-35A military jets, and

Whereas, in December 2013, the U.S. Air Force announced that BTV was selected as an F-35A basing site, and

Whereas, on June 30, 2014, seven residents of either South Burlington or Winooski and the Stop the F-35 Coalition filed a federal lawsuit (Civil Action No. 514-cv-132) against U.S. Air Force Secretary Deborah Lee James, seeking to set aside the BTV basing decision and requiring the preparation of a new and more thorough EIS that meets all of the NEPA requirements, and

Whereas, on March 3, 2015, the Winooski electorate, on a 627–408 majority vote, approved an advisory article on the city’s joining the lawsuit, now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives:
That the General Assembly supports the Vermont citizens who filed the federal law suit concerning the basing of F-35A military jets at the Burlington International Airport and the majority of the voters of the city of Winooski who voted on March 3, 2015, for the city to join the lawsuit, and be it further

Resolved: That the Secretary of State be directed to send a copy of this resolution to the Winooski City Clerk.

Which was read and, in the Speaker’s discretion, treated as a bill and referred to the committee on General, Housing & Military Affairs.

Proposal of Amendment Agreed to; Third Reading Ordered

S. 98

Rep. Kitzmiller of Montpelier, for the committee on Commerce & Economic Development, to which had been referred Senate bill, entitled

An act relating to captive insurance companies

Reported in favor of its passage in concurrence with proposal of amendment as follows:

First: In Sec. 2, 8 V.S.A. § 6004, subsection (c), after the first sentence, by inserting the following: “The Commissioner shall issue a bulletin defining “marketable securities” for the purpose of this subsection.”

Second: By adding Sec. 6 to read as follows:

Sec. 6. 8 V.S.A. § 6036(d) is amended to read:

(d) A participant shall insure only its own risks through a sponsored captive insurance company not insure any risks other than its own and the risks of affiliated entities or of controlled unaffiliated entities.

Third: By striking out Sec. 8 in its entirety and by inserting in lieu thereof a new Sec. 8 (to be renumbered as Sec. 9) to read as follows:

Sec. 9. 8 V.S.A. § 6052(g) is added to read:

(g) This subsection establishes governance standards for a risk retention group.

(1) As used in this subsection:

(A) “Board of directors” or “board” means the governing body of a risk retention group elected by risk retention group members to establish policy, elect or appoint officers and committees, and make other governing decisions.
(B) "Director" means a natural person designated in the articles of the risk retention group or designated, elected, or appointed by any other manner, name, or title to act as a director.

(C) "Independent director" means a director who does not have a material relationship with the risk retention group. A person that is a direct or indirect owner of or subscriber in the risk retention group – or is an officer, director, or employee of such an owner and insured, unless some other position of such officer, director, or employee constitutes a “material relationship” – as contemplated under subdivision 3901(a)(4)(E)(ii) of the federal Liability Risk Retention Act, is considered to be “independent.” A director has a material relationship with a risk retention group if he or she, or a member of his or her immediate family:

(i) In any 12-month period, receives from the risk retention group, or from a consultant or service provider to the risk retention group, compensation or other item of value in an amount equal to or greater than five percent of the risk retention group’s gross written premium or two percent of the risk retention group’s surplus, as measured at the end of any fiscal quarter falling in such 12-month period, whichever is greater. This provision also applies to compensation or items of value received by any business with which the director is affiliated. Such material relationship shall continue for one year after the item of value is received or the compensation ceases or falls below the threshold established in this subdivision, as applicable.

(ii) Has a relationship with an auditor as follows: Is affiliated with or employed in a professional capacity by a current or former internal or external auditor of the risk retention group. Such material relationship shall continue for one year after the affiliation or employment ends.

(iii) Has a relationship with a related entity as follows: Is employed as an executive officer of another company whose board of directors includes executive officers of the risk retention group, unless a majority of the membership of such other company’s board of directors is the same as the membership of the board of directors of the risk retention group. Such material relationship shall continue until the employment or service ends.

(D) “Material service provider” includes a captive manager, auditor, accountant, actuary, investment advisor, attorney, managing general underwriter, or other person responsible for underwriting, determination of rates, premium collection, claims adjustment or settlement, or preparation of financial statements, whose aggregate annual contract fees are equal to or greater than five percent of the risk retention group’s annual gross written premium or two percent of its surplus, whichever is greater. It does not mean defense counsel retained by a risk retention group, unless his or her annual fees
are equal to or greater than five percent of a risk retention group’s annual gross premium or two percent of its surplus, whichever is greater.

(2) The board of directors shall determine whether a director is independent; review such determinations annually; and maintain a record of the determinations, which shall be provided to the Commissioner promptly, upon request. The board shall have a majority of independent directors. If the risk retention group is reciprocal, then the attorney-in-fact is required to adhere to the same standards regarding independence as imposed on the risk retention group’s board of directors.

(3) The term of any material service provider contract entered into with a risk retention group shall not exceed five years. The contract, or its renewal, requires approval of a majority of the risk retention group’s independent directors. The board of directors has the right to terminate a contract at any time for cause after providing adequate notice, as defined in the terms of the contract.

(4) A risk retention group shall not enter into a material service provider contract without the prior written approval of the Commissioner.

(5) A risk retention group’s plan of operation shall include written policies approved by its board of directors requiring the board to:

(A) provide evidence of ownership interest to each risk retention group member;

(B) develop governance standards applicable to the risk retention group;

(C) oversee the evaluation of the risk retention group’s management, including the performance of its captive manager, managing general underwriter, or other person or persons responsible for underwriting, rate determination, premium collection, claims adjustment and settlement, or preparation of financial statements;

(D) review and approve the amount to be paid under a material service provider contract; and

(E) at least annually, review and approve:

(i) the risk retention group’s goals and objectives relevant to the compensation of officers and service providers;

(ii) the performance of officers and service providers as measured against the risk retention group’s goals and objectives;

(iii) the continued engagement of officers and material service providers.
(6) A risk retention group shall have an audit committee composed of at least three independent board members. A nonindependent board member may participate in the committee’s activities, if invited to do so by the audit committee, but he or she shall not serve as a committee member. The Commissioner may waive the requirement of an audit committee if the risk retention group demonstrates to the Commissioner’s satisfaction that having such committee is impracticable and the board of directors is able to perform sufficiently the committee’s responsibilities. The audit committee shall have a written charter defining its responsibilities, which shall include:

(A) assisting board oversight of the integrity of financial statements, compliance with legal and regulatory requirements, and qualifications, independence, and performance of the independent auditor or actuary;

(B) reviewing annual and quarterly audited financial statements with management;

(C) reviewing annual audited financial statements with its independent auditor and, if it deems advisable, the risk retention group’s quarterly financial statements as well;

(D) reviewing risk assessment and risk management policies;

(E) meeting with management, either directly or through a designated representative of the committee;

(F) meeting with independent auditors, either directly or through a designated representative of the committee;

(G) reviewing with the independent auditor any audit problems and management’s response;

(H) establishing clear hiring policies applicable to the hiring of employees or former employees of the independent auditor by the risk retention group;

(I) requiring the independent auditor to rotate the lead audit partner having primary responsibility for the risk retention group’s audit, as well as the audit partner responsible for reviewing that audit, so that neither individual performs audit services for the risk retention group for more than five consecutive fiscal years; and

(J) reporting regularly to the board of directors.

(7) The board of directors shall adopt governance standards, which shall be available to risk retention group members through electronic or other means, and provided to risk retention group members, upon request. The governance standards shall include:
(A) a process by which risk retention group members elect directors.
(B) director qualifications, responsibilities, and compensation;
(C) director orientation and continuing education requirements;
(D) a process allowing the board access to management and, as
necessary and appropriate, independent advisors;
(E) policies and procedures for management succession; and
(F) policies and procedures providing for an annual performance
evaluation of the board.

(8) The board of directors shall adopt a code of business conduct and
ethics applicable to directors, officers, and employees of the risk retention
group and criteria for waivers of code provisions, which shall be available to
risk retention group members through electronic or other means, and provided
to risk retention group members, upon request. Provisions of the code shall
address:

(A) conflicts of interest;
(B) matters covered under the Vermont corporate opportunities
document;
(C) confidentiality;
(D) fair dealing;
(E) protection and proper use of risk retention group assets;
(F) standards for complying with applicable laws, rules, and
regulations; and

(G) mandatory reporting of illegal or unethical behavior affecting
operation of the risk retention group.

(9) The president or chief executive officer of a risk retention group
shall promptly notify the Commissioner in writing of any known material
noncompliance with the governance standards established in this subsection.

Fourth: By striking out Sec. 9 (effective date) in its entirety and by
inserting in lieu thereof a new Sec. 9 (renumbered as Sec. 10) to read as
follows:

Sec. 10. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICATION

This act shall take effect on passage. Sec. 9 (governance standards
applicable to risk retention groups) shall apply to risk retention groups first
licensed on or after the effective date of this act, and shall apply to all other
risk retention groups one year after the effective date of this act.
and by renumbering the remaining sections to be numerically correct.

and that after passage the title of the bill be amended to read: “An act relating to captive insurance companies and risk retention groups”

The bill, having appeared on the Calendar one day for notice, was taken up, read the second time and the recommendation of proposal of amendment agreed to and third reading ordered.

Consideration Interrupted by Recess

H. 489

House bill, entitled

An act relating to revenue

Was taken up and pending third reading of the bill, Rep. Dame of Essex moved to amend the bill as follows:

In Sec. 1, in § 5811(21)(A)(iii), before the words “the amount”, by inserting the following: “for taxpayers with federal adjusted income over $59,336.00,”, and in (21)(A)(iv), before the words “the amount” by inserting the following: “for taxpayers with federal adjusted income over $59,336.00.”

Recess

At ten o'clock and twenty-three minutes in the forenoon, the Speaker declared a recess until the fall of the gavel.

At one o'clock in the afternoon, the Speaker called the House to order.

Consideration Resumed; Read Third Time and Passed

H. 489

Consideration resumed on House bill, entitled

An act relating to revenue

Pending the question, Shall the bill be amended, as recommended by Rep. Dame of Essex? Rep. Wright of Burlington moved to amend the recommendation of amendment offered by Rep. Dame of Essex as follows:

By striking out $59,336.00 where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof $90,000.00

Pending the question, Shall the amendment proposed by Rep. Dame of Essex be amended as proposed by Rep. Wright of Burlington et. al.? Rep. Savage of Swanton demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk proceeded to call the roll and the question, Shall the amendment proposed by Rep. Dame of Essex be
amended as proposed by Rep. Wright of Burlington et. al.? was decided in the negative. Yeas, 41. Nays, 99.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

- Bancroft of Westford
- Batchelor of Derby
- Beyor of Highgate
- Brennan of Colchester
- Burditt of West Rutland
- Cupoli of Rutland City
- Dame of Essex
- Devereux of Mount Holly
- Dickinson of St. Albans Town
- Donahue of Northfield
- Fiske of Enosburgh
- Gage of Rutland City
- Gamache of Swanton
- Graham of Williamstown
- Hebert of Vernon
- Higley of Lowell
- Hubert of Milton
- LaClair of Barre Town
- Lefebvre of Newark
- Lewis of Berlin
- Marcotte of Coventry
- Martel of Waterford
- McFaun of Barre Town
- Morrissey of Bennington
- Myers of Essex
- Parent of St. Albans City
- Poirier of Barre City
- Purvis of Colchester
- Quimby of Concord
- Savage of Swanton
- Scheuermann of Stowe
- Shaw of Pittsford
- Smith of New Haven
- Strong of Albany
- Tate of Mendon
- Terenzini of Rutland Town
- Turner of Milton
- Van Wyck of Ferrisburgh
- Viens of Newport City
- Willhoit of St. Johnsbury
- Wright of Burlington

Those who voted in the negative are:

- Ancel of Calais
- Bartholomew of Hartland
- Beck of St. Johnsbury
- Berry of Manchester
- Bissonnette of Winooski
- Botzow of Pownal
- Branagan of Georgia
- Briglin of Thetford
- Browning of Arlington
- Burke of Brattleboro
- Buxton of Tunbridge
- Canfield of Fair Haven
- Carr of Brandon
- Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs
- Christie of Hartford
- Clarkson of Woodstock
- Cole of Burlington
- Condon of Colchester
- Connor of Fairfield
- Conquest of Newbury
- Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford
- Corcoran of Bennington
- Dakin of Chester
- Dakin of Colchester
- Davis of Washington
- Deen of Westminster
- Eastman of Orwell
- Ellis of Waterbury
- Emmons of Springfield
- Fagan of Rutland City
- Felts of Lyndon
- Forguites of Springfield
- Frank of Underhill
- French of Randolph
- Gonzalez of Winooski
- Grad of Moretown
- Greshin of Warren
- Haas of Rochester
- Head of South Burlington
- Helm of Fair Haven
- Hooper of Montpelier
- Huntley of Cavendish
- Jerman of Essex
- Jewett of Ripton
- Johnson of South Hero
- Juskiewicz of Cambridge
- Keenan of St. Albans City
- Kitzmiller of Montpelier
- Klein of East Montpelier
- Krebs of South Hero
- Krowinski of Burlington
- Lalonde of South Burlington
- Lanpher of Vergennes
- Lawrence of Lyndon
- Lenes of Shelburne
- Lippert of Hinesburg
- Long of Newfane
- Lucke of Hartford
- Macag of Williston
- Manwaring of Wilmington
- Martin of Wolcott
- Masland of Thetford
- McCormack of Burlington
- McCullough of Williston
- Miller of Shaftsbury
- Mrowicki of Putney
- Murphy of Fairfax
- Nuovo of Middlebury
- Olsen of Londonderry
- O'Sullivan of Burlington
- Partridge of Windham
- Patt of Worcester
- Pearce of Richford
- Pearson of Burlington
- Potter of Clarendon
- Pugh of South Burlington
- Rachelson of Burlington
- Russell of Rutland City
- Ryerson of Randolph
- Sharpe of Bristol
- Sheldon of Middlebury
- Sibilia of Dover
- Stevens of Waterbury
- Stuart of Brattleboro
Rep. Wright of Burlington explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

This provision in the underlying bill raises 33 million dollars in new revenue. The amendment would have returned 5.9 million of tax increase to middle class Vermonters, and would have decreased the tax increase.”

Pending the question, Shall the bill be amended as recommended by Rep. Dame of Essex? Rep. Dame of Essex demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk proceeded to call the roll and the question, Shall the bill be amended as recommended by Rep. Dame of Essex? was decided in the negative. Yeas, 43. Nays, 98.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Bancroft of Westford
Batchelor of Derby
Beyor of Highgate
Brennan of Colchester
Browning of Arlington
Burditt of West Rutland
Canfield of Fair Haven
Dame of Essex *
Devereux of Mount Holly
Dickinson of St. Albans Town
Donahue of Northfield
Fiske of Enosburgh
Gage of Rutland City
Gamache of Swanton
Graham of Williamstown
Hebert of Vernon
Higley of Lowell
Hubert of Milton
LaClair of Barre Town
Lawrence of Lyndon
Lefebvre of Newark
Lewis of Berlin
Marcotte of Coventry
Martel of Waterford
McFaun of Barre Town
Morrissey of Bennington
Myers of Essex
Parent of St. Albans City
Purvis of Colchester
Quimby of Concord
Savage of Swanton
Scheuermann of Stowe
Shaw of Pittsford
Shaw of Derby
Smith of New Haven
Strong of Albany
Tate of Mendon
Terenzini of Rutland Town
Turner of Milton
Van Wyck of Ferrisburgh
Viens of Newport City
Willhoit of St. Johnsbury *
Wright of Burlington

Those who voted in the negative are:

Ancel of Calais
Bartholomew of Hartland
Beck of St. Johnsbury
Berry of Manchester
Bissonnette of Winooski
Botzow of Pownal
Branagan of Georgia
Briglin of Thetford
Burke of Brattleboro
Buxton of Tunbridge
Carr of Brandon
Chesnut-Tangerman of
Middletown Springs
Christie of Hartford
Clarkson of Woodstock
Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:

Baser of Bristol  Komline of Dorset  Poirier of Barre City
Donovan of Burlington  McCoy of Poultney  Ram of Burlington
Evans of Essex  O’Brien of Richmond

**Rep. Dame of Essex** explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

"I guess that helping the poor only matters when we talk about state-run spending programs, but not when it comes to allowing some of the poorest Vermonters keep what they have rightfully earned.”

**Rep. Willhoit of St. Johnsbury** explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

I voted for this amendment because I, like many Vermonters, grew up in poverty. Taxing our working poor further is not the formula for financial sustainability. We must control spending.”
Pending third reading of the bill, **Rep. Willhoit of St. Johnsbury** moved to amend the bill as follows:

In Sec. 1, 32 V.S.A. § 5811(21) (itemized deductions), in subdivision (A)(iv), after “other than State and local income taxes,” by inserting “and other than charitable contributions.”

Pending the question, Shall the bill be amended as recommended by Rep. Willhoit of St. Johnsbury? **Rep. Savage of Swanton** demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk proceeded to call the roll and the question, Shall the bill be amended as recommended by Rep. Willhoit of St. Johnsbury? was decided in the negative. Yeas, 46. Nays, 95.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bancroft of Westford</th>
<th>Graham of Williamstown</th>
<th>Purvis of Colchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Batchelor of Derby</td>
<td>Hebert of Vernon</td>
<td>Quimby of Concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck of St. Johnsbury</td>
<td>Higley of Lowell</td>
<td>Savage of Swanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyor of Highgate</td>
<td>Juskiewicz of Cambridge</td>
<td>Scheuermann of Stowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brennan of Colchester</td>
<td>LaClair of Barre Town</td>
<td>Shaw of Pittsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burditt of West Rutland</td>
<td>Lefebvre of Newark</td>
<td>Shaw of Derby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupoli of Rutland City</td>
<td>Lewis of Berlin</td>
<td>Smith of New Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dame of Essex</td>
<td>Lucke of Hartford</td>
<td>Strong of Albany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devereux of Mount Holly</td>
<td>Marcotte of Coventry</td>
<td>Tate of Mendon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson of St. Albans</td>
<td>Martel of Waterford</td>
<td>Terenzini of Rutland Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>McFaun of Barre Town</td>
<td>Turner of Milton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donahue of Northfield</td>
<td>Morrissey of Bennington</td>
<td>Van Wyck of Ferrisburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fagan of Rutland City</td>
<td>Murphy of Fairfax</td>
<td>Viens of Newport City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiske of Enosburgh</td>
<td>Parent of St. Albans City</td>
<td>Willhoit of St. Johnsbury *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage of Rutland City</td>
<td>Pearce of Richford</td>
<td>Wright of Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamache of Swanton</td>
<td>Poirier of Barre City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who voted in the negative are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ancel of Calais</th>
<th>Cole of Burlington</th>
<th>Forguites of Springfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew of Hartland</td>
<td>Condon of Colchester</td>
<td>Frank of Underhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry of Manchester</td>
<td>Connor of Fairfield</td>
<td>French of Randolph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bissonnette of Winooski</td>
<td>Conquest of Newbury</td>
<td>Gonzalez of Winooski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botzow of Pownal</td>
<td>Copeland-Hanzas of</td>
<td>Grad of Moretown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branagan of Georgia</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>Greshin of Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briglin of Thetford</td>
<td>Corcoran of Bennington</td>
<td>Haas of Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning of Arlington</td>
<td>Dakin of Chester</td>
<td>Head of South Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke of Brattleboro</td>
<td>Dakin of Colchester</td>
<td>Helm of Fair Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buxton of Tunbridge</td>
<td>Davis of Washington</td>
<td>Hooper of Montpelier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfield of Fair Haven</td>
<td>Deen of Westminster</td>
<td>Hubert of Milton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr of Brandon</td>
<td>Eastman of Orwell</td>
<td>Huntley of Cavendish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesnut-Tangerman of</td>
<td>Ellis of Waterbury</td>
<td>Jerman of Essex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Springs</td>
<td>Emmons of Springfield</td>
<td>Jewett of Ripton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie of Hartford</td>
<td>Feltus of Lyndon</td>
<td>Johnson of South Hero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkson of Woodstock</td>
<td>Fields of Bennington</td>
<td>Keenan of St. Albans City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rep. Willhoit of St. Johnsbury explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

I voted yes because, like fellow members of this body, I support the amazing work that VT non-profits do on the behalf of Vermonters. As we ask them to become more self-sufficient, however, we must not impact the gifts they need to survive.”

Thereupon, the bill was read the third time.

Pending the question, Shall the bill pass? Rep. Turner of Milton demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk proceeded to call the roll and the question, Shall the bill pass? was decided in the affirmative. Yeas, 90. Nays, 53.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Ancel of Calais *  Carr of Brandon  Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford
Bartholomew of Hartland  Chesnutt-Tangeman of Bennington  Corcoran of Bennington
Berry of Manchester  Middletown Springs  Dakin of Chester
Bissonnette of Winooksi  Christie of Hartford  Deen of Westminster
Botzow of Pownal  Clarkson of Woodstock  Dakin of Colchester
Branagan of Georgia  Cole of Burlington  Deen of Westminster
Briglin of Thetford  Condon of Colchester  Ellis of Waterbury
Burke of Brattleboro  Connor of Fairfield  Emmons of Springfield
Buxton of Tunbridge  Conquest of Newbury  Fagan of Rutland City
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feltus of Lyndon</th>
<th>Lenes of Shelburne</th>
<th>Rachelson of Burlington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fields of Bennington</td>
<td>Lippert of Hinesburg</td>
<td>Russell of Rutland City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forguites of Springfield</td>
<td>Long of Newfane</td>
<td>Ryerson of Randolph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank of Underhill</td>
<td>Lucke of Hartford</td>
<td>Sharpe of Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French of Randolph</td>
<td>Macaig of Williston</td>
<td>Sheldon of Middlebury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzalez of Winooski</td>
<td>Manwaring of Williston</td>
<td>Sibilia of Dover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad of Moretown</td>
<td>Martin of Wolcott</td>
<td>Stevens of Waterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haas of Rochester</td>
<td>Masland of Thetford</td>
<td>Stuart of Brattleboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of South Burlington</td>
<td>McCormack of Burlington</td>
<td>Sullivan of Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helm of Fair Haven</td>
<td>McCullough of Williston</td>
<td>Sweaney of Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooper of Montpelier</td>
<td>Miller of Shaftsbury</td>
<td>Till of Jericho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntley of Cavendish</td>
<td>Morris of Bennington</td>
<td>Toleno of Brattleboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerman of Essex</td>
<td>Mrowicki of Putney</td>
<td>Toll of Danville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewett of Ripton</td>
<td>Murphy of Fairfax</td>
<td>Townsend of South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson of South Hero</td>
<td>Nuovo of Middlebury</td>
<td>Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keenan of St. Albans City</td>
<td>O'Brien of Richmond</td>
<td>Tiber of Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitzmiller of Montpelier</td>
<td>Olsen of Londonderry</td>
<td>Troiano of Stannard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klein of East Montpelier</td>
<td>O'Sullivan of Burlington</td>
<td>Walz of Barre City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krebs of South Hero</td>
<td>Partridge of Windham</td>
<td>Webb of Shelburne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krowinski of Burlington</td>
<td>Patt of Worcester</td>
<td>Yantachka of Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalonde of South Burlington</td>
<td>Potter of Clarendon</td>
<td>Young of Glover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanpher of Vergennes</td>
<td>Pugh of South Burlington</td>
<td>Zagar of Barnard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who voted in the negative are:

- Bancroft of Westford
- Batchelor of Derby
- Beck of St. Johnsbury
- Beyor of Highgate
- Brennan of Colchester
- Browning of Arlington
- Burditt of West Rutland
- Canfield of Fair Haven
- Cupoli of Rutland City
- Dame of Essex
- Davis of Washington
- Devereux of Mount Holly
- Dickinson of St. Albans
- Town
- Donahue of Northfield
- Eastman of Orwell
- Fiske of Enosburgh
- Gage of Rutland City
- Gamache of Swanton
- Graham of Williamstown
- Greshin of Warren
- Hebert of Vernon
- Higley of Lowell
- Hubert of Milton
- Juskiewicz of Cambridge
- LaClair of Barre Town
- Lawrence of Lynden
- Lefebvre of Newark
- Lewis of Berlin
- Marcotte of Coventry
- Martel of Waterford
- McFaun of Barre Town
- Morrissey of Bennington
- Myers of Essex
- Parent of St. Albans City
- Pearce of Richford
- Pearson of Burlington
- Poirier of Barre City
- Purvis of Colchester
- Quimby of Concord
- Savage of Swanton
- Scheuermann of Stowe
- Shaw of Pittsford
- Shaw of Derby
- Smith of New Haven
- Strong of Albany
- Tate of Mendon
- Terenzini of Rutland Town
- Turner of Milton *
- Van Wyck of Ferrisburgh
- Viens of Newport City
- Willhoit of St. Johnsbury
- Woodward of Johnson
- Wright of Burlington

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:

- Baser of Bristol
- Donovan of Burlington
- Evans of Essex
- Komline of Dorset
- McCoy of Poultney
- Ram of Burlington
Rep. Ancel of Calais explained her vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

Recurring budget gaps tell us that we have structural problems with both revenue and spending. The budget makes real progress in addressing structural spending problems. This bill does its part on the revenue side. It represents significant tax reform. These changes restructure the income tax code to make it more fair and more progressive, recognizing growing income inequality in this state. It is good tax policy that raises necessary revenue and it will position us well for the future.”

Rep. Turner of Milton explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

Raising taxes is not the solution to Vermont’s financial problems. We have a spending problem. Please no more taxes.”

Bill Amended, Read Third Time and Passed

H. 490

House bill, entitled

An act relating to making appropriations for the support of government

Was taken up and pending third reading of the bill, Rep. Poirier of Barre City moved to amend the bill as follows:

In Sec. B.324 (Department for children and families – home heating fuel assistance/LIHEAP), by striking out the section in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof a new Sec. B.324 to read:

Sec. B.324  Department for children and families - home heating fuel assistance/LIHEAP

Grants  23,351,664

Total  23,351,664

Source of funds

General fund  6,000,000

Federal funds  17,351,664

Total  23,351,664

Pending the question, Shall the bill be amended as proposed by Rep. Poirier of Barre City? Rep. Poirier of Barre City demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk proceeded to call the roll and the question, Shall the bill be amended as

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Berry of Manchester</th>
<th>LaClair of Barre Town</th>
<th>Tate of Mendon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Browning of Arlington</td>
<td>Lefebvre of Newark</td>
<td>Turner of Milton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesnut-Tangerman of Middletown Springs</td>
<td>McFaun of Barre Town</td>
<td>Viens of Newport City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dame of Essex</td>
<td>Parent of St. Albans City</td>
<td>Walz of Barre City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis of Rutland City</td>
<td>Pearson of Burlington</td>
<td>Willhoit of St. Johnsbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donahue of Northfield</td>
<td>Poirier of Barre City</td>
<td>Wright of Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzalez of Winooski</td>
<td>Quimby of Concord</td>
<td>Zagar of Barnard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzalez of Winooski</td>
<td>Scheuermann of Stowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who voted in the negative are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ancel of Calais</th>
<th>Feltus of Lyndon</th>
<th>Long of Newfane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft of Westford</td>
<td>Fields of Bennington</td>
<td>Lucke of Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew of Hartland</td>
<td>Fiske of Enosburgh</td>
<td>Macaig of Williston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batchelor of Derby</td>
<td>Forguites of Springfield</td>
<td>Manwaring of Wilmington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck of St. Johnsbury</td>
<td>Frank of Underhill</td>
<td>Marcotte of Coventry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyor of Highgate</td>
<td>French of Randolph</td>
<td>Martel of Waterford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bissonnette of Winooski</td>
<td>Gage of Rutland City</td>
<td>Martin of Wolcott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botzow of Pownal</td>
<td>Gamache of Swanton</td>
<td>Masland of Thetford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branagan of Georgia</td>
<td>Grad of Moretown</td>
<td>McCormack of Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brennan of Colchester</td>
<td>Graham of Williamstown</td>
<td>McCullough of Williston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briglin of Thetford</td>
<td>Greshin of Warren</td>
<td>Miller of Shaftsbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burditt of West Rutland</td>
<td>Haas of Rochester</td>
<td>Morris of Bennington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke of Brattleboro</td>
<td>Head of South Burlington</td>
<td>Morrissey of Bennington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buxton of Tunbridge</td>
<td>Hebert of Vernon</td>
<td>Mrowicki of Putney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfield of Fair Haven</td>
<td>Helm of Fair Haven</td>
<td>Murphy of Fairfax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr of Brandon</td>
<td>Higley of Lowell</td>
<td>Myers of Essex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie of Hartford</td>
<td>Hooper of Montpelier</td>
<td>Nuovo of Middlebury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkson of Woodstock</td>
<td>Hubert of Milton</td>
<td>Olsen of Londonderry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole of Burlington</td>
<td>Huntley of Cavendish</td>
<td>O'Sullivan of Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condon of Colchester</td>
<td>Jerman of Essex</td>
<td>Partridge of Windham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor of Fairfield</td>
<td>Jewett of Ripton</td>
<td>Patt of Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford</td>
<td>Johnson of South Hero</td>
<td>Pearce of Richford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corcoran of Bennington</td>
<td>Juskiewicz of Cambridge</td>
<td>Potter of Clarendon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakin of Chester</td>
<td>Keenan of St. Albans City</td>
<td>Pugh of South Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakin of Colchester</td>
<td>Kitzmiller of Montpelier</td>
<td>Rachelson of Burlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deen of Westminster</td>
<td>Klein of East Montpelier</td>
<td>Russell of Rutland City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devereux of Mount Holly</td>
<td>Krebs of South Hero</td>
<td>Ryerson of Randolph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson of St. Albans Town</td>
<td>Krowinski of Burlington</td>
<td>Savage of Swanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson of St. Albans Town</td>
<td>Lalonde of South Burlington</td>
<td>Sharpe of Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Lanpher of Vergennes</td>
<td>Shaw of Pittsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastman of Orwell</td>
<td>Lawrence of Lyndon</td>
<td>Shaw of Derby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis of Waterbury</td>
<td>Leaes of Shelburne</td>
<td>Sheldon of Middlebury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmons of Springfield</td>
<td>Lewis of Berlin</td>
<td>Sibilia of Dover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fagan of Rutland City</td>
<td>Lippert of Hinesburg</td>
<td>Smith of New Haven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stevens of Waterbury    Toleno of Brattleboro    Van Wyck of Ferrisburgh
Strong of Albany            Toll of Danville               Webb of Shelburne
Stuart of Brattleboro       Townsend of South            Yantachka of Charlotte
Sullivan of Burlington      Burlington                      Young of Glover *
Sweaney of Windsor          Trieber of Rockingham
Terenzini of Rutland Town   Troiano of Stannard

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:
Baser of Bristol            Komline of Dorset            Till of Jericho
Conquest of Newbury         McCoy of Poultney            Woodward of Johnson
Donovan of Burlington       O’Brien of Richmond
Evans of Essex              Ram of Burlington

Rep. Beck of St. Johnsbury explained his vote as follows:
“Mr. Speaker:
While I am sympathetic to families that truly struggle with keeping their homes warm, I am concerned with the use of state and federal heating funds by individuals that are not in need. Before spending more state dollars on this program, we need to have a more careful vetting of those that qualify.”

Rep. Donahue of Northfield explained her vote as follows:
“Mr. Speaker:
We have yet to debate the budget as a whole this afternoon. When it comes to investing in programs that directly help people, balanced against areas of questionable government growth, this money is well spent.”

Rep. Gage of Rutland City explained his vote as follows:
“Mr. Speaker:
This cut in LIHEAP is important to many people. I would love to support it. But we must make tough cuts in order to keep our state solvent. How I wish I could support this initiative.”

Rep. Poirier of Barre City explained his vote as follows:
“Mr. Speaker:
I proudly voted yes. I view this amendment as a small step to correct some injustices that have been made to the elderly Vermonters who have counted on this program. I will be anxiously awaiting the work that you believe the Emergency Board will deliver. We will have another opportunity next January to rectify this injustice when we do the budget adjustment.”

Rep. Rachelson of Burlington explained her vote as follows:
“Mr. Speaker:
I strongly support LIHEAP. It’s crucial that we help Vermonters in need stay warm next winter. But, we need to make sure we fund it adequately and that we find a way to pay for it without voting for a deficit budget.”

Rep. Young of Glover explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

I thought we had a spending problem. I may be a tax and spend liberal but I find this new brand of don’t tax and spend anyway very curious.”

Pending third reading of the bill, Rep. Johnson of South Hero moved to amend the bill as follows:

First: In Sec. B.316, by striking out the figure “1,322,998” and inserting in lieu thereof the figure “1,342,998” and by striking out the figure “718,986” and inserting in lieu thereof the figure “638,986” and by striking out the figure “57,606,777” where it appears twice and inserting in lieu thereof the figure “57,526,777”

Second: In Sec. B.505, by striking out the figure “1,295,574,706” where it appears four times and inserting in lieu thereof the figure “1,290,500,000”

Third: In Sec. B.702, by striking out the figure “5,132,155” and inserting in lieu thereof the figure “5,162,155” and by striking out the figure “9,321,075” and inserting in lieu thereof the figure “9,291,075”

Fourth: In Sec. B.1100(a)(3), by striking out the figure “$1,244,500” and inserting in lieu thereof the figure “$1,269,600”

Fifth: In Sec. D.101(a)(4), by striking out the words “boating safety” and inserting in lieu thereof the words “blood and breath alcohol”

Sixth: In Sec. D.101(b)(2), by striking out the figure “$92,000” and inserting in lieu thereof the figure “$41,372”

Seventh: In Sec. D.101(b), by adding a new subdivision (3) to read as follows:

(3) Lumberjack Fund #40900: $20,000.

Eighth: By striking out Sec. E.208.4(a) in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof a new subsection (a) to read as follows:

(a) The Commissioner of Public Safety shall meet with regional groups to determine if those groups want to contract for State dispatch services. As used in this subsection, “regional groups” include the State legislators, assistant judges, municipal officials, and emergency service representatives for the areas served by the dispatching functions of the State-operating public safety answering points. The Commissioner shall work with each regional group to
calculate the cost of desired dispatch services, and determine whether each regional group would like to contract for dispatch services with the State.

Ninth: In Sec. E.224(a), by striking out the figure “$496,136” and inserting in lieu thereof the figure “$696,136”

Tenth: By inserting a new section to be numbered Sec. E.300.2 to read as follows:
Sec. E.300.2 LEGAL AID; INTENT

(a) The $47,000 reduction in general funds for Legal Aid shall not be accompanied by a reduction in federal funds.

Eleventh: By adding a new section to be Sec. E.307.3 to read as follows:
Sec. E.307.3 MEDICARE SUPPLEMENTAL PLANS FOR DUAL ELIGIBLE MEDICAID BENEFICIARIES

(a) The Department of Vermont Health Access shall explore the use of State or Global Commitment funds to purchase Medicare supplemental insurance plans for individuals eligible for both Medicare and Medicaid, including the feasibility of federal financial participation, the estimated savings to the State with and without federal financial participation, and the benefits both of providing Medicare supplemental plans to the entire population of dual eligible individuals and of providing the plans to only a subset of the highest utilizers of all or a specific set of services.

(b) If the Department determines that savings can be achieved, then as part of its recommendations for fiscal year 2016 budget adjustment the Department shall propose a plan for implementing the purchase of Medicare supplemental insurance plans for the dual eligibles in a manner that is the most cost-effective to the State and that provides the greatest benefits to the dual eligible population.

Twelfth: By inserting a new section to be numbered Sec. E.342.2 to read as follows:
Sec. E.342.2 WORKING GROUP ON THE VERMONT VETERANS’ HOME GOVERNANCE AND FUNDING

(a) Creation. There is created a Working Group on the Vermont Veterans’ Home Governance and Funding.

(b) Membership. The Working Group shall be composed of the following nine members:

(1) a current member of the House of Representatives who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House;
(2) a current member of the Senate who shall be appointed by the Committee on Committees;

(3) a member of the Vermont Veterans’ Home Board of Trustees;

(4) the Administrator of the Vermont Veterans’ Home or designee;

(5) a classified employee of the Vermont Veterans’ Home;

(6) the Adjutant and Inspector General or designee;

(7) the Director of the White River Junction VA Medical Center or designee;

(8) a representative of the Bennington County business community to be appointed by the Governor; and

(9) the Attorney General or designee.

(c) Powers and duties. The Working Group shall study solutions to the Vermont Veterans’ Home’s ongoing governance and funding challenges that will result in the elimination of the ongoing General Fund subsidy for the Home by fiscal year 2018, including the following issues:

(1) the current governance structure of the Home;

(2) alternative governance structures for the Home, including privatization or a public-private partnership, and the potential costs and benefits of adopting each alternative governance structure;

(3) alternatives to the current funding model for the Home that would eliminate the need for ongoing General Fund subsidies by fiscal year 2018;

(4) alternative uses for the Home and its property that would benefit veterans; and

(5) options for repurposing portions of the Home’s facilities and property for alternative uses that would benefit veterans.

(d) The Working Group shall consult with the Vermont Congressional delegation, veterans’ advocacy groups, and members of the Bennington business community.

(e) Assistance. The Working Group shall have the administrative, technical, and legal assistance of the Vermont Veterans’ Home and the Vermont Office of Veterans’ Affairs as necessary.

(f) Report. On or before January 15, 2016, the Working Group shall submit a report to the House Committees on Appropriations and on General, Housing and Military Affairs and the Senate Committees on Appropriations and on Government Operations with its findings and a plan that will enable the
Vermont Veterans’ Home to no longer require a subsidy from the General Fund by fiscal year 2018.

(g) Meetings.

(1) The Administrator of the Vermont Veterans’ Home shall call the first meeting of the Working Group to occur on or before July 15, 2015.

(2) The Working Group shall select a chair from among its members at the first meeting.

(3) A majority of the membership shall constitute a quorum.


(h) Reimbursement.

(1) For attendance at meetings during adjournment of the General Assembly, legislative members of the Working Group shall be entitled to per diem compensation and reimbursement of expenses pursuant to 2 V.S.A. § 406 for no more than six meetings.

(2) Other members of the Working Group who are not employees of the State of Vermont and who are not otherwise compensated or reimbursed for their attendance shall be entitled to per diem compensation and reimbursement of expenses pursuant to 32 V.S.A. § 1010 for no more than six meetings.

Which was agreed to.

Pending third reading of the bill, Rep. Burditt of West Rutland moved to amend the bill as follows:

By striking out Sec. A.100.1 in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. A.100.1 INTENT

(a) This fiscal year 2016 appropriations bill represents the beginning of a multiyear process to bend the trend of State spending and bring revenues and spending into a long-term balance. The fiscal year 2016 appropriations bill contains difficult choices; however, these types of decisions will continue to occur annually without a concerted effort to create a sustainable budget.

(b) The General Assembly shall:

(1) in the fiscal year 2017 appropriations bill, reduce the reliance on one-time funding for base budget needs;

(2) in the fiscal year 2018 appropriations bill, bend the rate of spending growth and bring the expenditure pressures in line with revenue growth to end the cycle of annual budget gaps:
(3) in the fiscal year 2019 appropriations bill, require that Administration and Legislative proposals for budget changes and new programs contain a multiyear analysis of what the changes will cost;

(4) in the fiscal year 2020 appropriations bill, use less than 100 percent of forecasted revenue to build a reserve which can help offset the variability of revenues that comes with a progressive tax system and the risk of reliance on federal funds; and

(5) in the fiscal year 2021 appropriations bill, explore moving to a two-year budgeting cycle where the interim year will be such as to allow time to be spent focusing on program performance, results-based analysis, and evidenced-based program evaluation.

Pending the question, Shall the bill be amended as proposed by Rep. Burditt of West Rutland? Rep. Burditt of West Rutland demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number. The Clerk proceeded to call the roll and the question, Shall the bill be amended as proposed by Rep. Burditt of West Rutland? was decided in the negative. Yeas, 41. Nays, 95.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Bancroft of Westford  Beck of St. Johnsbury  Beyor of Highgate  Browning of Arlington  Burditt of West Rutland *  Canfield of Fair Haven  Cupoli of Rutland City  Dame of Essex  Dickinson of St. Albans Town  Donahue of Northfield  Gage of Rutland City  Gamache of Swanton  Graham of Williamstown  Hebert of Vernon  Higley of Lowell  Hubert of Milton  Juskiewicz of Cambridge  LaClair of Barre Town  Lawrence of Lyndon  Lefebvre of Newark  Lewis of Berlin  Marcotte of Coventry  Martel of Waterford  McFaun of Barre Town  Morrissey of Bennington  Myers of Essex  Parent of St. Albans City

Those who voted in the negative are:

Rep. Burditt of West Rutland explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:
If we are truly committed to these 5 items why are we not passing this amendment to give us a harder push down the path we intend to go.”

Pending third reading of the bill, Rep. Tate of Mendon moved to amend the bill as follows:

First: In Sec. B.126, Legislature, by striking out the section in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. B.126  Legislature

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal services</td>
<td>3,543,991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses</td>
<td>3,435,835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,979,826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:

Baser of Bristol    Fiske of Enosburgh    Shaw of Derby
Batchelor of Derby  Komline of Dorset    Tall of Jericho
Devereux of Mount Holly McCoy of Poulneuy   Woodward of Johnson
Donovan of Burlington O'Brien of Richmond
Evans of Essex      Ram of Burlington
Source of funds
General fund 6,979,826
Total 6,979,826

Second: By inserting a new section to be Sec. E. 126.1 to read as follows:

Sec. E.126.1 32 V.S.A. § 1052 is amended to read:

§ 1052. MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(a) Each member of the General Assembly, other than the Speaker and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, is entitled to a weekly salary of $589.00 for the 2005 Biennial Session and thereafter; provided that, $639.00 beginning on January 1, 2007, January 1, 2016; provided that the weekly compensation shall be adjusted annually thereafter by the cost of living adjustment negotiated for State employees under the most recent collective bargaining agreement. The salary of members shall be paid in biweekly installments. During a special session, a member is entitled to $118.00 a day for each day of a special session which is called at any time following the 2005 biennial session January 1, 2016, for each day on which the House of which he or she is a member shall sit.

* * *

Pending third reading of the bill, Rep. Olsen of Londonderry moved to substitute an amendment for the amendment offered by Rep. Tate of Mendon as follows:

By inserting a new section to be Sec. E.126.1 to read as follows:

Sec. E.126.1 32 V.S.A. § 1052 is amended to read:

§ 1052. MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(a) Each member of the General Assembly, other than the Speaker and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, is entitled to a weekly salary of $589.00 for the 2005 Biennial Session and thereafter; provided that, beginning on January 1, 2007, the weekly compensation shall be adjusted annually thereafter by the cost of living adjustment negotiated for State employees under the most recent collective bargaining agreement. The salary of members shall be paid in biweekly installments. During a special session, a member is entitled to $118.00 a day for each day of a special session which is called at any time following the 2005 biennial session for each day on which the House of which he or she is a member shall sit.

* * *
(e) In each fiscal year, any member of the General Assembly may notify the Commissioner of Finance and Management that all or a portion of the salary provided in subsection (a) of this section shall be appropriated to any function of State government or to a nonprofit organization chosen by the member. Any portion of a member’s salary that is appropriated in this manner shall be paid directly to the State government entity or nonprofit organization and shall not be considered as part of the member’s compensation.

Which was agreed to on a Division vote: Yeas, 90. Nays, 35.

Thereupon, the amendment, as substituted by Rep. Olsen, was disagreed to.

Pending third reading of the bill, Rep. Davis of Washington moved to amend the bill as follows:

By inserting a new section to be numbered Sec. D.100.1 to read as follows:

Sec. D. 100.1 LIHEAP CONTINGENT FUNDING

(a) At the close of fiscal year 2015, the first five million dollars, after satisfying the requirements of 32 V.S.A. § 308 and 32 V.S.A. § 308c, that would otherwise be deposited in the Rainy Day fund shall be appropriated and held by the Secretary of Administration to meet LIHEAP funding needs.

Which was agreed to.

Thereupon, the bill was read the third time and passed.

Third Reading; Bill Passed in Concurrence

S. 2

Senate bill, entitled

An act relating to the establishment of a State Latin Motto

Was taken up, read the third time and passed in concurrence.

Favorable Report; Third Reading Ordered

H. 478

Rep. Lewis of Berlin, for the committee on Government Operations, to which had been referred House bill, entitled

An act relating to approval of the adoption and codification of the charter of the Town of Royalton

Reported in favor of its passage. The bill, having appeared on the Calendar one day for notice, was taken up, read the second time and third reading ordered.
A message was received from the Senate by Mr. Marshall, its Assistant Secretary, as follows:

Mr. Speaker:

I am directed to inform the House that:

The Senate has on its part passed Senate bills of the following titles:

S. 18. An act relating to privacy protection.

S. 141. An act relating to possession of firearms.

In the passage of which the concurrence of the House is requested.

The Senate has on its part adopted Senate concurrent resolutions of the following titles:


The Senate has on its part adopted concurrent resolutions originating in the House of the following titles:

H.C.R. 81. House concurrent resolution congratulating Carol Willey on being named the 2015 Vermont Mother of the Year.

H.C.R. 82. House concurrent resolution congratulating the 2015 Vermont Prudential Spirit of Community Award winners.

H.C.R. 83. House concurrent resolution congratulating the Pownal Historical Society on its 20th anniversary.


H.C.R. 86. House concurrent resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of the start of the Armenian Genocide.

H.C.R. 87. House concurrent resolution congratulating the 2015 Williamstown Blue Devils Division III championship boys’ basketball team.

H.C.R. 88. House concurrent resolution honoring Sandy Ware of
Brattleboro for her creative leadership as a nursing home activities director.

Adjournment

At six o'clock and twenty-one minutes in the evening, on motion of Rep. Turner of Milton, the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 31, 2015, at ten o’clock in the forenoon, pursuant to the provisions of J.R.S. 21.

Concurrent Resolutions Adopted

The following concurrent resolutions, having been placed on the Consent Calendar on the preceding legislative day, and no member having requested floor consideration as provided by Joint Rules of the Senate and House of Representatives, are hereby adopted in concurrence.

H.C.R. 81

House concurrent resolution congratulating Carol Willey on being named the 2015 Vermont Mother of the Year;

H.C.R. 82

House concurrent resolution congratulating the 2015 Vermont Prudential Spirit of Community Award winners;

H.C.R. 83

House concurrent resolution congratulating the Pownal Historical Society on its 20th anniversary;

H.C.R. 84

House concurrent resolution congratulating the record-breaking 2015 Mt. Anthony Union High School Patriots State and New England championship wrestling team;

H.C.R. 85

House concurrent resolution congratulating Caitlin C. Gregg on winning a bronze medal at the FIS (International Ski Federation) Nordic World Ski Championships 2015;

H.C.R. 86

House concurrent resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of the start of the Armenian Genocide;

H.C.R. 87

House concurrent resolution congratulating the 2015 Williamstown Blue Devils Division III championship boys’ basketball team;
H.C.R. 88

House concurrent resolution honoring Sandy Ware of Brattleboro for her creative leadership as a nursing home activities director;

S.C.R. 13

Senate concurrent resolution congratulating Maple Grove Farms on its centennial anniversary;

S.C.R. 14

Senate concurrent resolution congratulating Matt Lorman on his selection as a 2015 Down Under Sports cross country runner;

[The full text of the concurrent resolutions appeared in the House Calendar Addendum on the preceding legislative day and will appear in the Public Acts and Resolves of the 2015, seventy-third Biennial session.]