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

**Devotional Exercises**

Devotional exercises were conducted by Rep. Kate Webb of Shelburne, Vt.

**Committee Bill Introduced**

**H. 876**

Rep. Brennan of Colchester, for the committee on Transportation, introduced a bill, entitled

An act relating to the transportation capital program and miscellaneous changes to transportation-related law

Which was read the first time and, under the rule, placed on the Calendar for notice tomorrow.

**Senate Bills Referred**

Senate bills of the following titles were severally taken up, read the first time and referred as follows:

**S. 174**

Senate bill, entitled

An act relating to a model State policy for use of body cameras by law enforcement officers;

To the committee on Government Operations.

**S. 257**

Senate bill, entitled

An act relating to residential rental agreements;

To the committee on General, Housing & Military Affairs.

**Joint Resolution Adopted**

**J.R.S. 48**

By Senators Baruth and Benning,

J.R.S. 48. Joint resolution relating to weekend adjournment.
Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives:

That when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, March 25, 2016, it be to meet again no later than Tuesday, March 29, 2016.

Was taken up and adopted on the part of the House.

Committee Relieved of Consideration
and Bill Committed to Other Committee

S. 256

Rep. Pugh of South Burlington moved that the committee on Human Services be relieved of Senate bill, entitled

An act relating to extending the moratorium on home health agency certificates of need

And that the bill be committed to the committee on Health Care, which was agreed to.

Bill Amended, Read Third Time and Passed

H. 552

House bill, entitled

An act relating to threatened and endangered species

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

First: In Sec. 4, 10 V.S.A. § 5403, by striking out subsection (c) in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

(c) The Secretary may, with advice of the Endangered Species Committee and after the consultation required under subsection 5408(e) of this section, adopt rules for the protection and conservation, or recovery, of endangered and threatened species. The rules may establish application requirements for an individual permit or general permits issued under this section, including requirements that differ from the requirements of subsection 5408(h) of this title.

Second: In Sec. 9, 10 V.S.A. § 5408, in subdivision (l)(4)(C), after “the Secretary has” and before “best management practices” by striking out “adopted” and inserting lieu thereof “approved” and in subdivision (l)(10), after “issuance of the general permit” and before the period by inserting “unless existing best management practices approved under the general permit adequately protect the critical habitat or have been
amended to do so prior to the critical habitat designation pursuant to section 5402a of this title”

Which was agreed to. Thereupon, the bill was read the third time and passed.

Bill Amended, Read Third Time and Passed

H. 562

House bill, entitled

An act relating to professions and occupations regulated by the Office of Professional Regulation and to the review of professional regulation

Was taken up and pending third reading of the bill, Rep. Krebs of South Hero moved to amend the bill as follows:

After Sec. 17, by inserting a reader assistance heading and Secs. 17a and 17b to read:

* * * Land Surveyors * * *

Sec. 17a. 27 V.S.A. § 1403 is amended to read:

§ 1403. COMPOSITION OF SURVEY PLATS

(a) Plats filed in accordance with this chapter shall be on sheets 11 inches by 17 inches or 18 inches by 24 inches in size or 24 inches by 36 inches if the town or city has appropriate storage facilities as determined by the town or city clerk.

(b) Plats filed in accordance with this chapter shall also conform with the following further requirements:

(1) Each survey plat shall contain an inset locus map clearly indicating the location of the land depicted and a legend of symbols used.

(2) All lettering and data shall be clearly legible.

(3) Plat scale ratios shall be sufficient to allow all pertinent survey data to be shown, and each plat shall contain a graphic scale graduated in units of measure used in the body of the plat.

(4) Each plat sheet shall have a minimum one-half inch margin, except the binder side, which shall have a minimum one and one-half inch margin.

(5) Each plat sheet shall contain a title area in the lower right-hand corner of the sheet stating the location of the land, scale expressed in engineering units, date of compilation, the name of the record owner as of that
date, the land surveyor’s certification as outlined in 26 V.S.A. § 2596, and a certification that the plat conforms with requirements of this section. These certifications shall be accompanied by the responsible land surveyor’s seal, name and number, and signature.

(6) Each survey plat shall contain a graphical indication of the reference meridian used on the survey plat and a statement describing the basis of bearings referenced on the survey plat.

(7) When the plat sheet is produced by a reproduction process, the process shall be identified and certified to by the producer in the margin of the plat sheet. Original plat sheets shall be so identified and certified to by the same process.

(8) The recordable plat materials shall be composed in one of the following processes:

(A) fixed-line photographic process on stable base polyester film; or
(B) pigment ink on stable base polyester film or linen tracing cloth.

(c) Survey plats prepared and dated before July 1, 1992, shall be exempt from the requirements of subdivisions (b)(2)–(7) (b)(1)–(6) and (8) of this section, but shall comply with requirements in State law in effect when the plats were prepared and dated.

(d) Survey plats prepared and dated before any statutory regulation of land plats shall comply with subsections subsection (a) and subdivisions (b)(1) and (b)(8) subdivision (b)(7) of this section.

(e) Any survey plat exempted by subsection (c) or (d) of this section and revised after July 1, 1992, shall meet all the requirements of sections 1401–1406 of this title chapter.

Sec. 17b. 27 V.S.A. § 1404 is amended to read:

§ 1404. EXCEPTIONS EXEMPTIONS

(a) Survey plats prepared and filed by municipal and State government agencies shall be exempt from subdivision 1403(b)(5) of this title chapter. Each plat sheet filed under this exemption shall contain a title area in the lower right-hand corner of the sheet stating the location of the land, the scale expressed in engineering units, and the date of compilation. Highway plats or plans filed under this exemption shall also include right-of-way detail sheets and a title sheet.

(b) Survey plats prepared and filed in accordance with 24 V.S.A. § 4463 shall be exempt from subdivision 1403(b)(5) of this title chapter. Survey plats
or plans filed under this exemption shall contain a title area, the location of the land, and scale expressed in engineering units. In addition, they shall include inscriptions and data required by zoning and planning boards.

(c) Survey plats prepared and filed in accordance with chapter 15 of this title shall be exempt from subdivision 1403(b)(6) of this title chapter. Each plat sheet filed under this exemption shall contain a title area stating the location of the land, the scale expressed in engineering or architectural units, and the date of compilation.

Which was agreed to. Thereupon, the bill was read the third time and passed.

Bill Amended; Third Reading Ordered

H. 620

Rep. Morris of Bennington, for the committee on Health Care, to which had been referred House bill, entitled

An act relating to health insurance and Medicaid coverage for contraceptives

Reported in favor of its passage when amended by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 1. 8 V.S.A. §4099c is amended to read:

§ 4099c. REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH EQUITY IN HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE

(a) As used in this section, “health insurance plan” means any individual or group health insurance policy, any hospital or medical service corporation or health maintenance organization subscriber contract, or any other health benefit plan offered, issued, or renewed for any person in this State by a health insurer, as defined by 18 V.S.A. § 9402. The term shall not include benefit plans providing coverage for specific disease or other limited benefit coverage.

(b) A health insurance plan shall provide coverage for outpatient contraceptive services including sterilizations, and shall provide coverage for the purchase of all prescription contraceptives and prescription contraceptive devices approved by the federal Food and Drug Administration, except that a health insurance plan that does not provide coverage of prescription drugs is not required to provide coverage of prescription contraceptives and prescription contraceptive devices. A health insurance plan providing coverage required under this section shall not establish any rate, term or condition that places a greater financial burden on an insured or beneficiary for
access to contraceptive services, prescription contraceptives and prescription contraceptive devices than for access to treatment, prescriptions or devices for any other health condition.

(b) As used in this section, “health insurance plan” means any individual or group health insurance policy, any hospital or medical service corporation or health maintenance organization subscriber contract, or any other health benefit plan offered, issued, or renewed for any person in this state by a health insurer, as defined by 18 V.S.A. § 9402. The term shall not include benefit plans providing coverage for specific disease or other limited benefit coverage.

(c) A health insurance plan shall provide coverage without any deductible, coinsurance, co-payment, or other cost-sharing requirement for at least one drug, device, or other product within each method of contraception for women identified by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and prescribed by an insured’s health care provider.

(1) The coverage provided pursuant to this subsection shall include patient education and counseling by the patient’s health care provider regarding the appropriate use of the contraceptive method prescribed.

(2)(A) If there is a therapeutic equivalent of a drug, device, or other product for an FDA-approved contraceptive method, a health insurance plan may provide coverage for more than one drug, device, or other product and may impose cost-sharing requirements as long as at least one drug, device, or other product for that method is available without cost-sharing.

(B) If an insured’s health care provider recommends a particular service or FDA-approved drug, device, or other product for the insured based on a determination of medical necessity, the health insurance plan shall defer to the provider’s determination and judgment and shall provide coverage without cost-sharing for the drug, device, or product prescribed by the provider for the insured.

(d) A health insurance plan shall provide coverage for voluntary sterilization procedures for men and women without any deductible, coinsurance, co-payment, or other cost-sharing requirement, except to the extent that such coverage would disqualify a high-deductible health plan from eligibility for a health savings account pursuant to 26 U.S.C. § 223.

(e) A health insurance plan shall provide coverage without any deductible, coinsurance, co-payment, or other cost-sharing requirement for clinical services associated with providing the drugs, devices, products, and procedures covered under this section and related follow-up services, including
management of side effects, counseling for continued adherence, and device insertion and removal.

(f)(1) A health insurance plan shall provide coverage for a supply of contraceptives intended to last over a 12-month duration, which may be furnished or dispensed all at once or over the course of the 12 months at the discretion of the health care provider. The health insurance plan shall reimburse a health care provider or dispensing entity per unit for furnishing or dispensing a supply of contraceptives intended to last for 12 months.

(2) This subsection shall apply to Medicaid and any other public health care assistance program offered or administered by the State or by any subdivision or instrumentality of the State.

(g) Benefits provided to an insured under this section shall be the same for the insured’s covered spouse and other covered dependents.

Sec. 2. VALUE-BASED PAYMENTS FOR LONG-ACTING REVERSIBLE CONTRACEPTIVES

The Department of Vermont Health Access shall establish and implement value-based payments to health care providers for the insertion and removal of long-acting reversible contraceptives. The payments shall reflect the high efficacy rate of long-acting reversible contraceptives in reducing unintended pregnancies and the correlating decrease in costs to the State as a result of fewer unintended pregnancies. The payments shall create parity between the fees for insertion and removal of long-acting reversible contraceptives and those for oral contraceptives.

Sec. 3. APPROPRIATION

The sum of $1.00 is appropriated to the Department of Vermont Health Access from the General Fund in fiscal year for purposes of increasing reimbursement rates for long-acting reversible contraceptives pursuant to Sec. 2 of this act.

Sec. 4. EFFECTIVE DATES

(a) Sec. 3 (appropriation) and this section shall take effect on July 1, 2016.

(b) Sec. 1 shall take effect on October 1, 2016 and shall apply to Medicaid on that date and shall apply to health insurance plans on or after October 1, 2016 on such date as a health insurer issues, offers, or renews the health insurance plan, but in no event later than October 1, 2017.

(c) Sec. 2 (long-acting reversible contraceptives; payments) shall take effect on October 1, 2016.
Rep. Toll of Danville, for the committee on Appropriations recommended that the report of the committee in Health Care be amended as follows:

By striking Sec. 3, appropriation, in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof a new Sec. 3 to read as follows:

Sec. 3. APPROPRIATION

The sum of $34,864.00 in Global Commitment funds is appropriated to the Department of Vermont Health Access in fiscal year 2017 for the purposes of increasing reimbursement rates for long-acting reversible contraceptives pursuant to Sec. 2 of this act.

The bill, having appeared on the Calendar one day for notice, was taken up, read the second time, report of the committees on Health Care and Appropriations agreed to.

Pending the question, Shall the bill be read a third time? Rep. Lippert of Hinesburg 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 read a third time? was decided in the affirmative. Yeas, 128. Nays, 15.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:
MANWARING of Wilmington  
MARCOTTE of Coventry  
MARTIN of Wolcott  
MASLAND of Thetford  
McCORMACK of Burlington  
McCoy of Poultney  
McCullough of Williston  
McFaun of Barre Town  
Miller of Shaftsbury  
Morris of Bennington  
Mrowicki of Putney  
Murphy of Fairfax  
Nuovo of Middlebury  
O'Brien of Richmond  
Olsen of Londonderry  
O'Sullivan of Burlington  
Parent of St. Albans Town  
Partridge of Windham  
Patt of Worcester  
Peacoe of Richford  
Pearson of Burlington  
Poirier of Barre City  
Potter of Clarendon  
Pugh of South Burlington  
Purvis of Colchester  
Quimby of Concord  
Rachelson of Burlington *  
Ram of Burlington  
Russell of Rutland City  
Ryerson of Randolph  
Savage of Swanton  
Scheuermann of Stowe  
Sharpe of Bristol  
Shaw of Pittsford  
Shaw of Derby *  
Sheldon of Middlebury  
Sibilia of Dover  
Smith of New Haven  
Stuart of Brattleboro  
Sullivan of Burlington  
Sweaney of Windsor  
Toll of Jericho *  
Toleno of Brattleboro  
Toll of Danville  
Townsend of South  
Burlington  
Trieber of Rockingham  
Troiano of Stannard  
Turner of Milton  
Viens of Newport City  
Walz of Barre City  
Webb of Shelburne  
Wood of Waterbury  
Woodward of Johnson  
Wright of Burlington  
Yantachka of Charlotte  
Young of Glover  
Zagar of Barnard  

 Those who voted in the negative are:  

Beyor of Highgate  
Cupoli of Rutland City  
Dame of Essex  
Dickinson of St. Albans  
Town  
Donahue of Northfield  
Gamache of Swanton *  
Graham of Williamstown  
Hebert of Vernon  
Helm of Fair Haven  
Martel of Waterford  
Morrissey of Bennington  
Gamache of Swanton *  
Graham of Williamstown  
Terenzini of Rutland Town  
Van Wyck of Ferrisburgh  
Willhoit of St. Johnsbury  
Strong of Albany  

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

Batchelor of Derby  
Christie of Hartford  
Gonzalez of Winooski  
Grad of Moretown  
Stevens of Waterbury  
Tate of Mendon  

 Rep. Gamache of Swanton explained her vote as follows:  

“Mr. Speaker:  
This bill does not include religious exemption for institutions or religious believers.”  

 Rep. Komline of Dorset explained her vote as follows:  

“Mr. Speaker:
In light of Colorado’s results we know that increasing access to Long Acting Reversible Contraceptives will result in fewer unintended births and abortions. I want to thank the committee for their work on this bill.”

**Rep. Rachelson of Burlington** explained her vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

It’s important that all Vermonters have access to reliable birth control. This bill will remove cost being a barrier to Vermonters and we’ll have fewer unintended pregnancies in our state.”

**Rep. Shaw of Derby** explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

Breaks my heart to see abortions. My daughter had one 30 years ago, and still not over it mentally.”

**Rep. Till of Jericho** explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

I support this bill to increase the use of Long Acting Reversible Contraception. These are the most effective contraceptives known. They reduce unintended pregnancies and widespread use of LARCs has been demonstrated to reduce abortions.

Additionally, there are other medical benefits such as lifelong reduction of cancer of the uterus.

With 46% of pregnancies in Vermont being unintended, this is a very wise step.”

**Bill Read Second Time; Amended and Third Reading Ordered**

**H. 864**

**Rep. Lawrence of Lyndon** spoke for the committee on Agriculture & Forest Products.

House bill entitled

An act relating to agricultural exemption from Vermont’s sales and use tax

**Rep. Young of Glover**, for the committee on Ways and Means, recommended that the bill be amended as follows:

**First**: By striking out Sec. 1 in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof:

Sec. 1. 32 V.S.A. § 9741(25) is amended to read:
(25) Sales of agricultural machinery and equipment for use and consumption directly and exclusively, except for isolated or occasional uses, predominantly in the production for sale of tangible personal property on farms (including stock, dairy, poultry, fruit, and truck farms), orchards, nurseries, or in greenhouses or other similar structures used primarily for the raising of agricultural or horticultural commodities for sale. It shall be rebuttably presumed that uses are not isolated or occasional if they total more than four percent of the time the machinery or equipment is operated. As used in this subdivision, the term “predominately” means 75 percent or more of the time the machinery or equipment is in use.

Second: By striking out Sec. 2 in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 2. [Deleted.]

Having appeared on the Calendar one day for notice, was taken up and read the second time, the report of the committee on Ways and Means agreed to and third reading was ordered.

**Bill Read Second Time; Third Reading Ordered**

**H. 872**

**Rep. Branagan of Georgia** spoke for the committee on Ways & Means.

House bill entitled

An act relating to Executive Branch fees

Having appeared on the Calendar one day for notice, was taken up and read the second time.

Pending the question, Shall the bill be read a third time? **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 be read a third time? was decided in the affirmative. Yeas, 98. Nays, 46.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Ancel of Calais  Brigin of Thetford  Cole of Burlington
Bartholomew of Hartland  Burke of Brattleboro  Condon of Colchester
Baser of Bristol  Buxton of Tunbridge  Connor of Fairfield
Berry of Manchester  Canfield of Fair Haven  Conquest of Newbury
Bissonnette of Winooski  Carr of Brandon  Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford
Botzow of Pownal  Chesnut-Tangerman of  
Branagan of Georgia  Middletown Springs  Corcoran of Bennington
Brennan of Colchester  Clarkston of Woodstock  Dakin of Chester
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those who voted in the negative are:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft of Westford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck of St. Johnsbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyor of Highgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning of Arlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burditt of West Rutland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupoli of Rutland City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dame of Essex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devereux of Mount Holly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson of St. Albans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donahue of Northfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feltus of Lyndon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiske of Enosburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage of Rutland City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamache of Swanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham of Williamstown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Batchelor of Derby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie of Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales of Winooski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens of Waterbury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Rep. Turner of Milton** explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

This bill disguises the 20.8 million dollars assessed against mutual funds as fees and then creates an exemption to comply with a recent court decision. Make no mistake, this is a $20.8 million tax increase! Thank you.”

**Message from the Senate No. 32**

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. 169.** An act relating to the Rozo McLaughlin Farm-to-School Program.
- **S. 189.** An act relating to foster parents’ rights and protections.
- **S. 250.** An act relating to alcoholic beverages.

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

**Bill Read Second Time; Amended and Third Reading Ordered**

**H. 873**


House bill entitled

An act relating to making miscellaneous tax changes

Having appeared on the Calendar one day for notice, was taken up and read the second time.

Pending the question, Shall the bill be read the third time? **Rep. Ancel of Calais** moved to amend the bill as follows:

In Sec. 26, 21 V.S.A. § 2003, in subdivision (1)(A), by striking out the word “three” and inserting in lieu thereof the word “four”

Which was agreed to.

Pending the question, Shall the bill be read the third time? **Rep. Berry of Manchester** moved to amend the bill as follows:

By striking Sec. 18 in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof a new Sec. 18 to read as follows:

Sec. 18. 32 V.S.A. § 9202 is amended to read:
§ 9202. DEFINITIONS

The following words, terms, and phrases when used in this chapter shall have the meanings ascribed to them in this section unless the context clearly indicates a different meaning:

* * *

(3) “Hotel” means an establishment which holds itself out to the public by offering sleeping accommodations for a consideration, whether or not the major portion of its operating receipts is derived therefrom and whether or not the sleeping accommodations are offered to the public by the owner or proprietor or lessee, sublessee, mortgagee, licensee, or any other person or the agent of any of the foregoing. The term includes inns, motels, tourist homes and cabins, ski dormitories, ski lodges, lodging homes, rooming houses, furnished-room houses, boarding houses, and private clubs, as well as any building or structure or part thereof to the extent to which any such building or structure or part thereof in fact is held out to the public by offering sleeping accommodations for a consideration. The term shall not include the following:

(A) a hospital, licensed under 18 V.S.A. chapter 43 or a nursing home, residential care home, assisted living residence, home for the terminally ill, therapeutic community residence as defined pursuant to 33 V.S.A. chapter 71, or independent living facility;

(B) any establishment operated by any state or United States U.S. agency or institution, except the Department of Forests, Parks and Recreation of the State of Vermont;

(C) an establishment operated by a nonprofit corporation or association organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, or educational purposes, one or more, which, in furtherance of any of the purposes for which it was organized, operates a hotel as defined herein; and

(D) a continuing care retirement community certified under 8 V.S.A. chapter 151; and

(E) an establishment operated by at least one operator 65 years of age or older that is capable of providing three or less occupancies at any one time.

* * *

(15) “Restaurant” means:

(A) An establishment from which food or beverage of the type for immediate consumption is sold or for which a charge is made, including a cafe,
cafeteria, dining room, diner, lunch counter, snack bar, private or social club, bar, tavern, street vendor, or person engaged in the business of catering.

(B) An establishment 80 percent or more of whose total sales of food and beverage in the previous taxable year were, or in the first taxable year are reasonably projected to be, of alcoholic beverages, food, and beverage that are taxable under subdivision (10)(C) of this section, and food and beverage that are taxable under subdivision (10)(B) and are not exempt under subdivision (10)(D) of this section.

(C) “Restaurant” shall not include a snack bar on the premises of a retail grocery or “convenience” store.

(D) A vending machine is not a restaurant, but food or beverage that is sold from a vending machine shall be deemed to be sold by a “restaurant” if the vending machine is located on the premises of a restaurant.

Thereupon, Rep, Berry of Manchester asked and was granted leave of the House to withdraw his amendment.

Pending the question, Shall the bill be read a third time? 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 read a third time? was decided in the affirmative. Yeas, 86. Nays, 59.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Ancel of Calais        Davis of Washington       Krowinski of Burlington
Bartholomew of Hartland  Deen of Westminster       Lalonde of South Burlington
Berry of Manchester    Donovan of Burlington      Lanpher of Vergennes
Bissonnette of Winooski Emmons of Springfield     Lenes of Shelburne
Botzow of Pownal       Evans of Essex            Lippert of Hinesburg
Briglin of Thetford    Fields of Bennington       Long of Newfane
Burke of Brattleboro   Forguites of Springfield   Lucke of Hartford
Carr of Brandon        Frank of Underhill         Macaig of Williston
Chesnut-Tangerman of   French of Randolph        Manwaring of Wilmington
Middletown Springs     Grad of Moretown           Martin of Wolcott
Clarkson of Woodstock  Haas of Rochester          Masland of Thetford
Cole of Burlington     Head of South Burlington    McCormack of Burlington
Condon of Colchester   Hooper of Montpelier       McCullough of Williston
Connor of Fairfield    Huntley of Cavendish       Miller of Shaftsbury
Conquest of Newbury    Jerman of Essex           Morris of Bennington
Copeland-Hanzas of     Jewett of Ripton           Mrowicki of Putney
Bradford *             Johnson of South Hero       Murphy of Fairfax
Corcoran of Bennington  Keenan of St. Albans City Nuovo of Middlebury
Dakin of Chester       Kitzmiller of Montpelier   O’Brien of Richmond
Dakin of Colchester    Klein of East Montpelier    Olsen of Londonderry
Those who voted in the negative are:

- Bancroft of Westford
- Baser of Bristol
- Beck of St. Johnsbury
- Beyor of Highgate
- Branagan of Georgia
- Brennan of Colchester
- Browning of Arlington
- Burditt of West Rutland
- Buxton of Tunbridge
- Canfield of Fair Haven
- Cupoli of Rutland City
- Dame of Essex
- Devereux of Mount Holly
- Dickinson of St. Albans Town
- Donahue of Northfield
- Eastman of Orwell
- Fagan of Rutland City
- Felts of Lyndon
- Fiske of Enosburgh*
- Gage of Rutland City
- Gamache of Swanton
- Graham of Williamstown
- Greshin of Warren
- Hebret of Vernon*
- Helm of Fair Haven
- Higley of Lowell*
- Hubert of Milton
- Juskiewicz of Cambridge
- Komline of Dorset
- Krebs of South Hero
- LaClair of Barre Town
- Lawrence of Lyndon
- Lefebvre of Newark
- Lewis of Berlin
- Marcotte of Coventry
- Martel of Waterford
- McCoy of Poultney
- McFaun of Barre Town
- Morrissey of Bennington
- Myers of Essex
- Parent of St. Albans Town
- Pearce of Richford
- Poirier of Barre City
- Purvis of Colchester
- Quimby of Concord
- Savage of Swanton
- Scheuermann of Stowe
- Shaw of Pittsford
- Shaw of Derby
- Sibilia of Dover
- Smith of New Haven
- Strong of Albany
- Terenzini of Rutland Town
- Turner of Milton
- Van Wyck of Ferrisburgh
- Viens of Newport City
- Willhoit of St. Johnsbury
- Wood of Waterbury
- Wright of Burlington

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

- Batchelor of Derby
- Christie of Hartford
- Gonzalez of Winooski
- Tate of Mendon

Rep. Copeland Hanzas of Bradford explained her vote as follows:

"Mr. Speaker:

As much as we might wish that our country would join the rest of the world in finding a way to make health care a right of citizenship, we are stuck here in an employer based health care system. Changes made here on the employer assessment create a more level playing field between employers who are
participating in the system and those who benefit from the plans offered by other employers.”

**Rep. Fiske of Enosburgh** explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

Here we go once again, Mr. Speaker. I have people in my district who can’t pick up their prescriptions from Rite Aid; they try to figure out if they can buy wood for heat or put gas in their car. This weekend I’ll go home and listen once again how unaffordable it is to live in Vermont.”

**Rep. Hebert of Vernon** explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

This legislature has a spending problem, not a revenue problem. You cannot continue taxing your way out of it. Vermonters simply cannot afford what we’re doing. Thank you.”

**Rep. Higley of Lowell** explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

My constituents and businesses are telling me that they’d like to see some predictability and stability in Vermont’s regulations and taxation, not more of each.”

**Rules Suspended; Bill Read Second Time; Consideration Interrupted by Recess**

**H. 875**

On motion of **Rep. Turner of Milton**, the rules were suspended and House bill, entitled

An act relating to making appropriations for the support of government;

Appearing on the Calendar for notice, was taken up for immediate consideration.

**Rep. Johnson of South Hero** spoke for the committee on Appropriations. Thereupon the bill was read the second time.

**Recess**

At five o’clock and fifty-seven minutes in the afternoon, the Speaker declared a recess until the fall of the gavel.
At seven o’clock and seven minutes in the evening, the Speaker called the House to order.

**Consideration Resumed; Third Reading Ordered**

**H. 875**

Consideration resumed on House bill, entitled
An act relating to making appropriations for the support of government;

Pending the question, shall the bill be read the third time? Rep. Dakin of Colchester moved to amend the bill as follows:

By striking Sec. B.601 (Vermont Public Television) in its entirety

Which was disagreed to.

Pending the question, Shall the bill be read a third time? Rep. Olsen of Londonderry 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 read a third time? was decided in the affirmative. Yeas, 95. Nays, 48.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Ancel of Calais  Emmons of Springfield  Long of Newfane
Bartholomew of Hartland  Evans of Essex  Lucke of Hartford
Berry of Manchester  Fagan of Rutland City  Macaig of Williston
Bissonnette of Winooski  Fields of Bennington  Manwaring of Wilmington
Botzow of Pownal  Forguites of Springfield  Martin of Wolcott
Brennan of Colchester  Frank of Underhill  Masland of Thetford
Briglin of Thetford  French of Randolph  McCormack of Burlington
Burke of Brattleboro  Grad of Moretown  McCullough of Williston
Buxton of Tunbridge  Haas of Rochester  Miller of Shaftsbury *
Carr of Brandon  Head of South Burlington  Morris of Bennington
Chesnut-Tangeman of Middletown Springs  Helm of Fair Haven  Morrissey of Bennington
Clarkson of Woodstock  Hooper of Montpelier  Mrowicki of Putney
Cole of Burlington  Huntley of Cavendish  Murphy of Fairfax
Condon of Colchester  Jerman of Essex *  Nuovo of Middlebury
Connor of Fairfield *  Jewett of Ripton  O’Brien of Richmond
Conquest of Newbury  Johnson of South Hero  Olsen of Londonderry
Copeland-Hanzas of Bradford  Keenan of St. Albans City  O’Sullivan of Burlington
Bradford  Kitzmiller of Montpelier  Partridge of Windham
Corcoran of Bennington  Klein of East Montpelier  Patt of Worcester
Dakin of Chester  Krebs of South Hero  Pearce of Richford
Dakin of Colchester  Krowinski of Burlington  Pearson of Burlington *
Davis of Washington  Lalonde of South Burlington  Potter of Clarendon
Deen of Westminster  Lanpher of Vergennes  Pugh of South Burlington
Donovan of Burlington  Lenes of Shelburne  Rachelson of Burlington
Lippert of Hinesburg  Ram of Burlington
Russell of Rutland City *  
Ryerson of Randolph  
Sharpe of Bristol  
Sheldon of Middlebury  
Sibili of Dover *  
Stevens of Waterbury  
Stuart of Brattleboro  
Sullivan of Burlington  
Sweaney of Windsor  
Till of Jericho  
Toleno of Brattleboro  
Toll of Danville *  
Townsend of South  
Trieb of Rockingham  
Troiano of Stannard  
Walz of Barre City  
Webb of Shelburne  
Wood of Waterbury  
Woodward of Johnson  
Yantachka of Charlotte  
Zagar of Barnard

Those who voted in the negative are:

Bancroft of Westford *  
Baser of Bristol  
Beck of St. Johnsbury  
Beyor of Highgate  
Branagan of Georgia  
Browning of Arlington  
Burditt of West Rutland  
Canfield of Fair Haven  
Cupoli of Rutland City *  
Dame of Essex  
Devereux of Mount Holly  
Dickinson of St. Albans Town  
Donahue of Northfield  
Eastman of Orwell  
Feltus of Lyndon  
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  
Komline of Dorset  
LaClair of Barre Town  
Lawrence of Lyndon  
Lefebvre of Newark  
Lewis of Berlin  
Martel of Waterford  
McCoy of Poultney  
McFaun of Barre Town  
Myers of Essex  
Parent of St. Albans Town  
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 *  
Terenzini of Rutland Town  
Turner of Milton *  
Van Wyck of Ferrisburgh  
Viens of Newport City *  
Willhoit of St. Johnsbury  
Wright of Burlington

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

Batchelor of Derby  
Christie of Hartford  
Gonzalez of Winooski  
Marcotte of Coventry  
Shaw of Derby  
Tate of Mendon

Rep. Bancroft of Westford explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

This budget does not fulfill our responsibility, as elected legislators, to put the state on the path to fiscal health. On the contrary, it will continue the reckless and unsustainable cycle of spending beyond Vermont’s means.

Increasing new spending by $58 million (for the General fund alone) and creating an ongoing budget gap of over $30 million does not serve the people of Vermont. As a consequence, I cannot support the passing of this bill in good conscience.”

Rep. Connor of Fairfield explained his vote as follows:
“Mr. Speaker:

I rise to recognize and thank sincerely the two money committees, House Appropriations and Ways and Means, for their due diligence and process and transparency in developing and funding our state government. So very many of my constituents rely on a host of programming to live with dignity and purpose.

There are programs that, if I had a choice, I might be inclined to not support. However, my constituents, be them Progressives, Independents, Republicans or Democrats, have asked that I look forward to being inclusive for all Vermonters.”

**Rep. Cupoli of Rutland City** explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

Vermonters deserve to live in a fiscally sound state that boasts employment growth and economic vitality.

You don’t have to be an economist to understand that raising taxes and fees by 48 million dollars is not the way to achieve that goal. I cannot enable the continuation of this crisis and I vote no.”

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

‘Mr. Speaker:

I would like to thank the Appropriations committee for reversing and almost decade-long trend by taking an important step to invest in Vermont public higher education. The increase in support to the Vermont State Colleges is a strong signal that the body recognizes the importance of higher education to our future economy and workforce.

This budget begins to take pressure off tuition increases for students at Castleton, Johnson, Lyndon, Vermont Tech and Community College, the schools where Vermonters go to college, mostly supporting the regional economies outside of Chittenden County. This is an important, long overdue, and more than symbolic action.”

**Rep. Miller of Shaftsbury** explained her vote as follows:

“The 1st veteran was admitted to the Veteran’s Home in 1887. Today it is governed by the Vermont Veterans’ Home Board of Trustees.

The Home has 130 beds, 190 employees. They received 5 out of 5 stars for the excellence of their staff.
The veterans at the Home provide long term care, short term rehabilitation, Alzheimer’s/dementia care, respite care, hospice/palliative care, residential/domicile care and out-patient rehabilitation services.

The Veterans at the Home served in one of the following wars: World War II, Korean, Vietnam, Gulf War.

The veterans and their families, the staff, administration, the community and region appreciate the Appropriations committee’s support of the Home.”

Rep. Pearson of Burlington explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

Austerity budgets do not get my support because they are regressive budgets. They hurt working families and exacerbate poverty. This budget on the other hand makes responsible investments, stimulates the economy, trims the fat, and strengthens the safety net. I vote for this bill with appreciation.”

Rep. Russell of Rutland City explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

I thank the Appropriations committee for their thorough work and eye toward cautious fiscal policy.

My ‘yes’ vote includes support for Vermont Public Television which has been enjoyed for years by my constituents in Rutland.”

Rep. Sibilia of Dover explained her vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

I campaigned and arrived for my first biennium deeply concerned about the relationship between Vermont’s revenues and Vermont’s budget. I am still concerned. However, I believe there are not an abundance of easy or inconsequential choices to cut in front of us.

I voted to support this budget process, the inclusivity extended to the public and all members of the House, the commitment to examining each aspect of the budget to assess if it was serving Vermonterers and how well, and the request for all committees to examine the programs within their jurisdiction and prioritize them. I voted for this budget because of the process and progress I believe the committee is making. Clearly there is still work to do. And clearly a budget needs to be paid for.

My vote on the tax bill this afternoon reflects lingering specific concerns I have with some of the specific tax increases. I am hopeful with amendments those concerns may be alleviated.”
Rep. Strong of Albany explained her vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

As we look to ways to curb the opiate epidemic in our state, and the ever increasing costs to our budget to deal with that burden, I believe it is imperative to strengthen programs that help families to stay together and become healthier and function well. The Parent Child Centers have been level funded for 20 years, and these centers provide much needed prevention services that can save us money in the long run. Thank you.”

Rep. Toll Danville explained her vote as follows:

“This state budget is the responsibility of every member of this chamber. Where was your voice and your thoughts when asked to participate and be heard? Silence is not acceptable.”

Rep. Turner of Milton explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

The majority promised to propose a budget that would start bending the curve on spending this year. The House Republican Caucus is committed to preserving a much brighter financial future for Vermont, and we introduced numerous bills in support of this goal. Disappointingly, you have ignored our cost-cutting measures and decided against making the difficult yet crucial choice to rein in spending.

By increasing general fund spending by 4% or $58.8 million even though the revenue is projected to grow at a mere 2.2%, this budget will perpetuate the state’s budget problems. The projected budget gap will be in excess of $30 million for next year. Therefore, I cannot endorse an appropriations bill that will dig even deeper in the pockets of Vermonters to sustain the overspending crisis of the state government.”

Rep. Viens of Newport City explained his vote as follows:

“Mr. Speaker:

Montpelier is trapped in a quicksand of prodigality. Over the last 5 years, General Fund spending alone has grown at an average of 4.5%. Instead of focusing on generating revenue through strong fiscal policies, this budget proposal intends to fund the growth of government and ideological pet projects by taxing Vermonters even further. I remain committed to making Vermont affordable and giving Vermonters a much deserved financial break. As a consequence, I cannot support this bill.”
Action on Bill Postponed

H. 853

House bill, entitled

An act relating to setting the nonresidential property tax rate, the property dollar equivalent yield, and the income dollar equivalent yield for fiscal year 2017, and other education changes

Was taken up and pending second reading of the bill, on motion of Rep. Sharpe of Bristol, action on the bill was postponed until Tuesday, March 29, 2016.

Action on Bill Postponed

H. 859

House bill, entitled

An act relating to special education

Was taken up and pending second reading of the bill, on motion of Rep. Long of Newfane, action on the bill was postponed until the next legislative day.

Action on Bill Postponed

H. 519

House bill, entitled

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

Was taken up and pending the reading second reading of the bill, on motion of Rep. Lewis of Berlin, action on the bill was postponed until the next legislative day.

Bill Referred to Committee on Appropriations

H. 876

House bill, entitled

An act relating to the transportation capital program and miscellaneous changes to transportation-related law
Appearing on the Calendar, carrying an appropriation, under rule 35a, was referred to the committee on Appropriations.

Adjournment

At nine o'clock and four minutes in the evening, on motion of Rep. Turner of Milton, the House adjourned until tomorrow at one o'clock in the afternoon.