

**From:** Todd Bailey [<mailto:todd@leoninepublicaffairs.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 18, 2018 1:53 PM  
**To:** Maria Royle  
**Cc:** Bill Botzow; Michael Marcotte; Charlie Kimbell  
**Subject:** Lyft proposed edits (H.143)

All,

The team at Lyft had the opportunity to review the latest draft. They had some areas that they'd like to suggest technical changes to the current language (notes on each below).

I've attached a red line version for your to review.

There is also one substantive change they are asking be considered which has to do with the preemption language. The proposed edits are included in the attached version as well.

I'll be in committee tomorrow to address questions you may have.

Thank you

Todd

Pg 3, Line 8 - 9. We added necessary exemption from being treated as a common carrier, contract carrier, or motor carrier. This is standard in other markets.

Pg 10, Lines 10 - 16. edits that we think make it more operational

Pg 12, Lines 8-10; 18-20. Made some editing changes. Specifically 18-20, it was ambiguous and would have made compliance difficult from Lyft's perspective

Pg 15, Lines 7-19. Strengthened the preemption language to make this statewide bill work. As currently written, it would allow for municipalities to potentially write more restrictive language. we also reduced the carve out for Burlington from 4 to 2 given that this bill would essentially create two classes of drivers since Burlington has a different compliance checklist that the current law is requiring. Again, given the geographic size of Vermont, without a stronger preemption clause, it would defeat the purpose of a statewide bill if Burlington has 4yrs to operate differently than the rest of the state.