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


**Devotional Exercises**

Devotional exercises were conducted by Rep. David Potter of Clarendon.

**Bill Referred to Committee on Appropriations**

S. 131

Senate bill, entitled

An act relating to insurance and securities

Appearing on the Calendar, carrying an appropriation, under rule 35(a), was referred to the committee on Appropriations.

**Third Reading; Bill Passed in Concurrence**

with Proposal of Amendment

S. 40

Senate bill, entitled

An act relating to testing and remediation of lead in the drinking water of schools and child care facilities

Was taken up and pending third reading of the bill, **Rep. Burditt of West Rutland** moved to propose to the Senate to amend the bill as follows:

By adding a Sec. 5b to read as follows:

Sec. 5b. ANR REPORT ON TESTING OF CONTAMINANTS OF EMERGING CONCERN

(a) Findings. The General Assembly finds that:

(1) Contaminants of emerging concern (CECs) are increasingly being detected in surface waters, public water supplies, and effluent from wastewater treatment facilities.

(2) Recent studies have shown that some CECs can act as endocrine disruptors for humans and wildlife, disrupting normal hormone function and producing effects at the parts per billion or parts per trillion level.
(3) Many CECs do not break down, or they persist in the environment for a very long time, especially in water, and consequently, CECs can be found in many bodies of water and in the blood of humans and wildlife.

(4) Most CECs are not regulated under federal or State drinking water standards.

(5) To protect the health of Vermonters and prevent future degradation of the environment, the State should require the Secretary of Natural Resources to recommend to the General Assembly CECs that public water systems and other drinking water systems should be required to test.

(b) On or before January 15, 2020, the Secretary of Natural Resources shall submit to the General Assembly recommended CECs that the State should test for the presence of in drinking water. The recommendations shall:

(1) Summarize the basis for any recommendation, including how each recommendation will benefit the public health or the environment.

(2) Address, at a minimum, whether testing should be required for the following types or categories of CEC, and the reasons why:
   
   (A) phthalates;
   
   (B) bisphenol A;
   
   (C) perfluoroalkyl, polyfluoroalkyl substances, and other perfluorinated chemicals;
   
   (D) arsenic;
   
   (E) brominated, chlorinated, or other types of flame retardants;
   
   (F) glycol;
   
   (G) dioxins; and
   
   (H) mercury.

(3) If State or federal law already requires a public water system to test for a CEC, propose whether testing should be required in locations, such as schools or hospitals, where sensitive populations, such as children, pregnant women, or the elderly, may be present.

Thereupon, Rep. Burditt of West Rutland asked and was granted leave of the House to withdraw the amendment.

Thereupon, pending third reading of the bill, Rep. Shaw of Pittsford moved to propose to the Senate to amend the bill as follows:

In Sec. 1, 18 V.S.A. § 1244, in subdivision (2), after “performed” and before the “;”, by inserting the following: , provided that if an alternative
water source cannot be provided from another outlet in the building or facility, the Department of Health shall pay for the costs of any containerized, bottled, or packaged drinking water provided to the occupants of the building or facility.

Thereupon Rep. Shaw of Pittsford asked and was granted leave of the House to withdraw the amendment. Thereupon, the bill was read the third time.

Pending the question, Shall the bill pass in concurrence with proposal of amendment? Rep. Webb of Shelburne 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 in concurrence with proposal of amendment? was decided in the affirmative. Yeas, 138. Nays, 3.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Ancel of Calais        Gamache of Swanton        Nicoll of Ludlow
Anthony of Barre City  Gannon of Wilmington   Norris of Shoreham
Austin of Colchester   Gardner of Richmond     Notte of Rutland City
Bancroft of Westford   Giambatista of Essex     Noyes of Wolcott
Bartholomew of Hartland Goslant of Northfield   O'Brien of Tunbridge
Batchelor of Derby     Grad of Moretown         Ode of Burlington
Bates of Bennington    Graham of Williamstown   O'Sullivan of Burlington
Beck of St. Johnsbury  Gregoire of Fairfield    Page of Newport City
Birong of Vergennes    Haas of Rochester        Pajala of Londonderry
Bock of Chester       Hango of Berkshire        Palasik of Milton
Brennan of Colchester  Harrison of Chittenden   Patt of Worcester
Briglin of Thetford    Hashim of Dummerston     Potter of Clarendon
Brownell of Pownal     Helm of Fair Haven       Rachelson of Burlington
Browning of Arlington  Higley of Lowell         Ralph of Hartland
Brumsted of Shelburne  Hooper of Montpelier      Redmond of Essex
Burditt of West Rutland Hooper of Randolph       Rogers of Waterville
Burke of Brattleboro   Hooper of Burlington      Rosenquist of Georgia
Campbell of St. Johnsbury Houghton of Essex      Savage of Swanton
Canfield of Fair Haven  Howard of Rutland City   Schu of Middlebury
Carroll of Bennington  James of Manchester       Scheuermann of Stowe
Chase of Colchester    Jerome of Brandon          Shaw of Pittsford
Chesnut-Tangeman of Jickling of Randolph         Sheldon of Middlebury
Middletown Springs
Christensen of Weathersfield Killacky of South Burlington Smith of Derby
Christie of Hartford   Kimbell of Woodstock      Smith of New Haven
Cina of Burlington    Kitzmiller of Montpelier   Squirrell of Underhill
Coffey of Guilford    Kornheiser of Brattleboro  Stevens of Waterbury
Colburn of Burlington  LaClair of Barre Town     Strong of Albany
Colston of Winooski    LaLonde of South          Sullivan of Dorset
Conlon of Cornwall     Burlington                  Sullivan of Burlington
Conquest of Newbury    Lanpher of Vergennes     Szott of Barnard
Copeland-Hanzas of Lefebvre of Newark              Terenzini of Rutland Town
Bradford               Leffler of Enosburgh      Till of Jericho
Corcoran of Bennington  Lippert of Hinesburg  Toleno of Brattleboro
Cordes of Lincoln  Long of Newfane  Toll of Danville
Cupoli of Rutland City  Macaig of Williston  Toof of St. Albans Town
Demrow of Corinth  Marcotte of Coventry  Townsend of South
Dickinson of St. Albans  Masland of Thetford  Burlington
Town  Mattos of Milton  Troiano of Stannard
Dolan of Waitsfield  McCarthy of St. Albans City  Walz of Barre City
Donahue of Northfield  McCormack of Burlington  Webb of Shelburne *
Donovan of Burlington  McCoy of Poultney  White of Hartford
Durfee of Shaftsbury  McCullough of Williston  Wood of Waterbury
Elder of Starksboro  McFaun of Barre Town  Yacovone of Morristown
Emmons of Springfield  Morgan of Milton  Yantachka of Charlotte
Fagan of Rutland City  Morrissey of Bennington  Young of Greensboro
Fegard of Berkshire  Mrowicki of Putney
Feltus of Lyndon  Murphy of Fairfax  Myers of Essex

Those who voted in the negative are:
Seymour of Sutton  Taylor of Colchester  Trieber of Rockingham *

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:
Gonzalez of Winooski  Martel of Waterford  Quimby of Concord
Hill of Wolcott  Partridge of Windham
Johnson of South Hero  Pugh of South Burlington

Rep. Trieber of Rockingham explained his vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

The question before us is not should we protect our children from lead; of course we should. The question is, rather, how to pay for it. The longer we continue to funnel General Funds into education costs, thereby obscuring the actual cost of education from Vermonters, the more we delay the inevitable conclusion that our grand experiment of education funding is nothing more than an abject failure.”

Rep. Webb of Shelburne explained her vote as follows:

“Madam Speaker:

With the passage of this bill, Vermont will have the lowest mandatory action level in the country with one of the most health-protective remediation plans and supports.”

Third Reading; Bill Passed in Concurrence
With Proposal of Amendment
S. 43

Senate bill, entitled
An act relating to prohibiting prior authorization requirements for medication-assisted treatment

Was taken up, read the third time and passed in concurrence with proposal of amendment.

Recess

At two o'clock and three minutes in the afternoon, the Speaker declared a recess until the fall of the gavel.

At two o'clock and twelve minutes in the afternoon, the Speaker called the House to order.

Third Reading; Bill Passed in Concurrence
With Proposal of Amendment

S. 133

Senate bill, entitled
An act relating to juvenile jurisdiction

Was taken up, read the third time and passed in concurrence with proposal of amendment.

Third Reading; Resolution Passed in Concurrence

J.R.S. 13

Senate resolution, entitled
Joint resolution authorizing the Commissioner of Forests, Parks and Recreation to amend the Department’s lease with the Okemo Limited Liability Company and to authorize a conveyance of Woodchuck Mountain in Newbury as an alternative to the conveyance authorized in 2002 Acts and Resolves No. 149, Sec. 83(a)(3)

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

Action on Bill Postponed

H. 133

House bill, entitled
An act relating to miscellaneous energy subjects

Was taken up and pending consideration of the Senate proposal of amendment, on motion of Rep. Patt of Worcester, action on the bill was postponed until May 7, 2019.
Senate Proposal of Amendment Concurred in

H. 526

The Senate proposed to the House to amend House bill, entitled

An act relating to town clerk recording fees and town restoration and preservation reserve funds

The Senate proposes to the House to amend the bill as follows:

First: In Sec. 9, 24 V.S.A. § 1159, subdivision (a)(2), immediately following the words “certificate of the date” by inserting the words and time

Second: In Sec. 9, 24 V.S.A. § 1159, subsection (b), immediately following the words “and the date” by inserting the words and time

Which proposal of amendment was considered and concurred in.

Adjournment

At two o'clock and twenty minutes in the afternoon, on motion of Rep. McCoy of Poultney, the House adjourned until tomorrow at nine o'clock and thirty minutes in the forenoon.