



TO: House and Senate Committees on Judiciary

FROM: Hon. Thomas Zonay, Chair
Commission on Sentencing Disparities and Criminal Code Reclassification
("Sentencing Commission")

RE: Sentencing Commission Report pursuant to Act 142 (2018), *An act relating to establishing the Commission on Sentencing Disparities and Criminal Code Reclassification*

DATE: November 27, 2019

Executive Summary

In 2018, the Vermont General Assembly passed Act No. 142 reconstituting the Vermont Sentencing Commission for the express purpose of overseeing criminal sentencing practices in the State, reducing geographical disparities in sentencing, and making recommendations regarding criminal sentencing to the General Assembly. As of the submission of this report, the Commission has met 11 times to discuss and formulate recommendations relating to the specific charges included in the enabling legislation. The Commission recommends the following:

Recommendations Regarding Classification of Criminal Offenses

The Commission recommends enactment of legislation consistent with its interim proposal on Classification submitted on March 21, 2019 as to the scheme for sentences to imprisonment. The Commission will follow-up with a classification scheme as to fines at a later date following further review. See Attachment A.

The Commission recommends enactment of legislation consistent with its attached proposal on classification of sexual offenses. See Attachment B.

The Commission recommends enactment of legislation consistent with its attached proposal on classification of property crimes. See Attachment C.

Additional Recommendations

The Commission recommends expanding and fully funding the alternative justice options already in existence, such as Diversion, Tamarack, and drug treatments courts.

The Commission recommends that the Legislature consider the merits of permitting a judge to send a case to Diversion or Tamarack in a manner consistent with constitutional separation of powers and established procedures from other jurisdictions.

The Commission recommends establishing consistent statewide criteria for drug treatment court eligibility and standard practices for referrals.

The Commission recommends that the Legislature re-examine the various possession thresholds in Title 18, Chapter 84 and consider increasing the weight and/or dosage upper limits for misdemeanor possession crimes to better reflect current personal use amounts.

The Commission recommends enactment of legislation consistent with its attached proposal on amending 33 V.S.A. § 5204a. See Attachment D.

The Commission has identified additional issues that require further consideration and analysis. The Commission intends to make recommendations in a supplemental report to the General Assembly on or before November 30, 2020 with respect to the following:

the classification of additional crimes beyond sexual and property crimes;

the decriminalization of some or all fine-only offenses and the transferal of them to the Judicial Bureau for consideration as civil offenses;

the development of a classification scheme for all fines; and

the reconciliation of categories of crimes within existing Vermont statutes, to include listed crimes and designated crimes.

Report Requirements

The Vermont General Assembly, through Act No. 142 (2018), *An act relating to establishing the Commission on Sentencing Disparities and Criminal Code Reclassification*, reconstituted the Commission on Sentencing Disparities and Criminal Code Reclassification (“Sentencing Commission” or “Commission”). The enabling legislation directs the Sentencing Commission to develop responses to the significant impacts that increased opioid addiction have had on the criminal justice system. Specifically, the enabling legislation requires the Commission to consider:

- (1) whether and under what circumstances offenses committed as a result of opioid addiction should be classified as civil rather than criminal offenses;
- (2) whether the possession or sale of specific, lesser amounts of opioids and other regulated drugs should be classified as civil rather than criminal offenses;
- (3) how to maximize treatment for offenders as a response to offenses committed as a result of opioid addiction.

Section 3 of Act 142 further directs the Sentencing Commission to develop a classification system that creates categories of criminal offenses on the basis of the maximum potential period of imprisonment and the maximum potential fine. In developing this classification system, the Commission shall consider whether the existing statutory penalties for the offense are appropriate or in need of adjustment better to reflect prevailing average sentencing practices and the effective uses of criminal punishment. Unless there is a compelling rationale, the Commission shall not propose establishing new mandatory minimum sentences or increasing existing minimum or maximum sentences. Finally, as part of the classification proposal, the enabling legislation directs the Commission to consider whether to propose:

- (1) rules of statutory interpretation specifically for criminal provisions;
- (2) the consistent use of *mens rea* terminology in all criminal provisions;
- (3) a comprehensive section of definitions applicable to all criminal provisions;
- (4) the decriminalization of some or all fine-only offenses and the transferal of them to the Judicial Bureau for consideration as civil offenses; and
- (5) a redefinition of what constitutes an attempt in Vermont criminal law, including whether the Model Penal Code’s definition of attempt should be adopted in Vermont.

Act 40 (2019), *An act relating to miscellaneous court and Judiciary related amendments*, directs the Sentencing Commission, on or before December 15, 2019, to propose alternatives, in light of 33 V.S.A. § 5204a, for providing the court with jurisdiction over cases where a person under 18 years of age commits a criminal offense that is not a listed crime under 13 V.S.A. § 5301(7) and is not charged with the offense until after turning 18 years of age. The report required under Act 40 is included herein as Attachment D.

Act 32 (2019), *An act relating to sealing and expungement of criminal records*, directs the Sentencing Commission to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the statutes governing the expungement and sealing of criminal history records in Vermont, including reviewing the crimes eligible for expungement or sealing, the process by which criminal history records are expunged or sealed, the mechanism by which expunged or sealed records are indexed, and the effect of sealing or expungement. The report required pursuant to Act 32 regarding expungement was timely submitted as directed by the legislation.

Background on Sentencing Commission

The enabling legislation set forth individual titles of certain persons who would serve on the Sentencing Commission, as well as certain entities which would make appointments. At its initial meeting on August 7, 2018, Chief Justice Paul Reiber appointed Judge Thomas A. Zonay to serve as Chair of the Commission and Rebecca Turner to serve as Vice-chair. The other members of the Commission were: Chief Superior Judge Brian Grearson, Judge John Treadwell, Senator Richard Sears, Representative Martin LaLonde, David Scherr on behalf of the Attorney General, Defender General Matthew Valerio, Executive Director of the Department of State's Attorneys and Sheriffs John Campbell, Deputy Defender General Marshall Pahl, Windsor County State's Attorney David Cahill, Vermont Bar Association appointee Jordana Levine, Commissioner Lisa Menard¹, Commissioner Thomas Anderson², Executive Director of the Vermont Center for Crime Victim Services Chris Fenno³, and Executive Director of the Vermont Crime Research Group Karen Gennette.

The Sentencing Commission has met 11 times as of the submission of this Report. In addition to reviewing materials provided to it at its meetings, the Sentencing Commission also heard from Judge Michael Kainen. Judge Kainen had been the Executive Director of the prior iteration of the Sentencing Commission. He provided the Commission with his insight into the work of the prior Sentencing Commission and identified where, in his assessment, issues arose that prevented the prior Commission from being able to operate effectively.

In order to most efficiently evaluate the questions and issues it needed to address, the Sentencing Commission concluded that it would be appropriate to appoint committees to address identified tasks and to report back to the full Commission. In furtherance of this determination, Judge Zonay created three committees and apportioned assignments to each as follows:

¹ Currently Monica Weeber serves on the Commission as the designee for the Commissioner of the Department of Corrections.

² Currently Commissioner Michael Shirling serves on the Commission.

³ Currently Elaine Boyce serves on the Commission as the designee for the Executive Director of the Vermont Center for Crime Victim Services.

Committee A:

Whether and under what circumstances offenses committed as a result of opioid addiction should be classified as civil rather than criminal offenses (13 V.S.A. § 5452(c)(1));

Whether the possession or sale of specific, lesser amounts of opioids and other regulated drugs should be classified as civil rather than criminal offenses (13 V.S.A. § 5452(c)(2)); and

Decriminalization of some or all fine-only offenses and the transferal of them to the Judicial Bureau for consideration as civil offenses (Act 142, Sec. 3, § 4(D)).

Committee B:

How to maximize treatment for offenders as a response to offenses committed as a result of addiction (13 V.S.A. § 5452(c)(3)).

Committee C:

Review existing sentencing law and practice to determine whether statutory penalties are appropriate and to address sentencing classification. Also, except for decriminalization under Sec. 3, § 4(D), address the matters identified in Sec. 3, § 4 of enabling legislation.

Findings and Recommendations

1. Whether and under what circumstances offenses committed as a result of opioid addiction should be classified as civil rather than criminal offenses

In considering its charge on this question, the Sentencing Commission, through Committee A, reviewed multiple datasets from the Crime Research Group (CRG) and DOC. CRG data included the following: (1) “Other Charges Filed with Drug Charges 2014-2017,” and (2) “Misdemeanor drug charges referred to diversion statewide 2014-2017.” DOC data relating to incarcerated individuals on the opiate withdrawal scale and those diagnosed with opioid use disorder (OUD) were also reviewed.

The Commission further considered whether it was feasible to create a process to determine (1) whether an offense was committed “as a result of opioid addiction,” and (2) for those offenses determined to have resulted from an opioid addiction whether the offense should then be considered a civil offense.

With respect to the first question, Committee A identified two ways a criminal offense of any nature could be determined to have been “committed as a result of opioid addiction.” First, the State’s Attorney at the charging stage could determine the offense was “committed as a result of opioid addiction” and file a civil rather than a criminal charge (assuming a civil offense is available). Second, the criminal rules could be amended—or a statute enacted—to provide a defendant the right to have a judicial determination of whether an offense was “committed as a result of opioid addiction.” That is, the court would hold an evidentiary hearing to determine whether the charged criminal offense or offenses were “committed as a result of opioid addiction.” Questions regarding the burden of proof in such a hearing (*e.g.*, preponderance or clear and convincing evidence) and who bears that burden would have to be determined either by rule or by case law in the absence of a statute.

In addition, Committee A noted that what is meant by “committed as a result of opioid addiction” would need to be further defined. Does the offense have to be *exclusively* committed as a result of opioid addiction or only *partially* motivated by addiction? The Commission believes that complete study of this question would require development and analysis of data that has not yet been collected.

Putting aside the potential constitutional and practical challenges of such a scheme, including those which could arise through carving out a specific class of drugs for special and more lenient treatment, the inevitable burdens such a process would place on an already overburdened criminal justice system must also be considered. It would seem highly probable that defendants who use opioids and are charged with a crime would seek to have his/her criminal offense transformed into a civil offense if that result were available.

For those cases in which a determination is made the offense was “committed as a result of opioid addiction,” there would then have to be a civil offense identified. “Civil” penalties often only involve the imposition of a fine. Thus, the Legislature could consider creating a single catch-all civil offense for any criminal case in which it is determined the offense was “committed as a result of opioid addiction” and set a specific fine amount or a fine range to be determined by the court based on the severity of the offense and other factors—*e.g.*, ability to pay. If appropriate, the Legislature also could consider other civil sanctions, as long as they do not actually amount to “punitive” criminal penalties. See United States v. Ward, 448 U.S. 242, 249 (1980) (“We turn then to consider whether Congress, despite its manifest intention to establish a civil, remedial mechanism, nevertheless provided for sanctions so punitive as to ‘transfor[m] what was clearly intended as a civil remedy into a criminal penalty.’” (citation omitted)); Town of Hinesburg v. Dunkling, 167 Vt. 514, 527 (Vt. 1998).

Alternatively, the Legislature could consider creating a parallel civil code for each criminal offense determined to have been “committed as a result of opioid addiction.” The Legislature would also have to determine whether a defendant has the right to a jury trial, a public defender, and what the State’s burden of proof would be once a criminal case becomes a proceeding involving a civil offense. In addition, the issue of repeat offenders would also need to be addressed and a determination be made as to whether second or subsequent civil offenses would result in criminal prosecution and the conduct would no longer qualify for treatment as a civil

matter. A further concern to be addressed relates to the potential collateral consequences even a civil finding may bring upon an individual.

One identified limitation of making historically criminal offenses civil offenses is the lack of sentencing alternatives for civil offenses like those currently available for criminal offenses. *See* 13 V.S.A. § 7030. Indeed, absent legislation expanding the sanctions for civil offenses to include some form of ongoing supervision or a civil commitment law for drug treatment, classifying criminal offenses committed as a result of opioid addiction as civil offenses may have undesired consequences. While an individual may not wind up with a criminal conviction, he/she is also unlikely to get help for his/her addiction and may pose an ongoing risk to the public.

Finally, the Commission noted that if the intent of this directive is to divert individuals addicted to opioids from the criminal justice system, Vermont currently has a variety of programs for doing so, including through deferred sentences, diversion, and drug treatment courts. These programs are designed to allow a defendant to avoid criminal liability, or reduce liability, provided he/she complies with various conditions, which often include participating in drug treatment. Developing methods to more fully utilize these programs and creating strategies that provide equal access to them should be fully explored and appear to be a more efficient means of achieving the goal of treating criminal offenses truly and solely motivated by opioid or other drug addiction as a public health issue.

Recommendation:

The Commission has not voted to recommend making offenses committed as the result of opioid addiction, or any other drug addition, be civil rather than criminal offenses.

The Commission recommends expanding and fully funding the alternative justice options already in existence, such as Diversion, Tamarack, and drug treatments courts. A majority of the Commission would also recommend that the Legislature consider the merits of permitting a judge to send a case to Diversion or Tamarack in a manner consistent with constitutional separation of powers and established procedures from other jurisdictions.

The Commission further recommends establishing consistent statewide criteria for drug treatment court eligibility and standard practices for referrals. As to this recommendation, the Commission believes that the development and implementation of drug treatment courts should be done on a statewide basis and not be delegated to the various counties to decide whether to implement such a program, thereby resulting in different opportunities and outcomes for people facing similar issues throughout the State.

2. Whether the possession or sale of specific, lesser amounts of opioids and other regulated drugs should be classified as civil rather than criminal offenses

As it pertains to Question 2, the Sentencing Commission reviewed other states' efforts at reclassification and "de-felonization" generally. Based on its review, the Commission did not identify any state that has reclassified offenses in the manner contemplated within Question 2. A Vermont Legislative Counsel report from 2017 similarly found that "[n]o U.S. state has taken the

step of decriminalizing illicit drugs other than marijuana.” However, it does appear that the issue of civil reclassification has come up in certain states—*e.g.*, Hawaii (a legislative report) and Maryland (a proposed bill)—without such reclassification ultimately being adopted in those states.

Although research has not yet uncovered other state efforts to reclassify sale or possession of drugs from criminal to civil offenses, the Commission is aware that other states have undertaken efforts to “de-felonize” offenses. Accordingly, although outside the scope of Question 2, the Commission reviewed an October 2018 report by the Urban Institute identifying five states that reclassified felony drug possession crimes as misdemeanors; according to the report, those state laws also share certain “policy details” (*e.g.*, weights not specified). The report identifies those states as Alaska, California, Connecticut, Oklahoma, and Utah. *Id.* at 5.

While no formal vote was taken on a specific “de-felonization” recommendation, members of the Sentencing Commission largely agree that the felony weight and/or dosage thresholds for many of the Title 18, Chapter 84 (Possession and Control of Regulated Drugs) crimes do not reflect current personal use estimates for a typical heavy user in Vermont.

Recommendation:

The Commission has not voted to recommend classifying the possession or sale of specific, lesser amounts of opioids and other regulated drugs as civil rather than criminal offenses.

The Legislature should re-examine possession thresholds in Title 18, Chapter 84 and consider increasing the weight and/or dosage upper limits for misdemeanor possession crimes to better reflect current personal use amounts.

3. How to maximize treatment for offenders as a response to offenses committed as a result of opioid addiction

Committee B sent out surveys and interviewed a number of local treatment providers to solicit their perspective on the barriers to accessing treatment. To date, Committee B has not presented any formal recommendations to the Sentencing Commission but will be working in conjunction with the Council for State Governments’ Justice Reinvestment team to develop specific recommendations with respect to this charge. As such, the Commission expects to be addressing this question as it continues its work moving forward.

4. Develop a classification system that creates categories of criminal offenses on the basis of the maximum potential period of imprisonment and the maximum potential fine

The Sentencing Commission considered a proposal to classify *all* existing criminal offenses into a scheme consistent with the recommendations set forth in the Act 61 Criminal Code Reclassification Final Report of July 2015.⁴ The Commission subsequently reviewed and

⁴http://www.crgvt.org/uploads/5/2/2/2/52222091/act_61_reclassification_of_the_criminal_code_final_report.pdf

approved a proposal to automatically classify all existing crimes based on this classification scheme. On March 21, 2019, this proposal was sent to the Chairs of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees as an interim Proposal for Legislation. A copy of the proposal is attached hereto as Attachment A.

In developing the proposal, the Commission worked to ensure that it was generally consistent with the direction provided in Act 148 that no maximum terms be increased. As drafted, the proposal incorporated an effective date of July 1, 2020.

As discussed herein in Section 5, the Commission has also considered proposed amendments to classification of certain categories of existing offenses. In considering the classification of these offenses, the Commission applied the proposed classification scheme. Further details of those results as they relate to changes to sentences of imprisonment are discussed in Section 5. When the Commission applied the proposed classification scheme as to fines, it realized that fines would be increased across the board and sometimes substantially. Concerns were raised about the universal increase in fines that this classification scheme would result in, a stark departure from current penalties without any attendant compelling rationale for such an increase consistent with effective uses of criminal punishment.

Recommendation:

The Commission recommends enactment of legislation consistent with its interim proposal on Classification submitted on March 21, 2019 as to the scheme for sentences to imprisonment attached hereto as Attachment A. The Commission will follow-up with a classification scheme as to fines at a later date following further review.

5. Propose legislation that places each of Vermont’s criminal statutes into one of the classification offense categories it identifies

In working with the Crime Research Group tableau showing historical data on all criminal statutes charged in Vermont and the distribution of their actual sentences delineated by county, the Sentencing Commission identified four broad categories of offenses—sexual offenses, property offenses, motor vehicle offenses, and crimes against persons. The Commission then reviewed each offense and associated statutory penalty (and actual sentence imposed) within these categories to determine how they should be classified in the proposed classification structure.

The Commission has addressed and voted upon two classification categories, to wit: Sexual Offenses and Property Crimes. The Commission has begun to address, and intends to continue to address, and make future recommendations, as to the classification categories of motor vehicle offenses and crimes against persons.

(A) Sexual Offenses

As it pertains to the classification of sexual offenses, the Sentencing Commission voted to recommend the proposed classification structure attached hereto as Attachment B.

(B) Property Crimes

As it pertains to the classification of property crimes, the Sentencing Commission recommends on a vote of 8-6 a classification proposal that creates tiers of offenses based on the dollar amount of amount of damage or harm. A copy of this proposal is attached hereto as Attachment C.

This proposal reduces the maximum potential penalty for the vast majority of property offenses compared to the *status quo*, including “de-felonizing” a large number of current property crimes where the harm or damage is below \$10,000. The proposal does, however, include recommended increases in the current penalties for a small number of crimes. The rationale for the increases was to create consistency among penalties for overlapping offenses, such as credit card fraud and false pretenses.

Concerns were raised about the proposed increases and that the stated rationale was not compelling. The view by some Commission members was that a general lack of consideration of “the effective uses of criminal punishment” in developing this proposal resulted in arbitrary proposals to increase penalties, which may have the contrary effect intended by the enabling legislation and actually aggravate the problem.

The Commission voted 8-6 to recommend the property crime classification proposal with the uniform subsequent offense enhancement scheme removed and explicitly note for the Legislature the offenses where the potential sentence increased under the proposal. These increases are identified in the highlighted portions of Attachment C.

The following members voted in the affirmative: Chief Judge Brian Grearson, Judge John Treadwell, Martin LaLonde, Elaine Boyce, John Campbell, David Cahill, Michael Schirling, and David Scherr. The following members voted in the negative: Karen Gennette, Monica Weeber, Matthew Valerio, Marshall Pahl, Rebecca Turner, and Jordana Levine. Judge Thomas Zonay abstained.

Recommendation:

The majority of the Commission recommends enactment of legislation consistent with its attached proposals on Classification of sexual offenses and property crimes as appended hereto as Attachment B and Attachment C.

6. Consideration of whether to propose:

(A) rules of statutory interpretation specifically for criminal provisions

The Commission recommends that the rules of statutory interpretation remain unchanged. The rules of interpretation that apply specifically to penal statutes are well-understood and there is a

substantial body of precedential law that exists. *See, e.g., State v. Brunner*, 2014 VT 62, ¶ 11 (“Under the rule of lenity, we resolve ambiguity in statutory language in favor of the defendant but will not apply the rule if the statute is clear and unambiguous”).

(B) the consistent use of *mens rea* terminology in all criminal provisions

The Commission supports the use of consistent *mens rea* terminology in enacting and amending criminal statutes. Thus, where terms have substantially identical meanings such as “intentionally,” “purposely” and “willfully,” the Committee suggests that only one of the terms be used. *See State v. Jackowski*, 2006 VT 119 (discussing the similarity of these terms).

All criminal statute should expressly include the necessary culpable mental state. Newly enacted laws should, thus, include the necessary mental state. Additionally, where the Vermont Supreme Court has interpreted a statute to include an unstated *mens rea*, the statute should be amended to explicitly state that mental state.

(C) a comprehensive section of definitions applicable to all criminal provisions

The Commission supports the use of consistent terminology by the Legislature in enacting and amending criminal statutes. Where terms or phrases are defined by statute that there be an explicit reference to the statutory definition. *See, e.g., 13 V.S.A. § 1021(a)(2)* (defining serious bodily injury). The Commission recommends discouraging the use of undefined terms or phrases particularly if those terms are similar to existing defined terms.

(D) the decriminalization of some or all fine-only offenses and the transferal of them to the Judicial Bureau for consideration as civil offenses

The Commission is currently reviewing the list of fine-only offenses as developed by CRG with a focus on archaic offenses and offenses that have not been charged within the past ten years. In consultation with interested agencies the Commission intends to develop recommendations to repeal, decriminalize or keep each fine-only offense.

(E) a redefinition of what constitutes an attempt in Vermont criminal law, including whether the Model Penal Code’s definition of attempt should be adopted in Vermont

The Commission concluded that the concept of attempt is well understood in Vermont law and is distinguishable from the Model Penal Code definition. An amendment is not warranted under the current state of the law in Vermont.

7. Providing jurisdiction over cases where a person under 18 years of age commits a criminal offense that is not a listed crime under 13 V.S.A. § 5301(7) and is not charged with the offense until after turning 18 years of age

Under current law, neither the Family Division nor the Criminal Division of the Superior Court maintains jurisdiction over individuals who commit crimes—other than those listed in 13 V.S.A. § 5301 or in 33 V.S.A. § 5402(a)—prior to obtaining eighteen years of age but are not charged until after obtaining eighteen years of age. The Commission reviewed and adopted on a unanimous vote a recommendation to extend the jurisdiction of the Family Division over such individuals until their twentieth birthday so long as charges are filed before their nineteenth birthday and the crime was committed when the offender was at least seventeen years of age. A copy of this recommended proposal is attached hereto as Attachment D.⁵

Recommendation:

The Commission recommends enactment of legislation consistent with its attached proposal on amending 33 V.S.A. § 5204a, as appended hereto as Attachment D.

8. Deferred Sentences

On February 9, 2019, the Commission sent an interim proposal to the Chairs of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees recommending the elimination of the 28-year old age limit for eligibility to receive a deferred sentence over the objection of a State’s Attorney under 13 V.S.A. § 7041. This recommendation was adopted into law pursuant to Section 18 of Act 77 (2019) and became effective on June 19, 2019.

Conclusion

With submission of this report, that Sentencing Commission has fulfilled its current statutory requirements. Section 5 of Act 142 repeals the statute creating the Vermont Sentencing Commission on July 1, 2021. As indicated herein, the Commission intends to continue its efforts to evaluate additional matters including:

- the classification of additional crimes beyond sexual and property crimes;
- the decriminalization of some or all fine-only offenses and the transferal of them to the Judicial Bureau for consideration as civil offenses;

⁵ It should be noted that this proposal will need to be amended when the jurisdiction of the Family Division is extended to include eighteen- and nineteen-year olds pursuant to Act 201 (2018).

the development of a classification scheme for all fines; and
the reconciliation of categories of crimes within existing Vermont
statutes, to include listed crimes and designated crimes.

The Commission anticipates making further recommendations in a supplemental report to the General Assembly regarding these issues on or before November 30, 2020. The Commission will gladly accept any additional requests from the Legislature until the repeal of the Sentencing Commission statutes takes effect.

Sec. 1. 1. Chapter 1 of Title 13 is amended as follows:

Subchapter 1 – Classification of Criminal Offenses

...

§ 1a. Classification of offenses

(a) All felonies shall be classified as follows: Class A, Class B, Class C, Class D, Class E.

(b) All misdemeanors shall be classified as follows: Class A, Class B, Class C, Class D,

Class E.

(c) Except as otherwise provided by law, for all offenses the court may impose a sentence of imprisonment, or a fine, or both.

§ 1b. Sentences of Imprisonment

(a) The maximum term of imprisonment for a felony shall be as follows:

(i) Class A: life imprisonment;

(ii) Class B: imprisonment for 25 years;

(iii) Class C: imprisonment for 10 years;

(iv) Class D: imprisonment for 5 years; and,

(v) Class E: imprisonment for 3 years.

(b) The maximum term of imprisonment for a misdemeanor shall be as follows:

(i) Class A: imprisonment for 2 years;

(ii) Class B: imprisonment for 1 year;

(iii) Class C: imprisonment for 6 months;

(iv) Class D: imprisonment for 30 days;

(v) Class E: no term of imprisonment.

(c) The minimum term of imprisonment for a felony or a misdemeanor shall be as provided by law.

(d) Any statutory or mandatory minimum or maximum term shall be as provided by law.

§ 1c. Fines

(a) Unless otherwise provided by law, the maximum fine for a felony shall be as follows:

(i) Class A: \$1,000,000.00;

(ii) Class B: \$500,000.00;

(iii) Class C: \$100,000.00;

(iv) Class D: \$50,000.00;

(v) Class E: \$25,000.00

(b) Unless otherwise provided by law, the maximum fine for a misdemeanor shall be follows:

(i) Class A: \$10,000.00;

(ii) Class B: \$5,000.00;

(iii) Class C: \$2,500.00;

(iv) Class D: \$1,000.00; and,

(v) Class E: \$500.00.

§ 1d. Transitional Provisions.

(a) Unless otherwise provided by law, criminal offenses shall be classified pursuant to existing statutory maximum penalties. Offenses shall be classified as follows:

(i) Felonies.

(A) All felonies presently punishable by a maximum term of life imprisonment shall be Class A felonies;

(B) All felonies punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of 25 years or more but less than life shall be Class B felonies;

(C) All felonies punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more but less than 25 years shall be Class C felonies;

(D) All felonies punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of 5 years or more but less than 10 years shall be Class D felonies; and,

(E) All felonies punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of less than 5 years shall be Class E felonies.

(ii) Misdemeanors.

(A) All misdemeanors presently punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of 2 years shall be Class A misdemeanors;

(B) All misdemeanors punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of 1 year or more but less than 2 years shall be Class B misdemeanors;

(C) All misdemeanors punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of 6 months or more but less than 12 months shall be Class C misdemeanors;

(D) All misdemeanors punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of 30 days or more but less than 6 months shall be Class D misdemeanors; and,

(E) All misdemeanors punishable by a fine and no term of imprisonment or a maximum term of imprisonment of less than 30 days shall be Class E misdemeanors.

(iii) Mandatory minimums. All minimum terms of imprisonment and minimum fines shall remain as provided by law.

(iv) Mandatory maximum terms. Where offenses presently have mandatory maximum terms set by statute, those maximum terms shall remain as provided by law consistent with the maximum term of the Class of the offense.

Sec. 2. Attempts

13 V.S.A. § 9 is amended as follows

...

(b) If the offense attempted to be committed is a felony other than those set forth in subsection (a) of this section, a person shall be punished by the less severe of the following punishments:

(1) ~~imprisonment for not more than 10 years or fined not more than \$10,000.00, or both~~ as a Class C felony; or

(2) as the offense attempted to be committed is by law punishable.

(c) If the offense attempted to be committed is a misdemeanor, a person shall be imprisoned or fined, or both, ~~in an amount not to exceed one-half the maximum penalty for which~~ as a misdemeanor at the Class one level lower than the offense so attempted to be committed is by law punishable.

Sec. 3. Effective Date. The effective date is July 1, 2020.

**Criminal Offense Classification Proposal – Sex Offenses
Draft – 2019-07-05**

Offense	Statute	Penalty	Automatic Classification	Proposal	Notes
Intermarriage of or fornication by persons prohibited to marry	13 VSA § 205	5 years/ \$1000/both	D felony	D felony	
Cruelty to Animals - sexual conduct with animals – first offense	13 VSA §§ 11(A)-(F) & 353(a)(1)	1 year/\$1000/both	B misdemeanor	B misdemeanor	
Cruelty to Animals - sexual conduct with animals – second or subsequent	13 VSA §§ 11(A)-(F) & 353(a)(1)	2 years/\$5000/both	A misdemeanor	A misdemeanor	
Cruelty to a child – subjected to sexual conduct	13 VSA § 1304(a)&(b)	10 years/\$20000/both	C felony	C felony	
Sexual abuse of a vulnerable adult – sexual activity	13 VSA § 1379(a)	2 years/\$10000/both	A misdemeanor	A misdemeanor	
Sexual abuse of a vulnerable adult – nonconsensual lewd conduct	13 VSA § 1379(b)&(c)(1)	5 years/\$10000/both	D felony	C felony	Status of victim is appropriate grounds for enhanced penalty - see 13 VSA § 2602
Sexual abuse of a vulnerable adult – nonconsensual sexual act	13 VSA § 1379(b)&(c)(2)	20 years/\$10000/both	C felony	A felony	Nonconsensual acts punished as life felonies The statute was enacted in 2005. The indeterminate life sentencing statute for sex

**Criminal Offense Classification Proposal – Sex Offenses
Draft – 2019-07-05**

					offenses was enacted in 2006. 13 V.S.A. § 3271.
Sexual abuse of a vulnerable adult – caregiver nonconsensual lewd conduct	13 VSA § 1379(b)&(d)(1)	7 years/\$10000/both	D felony	C felony	Elements include aggravating factors – consider mandatory minimum?
Sexual abuse of a vulnerable adult – caregiver nonconsensual sexual act	13 VSA § 1379(b)&(d)(2)	25 years/\$10000/both	B felony	A felony	Nonconsensual sexual acts punished as life felonies
Lewd and lascivious conduct	13 VSA § 2601	5 years/\$300/both	D felony	D felony	
Prohibited conduct – first offense	13 VSA § 2601a(a)&(b)(1)	1 year/\$300/both	B misdemeanor	B misdemeanor	
Prohibited conduct – second or subsequent	13 VSA § 2601a(a)&(b)(2)	2 years/\$1000/both	A misdemeanor	A misdemeanor	This is a recent enactment - but see 13 VSA 2632
Lewd or lascivious conduct with a child – first offense	13 VSA § 2602(a)(1)&(b)(1)	15 years/\$5000/both soft 2 year minimum	C felony	C felony	
Lewd or lascivious conduct with a child – second offense	13 VSA § 2602(a)(1)&(b)(2)	Life. \$25000 hard 5 year minimum with downward departure	A felony	A felony	
Lewd or lascivious conduct with a child – third or subsequent	13 VSA § 2602(a)(1)&(b)(3)	Life. \$25000 hard 10 year minimum with downward departure	A felony	A felony	

**Criminal Offense Classification Proposal – Sex Offenses
Draft – 2019-07-05**

Voyeurism – first offense	13 VSA § 2605(b)(d)(e)&(j)	2 years/\$1000/both	A misdemeanor	A misdemeanor	
Voyeurism – second or subsequent	13 VSA § 2605(b)(d)(e)&(j)	3 years/\$5000/both	E felony	E felony	
Voyeurism – disclose to 3 rd party	13 VSA § 2605(c)&(j)	5 years/\$5000/both	D felony	D felony	
Disclosure of sexually explicit images without consent	13 VSA § 2606(b)(1)	2 years/\$2000/both	A misdemeanor	A misdemeanor	
Disclosure of sexually explicit images without consent – for profit	13 VSA § 2606(b)(1)&(2)	5 years/\$10000/both	D felony	D felony	
Prostitution – first offense	13 VSA § 2632	1 year/\$100/both	B misdemeanor	B misdemeanor	
Prostitution – second or subsequent	13 VSA § 2632	3 years	E felony	A misdemeanor	See 13 VSA 2601a
Slave traffic	13 VSA § 2635	10 years/\$2000/both soft 2 year/\$200/both minimum	C felony	C felony	
Unlawful procurement	13 VSA § 2636	10 years/\$2000/both soft 2 year/\$200/both minimum	C felony	C felony	
Appropriating or levying upon earnings of prostitute	13 VSA § 2637	10 years/\$2000/both soft 2 year/\$200/both minimum	C felony	C felony	
Human trafficking – commercial sex act	13 VSA § 2652(a)(1)(2)(3)(4) &(b)	Life/\$500000/both	A felony	A felony	
Aggravated human trafficking	13 VSA § 2653	Life/\$100000/both soft 20 year minimum	A felony	A felony	

**Criminal Offense Classification Proposal – Sex Offenses
Draft – 2019-07-05**

Patronizing or facilitating human trafficking	13 VSA § 2654	5 years/\$100000/both	D felony	D felony	
Solicitation – commercial sex act	13 VSA § 2655	5 years/\$100000/both	D felony	D felony	
Disseminating indecent material to a minor in the presence of the minor	13 VSA § 2802 & 2807	1 year/\$1000/both	B misdemeanor	B misdemeanor	
Disseminating indecent material to a minor outside the presence of the minor	13 VSA § 2802a & 2807	1 year/\$1000/both	B misdemeanor	B misdemeanor	
Minor electronically disseminating indecent material to another person – adult in possession of disseminated materials	13 VSA § 2802b(a)(2)&(c)	6 months/\$300/both	C misdemeanor	C misdemeanor	
Distribution of indecent material	13 VSA § 2803 & 2807	1 year/\$1000/both	B misdemeanor	B misdemeanor	
Exhibition of motion pictures	13 VSA § 2804 & 2807	1 year/\$1000/both	B misdemeanor	B misdemeanor	
Publicly displaying sex or nudity for advertising purposes	13 VSA § 2804a & 2807	1 year/\$1000/both	B misdemeanor	B misdemeanor	
Displaying obscene materials to minors	13 VSA § 2804b & 2807	1 year/\$1000/both	B misdemeanor	B misdemeanor	
Use of a child in a sexual performance – first offense	13 VSA § 2822 & 2825(a)	10 years/\$20000/both	C felony	C felony	

**Criminal Offense Classification Proposal – Sex Offenses
Draft – 2019-07-05**

Use of a child in a sexual performance – second or subsequent	13 VSA § 2822 & 2825(b)	15 years/\$50000/both Soft 1 year minimum	C felony	C felony	Soft mandatory minimum for subsequent offense. Alternatives could be a hard minimum or repeal.
Consenting to a sexual performance – first offense	13 VSA § 2823 & 2825(a)	10 years/\$20000/both	C felony	C felony	
Consenting to a sexual performance – second or subsequent	13 VSA § 2823 & 2825(b)	15 years/\$50000/both Soft 1 year minimum	C felony	C felony	Soft mandatory minimum for subsequent offense. Alternatives could be a hard minimum or repeal.
Promoting a recording of sexual conduct – first offense	13 VSA § 2824 & 2825(a)	10 years/\$20000/both	C felony	C felony	
Promoting a recording of sexual conduct – second or subsequent	13 VSA § 2824 & 2825(b)	15 years/\$50000/both Soft 1 year minimum	C felony	C felony	Soft mandatory minimum for subsequent offense. Alternatives could be a hard minimum or repeal.
Possession of child pornography – lewd exhibition – first offense	13 VSA § 2827 & 2825(c)(1)	2 years/\$5000/both	A misdemeanor	A misdemeanor	
Possession of child pornography – sexual conduct – first offense	13 VSA § 2827 & 2825(c)(2)	5 years/\$10000/both	D felony	D felony	

**Criminal Offense Classification Proposal – Sex Offenses
Draft – 2019-07-05**

Possession of child pornography – second or subsequent	13 VSA § 2827 & 2825(d)	10 years/\$50000/both	C felony	C felony	
Luring a child	13 VSA § 2828 & 2825(e)	5 years/\$10000/both	D felony	D felony	
Sexual assault	13 VSA § 3252(a)(b)(d)&(e)	Life. \$25000 soft 3 year minimum	A felony	A felony	
Sexual assault – minor victim	13 VSA § 3252(c)	20 years. \$10000	C felony	B felony	B felony is closer to the existing statutory penalty but note L&L w/ child now a C felony
Aggravated sexual assault	13 VSA § 3253	Life. \$50000 hard 10 year minimum with downward departure to 5 years	A felony	A felony	
Aggravated sexual assault of a child	13 VSA § 3253a	Life. \$50000 hard 25 year minimum	A felony	A felony	
Sexual exploitation of an inmate	13 VSA § 3257	5 years/\$10000/both	D felony	D felony	
Sexual exploitation of a minor	13 VSA § 3258(a)&(b)	1 year/\$2000/both	B misdemeanor	B misdemeanor	
Sexual exploitation of a minor – abuse of authority	13 VSA § 3258(a)&(c)	5 years/\$10000/both	D felony	D felony	
Sexual exploitation of a person in the custody of a law enforcement officer	13 V.S.A. § 3259	5 years/\$10000/both	D felony	D felony	

**Criminal Offense Classification Proposal “B” – Property Crimes & Frauds
Draft 08-29-2019**

**Proposed Tiered Classification System for Property Crimes
*Felony Threshold is “Greater Than \$10,000.”***

<u>Value* at Issue:</u>	<u>Classification Is:</u>
Greater than \$0	D misdemeanor (30 days)
\$1,000-\$9,999	A Misdemeanor (2 years)
\$10,000-\$99,999	D Felony (5 years)
\$100,000 +	C Felony (10 years)
Subsequent Offense	No recommendation

Intended Effect of Proposal “B” Tier Classification System: (1) create a uniform system of penalties based upon the dollar value of the item stolen or damage done; (2) de-felonize the range from \$900-\$9,999; (3) cap exposure at a C Felony, which is reserved for the \$100,000+ tier or a subsequent offense of the \$10,000-\$99,999 tier; and (4) achieve reforms consistent with or more progressive than other states’ recent efforts to reform of dollar cut-off values. See *Appendix*, p. 9.

*It might make sense to clarify in instances of property damage that “value” is the cost of restoring property to its previous condition, not the value of the property itself. For example, Defendant takes a key to his estranged girlfriend’s Ford Mustang, gouging the paint on three body panels. The depreciated actual cash value of the Mustang is \$15,000. The cost to repair the body panels to their previous condition is \$1,200. The “value” for purposes of the above table is therefore \$1,200. The value of the Mustang (\$15,000) is immaterial. The offense is chargeable as an A Misdemeanor, not as a D Felony.

Periodic Inflation Adjustment Recommendation: On July 1, 2045 and thereafter every 25 years, the Joint Fiscal Office (JFO) shall calculate the inflation or deflation rate for the preceding 25 years using a generally-accepted measure of consumer price inflation or deflation. Based upon that calculation, the JFO shall issue a report recommending to the General Assembly the adjustment of the dollar-value-denominated penalty tiers for property crimes, rounding to the nearest \$100.

Classification Recommendations: not all property crimes are well-suited to dollar-value tiers. For instance, crimes against a person such as *Larceny From a Person* are not tiered. The classification recommendations follow:

**Criminal Offense Classification Proposal "B" – Property Crimes & Frauds
Draft 08-29-2019**

Offense	Statute	Penalty	Automatic Classification	Proposal	Notes
Credit Card Fraud \$50 or Less	9 VSA 4043 & 4044(a)	6 mo/ \$500/both	C misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	Less time
Credit Card Fraud \$50 or More	9 VSA 4043 & 4044(b)	1 yr/ \$1000/both	B misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	More time
Forgery	13 VSA 1801	10 yr /\$1000/both	C felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 100K, same time 100K
Uttering Forgery	13 VSA 1802	10 yr /\$1000/both	C felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 100K, same time 100K
Counterfeiting	13 VSA 1804	14 yr/\$1000/both	C felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 100K, same time 100K
Credit Card Skimmer	13 VSA 1816	10 yr/\$10000/both	C felony	C felony	The crime itself is suggestive of non-petty dollar amounts
False Personation	13 VSA 2001	10 years/\$2000/both	C felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 100K, same time 100K
False Pretenses \$900 or Less	13 VSA 2002	1 yr / \$1000/both	B misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	less time
False Pretenses \$900 or More	13 VSA 2002	10 yr / \$2000/both	C felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 100K, same time 100K
Home Improvement Fraud, Less than \$1000	13 VSA 2029	2 years/\$1000/both	A misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	less time
Home Improvement Fraud, Less than \$1000, 2 nd Offense	13 VSA 2029	3 years/\$5000/both	E felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time
Home Improvement Fraud, More than \$1000 (or \$2500 aggregate)	13 VSA 2029	3 years/\$5000/both	E felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time up to 10K more time over 10K

**Criminal Offense Classification Proposal “B” – Property Crimes & Frauds
Draft 08-29-2019**

Home Improvement Fraud, More than \$1000 (or \$2500 aggregate), 2 nd Offense	13 VSA 2029	5 years/\$10000/both	D felony	Follow tiered proposal	same time up to 10K, more time over
Home Improvement Fraud – Registry Violations	13 VSA 2029(c) & (e)	2 years/\$1000/both	A misdemeanor		This is a status offense not subject to dollar amount tiers.
ID Theft- 1 st offense	13 VSA 2030	3 years/\$5000/both	E felony	E felony	Some variants of this offense are not susceptible to tiering
ID Theft – 2 nd offense	13 VSA 2030	10 years/\$1000/both	C felony	C felony	
Insurance Fraud, Less than \$900	13 VSA 2031	6 months /\$5000	C misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	Less time
Insurance Fraud, More than \$900	13 VSA 2031	5 years / \$10000	D felony	Follow tiered proposal	Less time under 10K, same time 10K, more time over 100K
Insurance Fraud, 2 nd Offense, any amount	13 VSA 2031	5 years / \$20000	D felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 10K, Same time 10K, more time over 10K
Petit Larceny, \$900 or Less	13 VSA 2602	1 year / \$1000 fine	B misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	less time
Grand Larceny, More than \$900	13 VSA 2601	10 years / \$5000 fine	C felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 100K, same time 100K
Larceny From Person	13 VSA 2503	10 years / \$500	C felony	C felony	This is often the go-to for robberies of retail/banking businesses. Because of the element of violence or intimidation, it might make sense to leave

**Criminal Offense Classification Proposal “B” – Property Crimes & Frauds
Draft 08-29-2019**

					this one alone or adopt a modified tiered system enhanced by 2 classes (subject to Fel Class B cap).
Embezzlement \$100 or Less	13 VSA 2531	1 yr / \$1000/ both	B misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	less time
Embezzlement More than \$100	13 VSA 2531	10 years/\$10000/both	C felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 100K, same time 100K
Embezzlement – Bank Officer	13 VSA 2532	10 years/\$1000/both	C felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 100K, same time 100K
Embezzlement - Trustee	13 VSA 2533	10 years/\$1000/both	C felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 100K, same time 100K
Embezzlement -Official Capacity	13 VSA 2537	10 years/\$1000/both	C felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 100K, same time 100K
Stolen Property-Buy/Receive/Possess, \$900 or Less	13 VSA 2561	1 year / \$1000 fine	B misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	Less time
Stolen Property-Buy/Receive/Possess, More than \$900	13 VSA 2561	10 years / \$5000 fine	C felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 100K, same time 100K
Retail Theft, \$900 or Less	13 VSA 2577	6 months / \$500 /both	C misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	Less time
Retail Theft, More Than \$900	13 VSA 2577	10 years / \$1000/both	C felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 100K, same time 100K
Retail Theft, Alter UPC label	13 VSA 2577	2 years / \$1000/both	A misdemeanor	A misdemeanor	
Retail Theft, 15 or More Altered UPC labels	13 VSA 2577	10 years/\$10,000/both	C felony	C felony	

**Criminal Offense Classification Proposal “B” – Property Crimes & Frauds
Draft 08-29-2019**

Retail Theft – Manufacture/Sell/Possess tools or devices to shield merchandise	13 VSA 2577	10 years/\$10,000/both	C felony	C felony	
Theft of Services, \$900 or Less	13 VSA 2582	1 year/\$1,000/both	B misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	less time
Theft of Services, More than \$900	13 VSA 2582	10 years/\$5,000/both	C felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 100K, same time 100K
Theft of Rented Property, \$900 or Less	13 VSA 2591	6 months/\$500/both	C misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	less time
Theft of Rented Property, More than \$900	13 VSA 2591	2 years/\$1000/both	A misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	Less time under 1K, same time 1K- 10K, more time over 10K
Theft of Rented Property, More than \$900, 2nd Offense	13 VSA 2591	5 years/\$5000/both	D felony	Follow tiered proposal	more time 2ND offense over 10K
Failure to Return Rented/Leased Vehicle	13 VSA 2592	3 years/\$3000/both	E felony	E felony	Makes sense given that rental/leased cars are worth a 5- digit number. No need to tier.
Failure to Return Rented/Leased Vehicle, 2 nd Offense	13 VSA 2592	5 years/\$5000/both	D felony	D felony	
False Claim, Less than \$500	13 VSA 3016	2 years/\$5000/both	A misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	less time
False Claim, \$500 or More	13 VSA 3016	5 years/\$10000/both	D felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 10K, same time 10K, more time 100K
Unlawful Mischief, More than \$1000	13 VSA 3701(a)	5yrs/\$5000/both	D felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 10K, same time 10K-

**Criminal Offense Classification Proposal "B" – Property Crimes & Frauds
Draft 08-29-2019**

					100K, more time 100K+
Unlawful Mischief, More than \$250	13 VSA 3701(b)	1yr/\$1000/both	B misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 1K
Unlawful Mischief	13 VSA 3701(c)	6 mo/\$500/both	C misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	less time
Unlawful Mischief w / Explosive	13 VSA 3701(d)	5 yr / \$5000/both	D felony	D felony	
Timber Trespass-1 st offense	13 VSA 3606a	1 yr/\$20000/both	B misdemeanor	B misdemeanor	
Timber Trespass-2nd offense	13 VSA 3606a	2 yrs/\$50000/both	A misdemeanor	A misdemeanor	
Unlawful Trespass-Land	13 VSA 3705(a)	3mo/\$500/both	D misdemeanor	D misdemeanor	
Unlawful Trespass-Building	13 VSA 3705(c)	1 yr/\$500/both	B misdemeanor	B misdemeanor	
Unlawful Trespass-Dwelling	13 VSA 3705(d)	3 yrs /\$2000/both	E felony	E felony	
Unauthorized Book Removal from Library	13 VSA 3732	NMT \$50 (half to library, half to cover prosecution costs!)	E misdemeanor	E misdemeanor	Does this really need to be its own crime?
Opening a Dam	13 VSA 3733	5 years /\$500/both	D felony	Follow tiered proposal?	Shouldn't it matter how much damage one causes?
Motor Vehicle Trespass	13 VSA 3738	NMT \$500	E misdemeanor	E misdemeanor	General comment: E misdemeanors seem rather pointless.
Operate Vehicle on State-Owned Land	13 VSA 3739	NMT \$500	E misdemeanor	E misdemeanor	General comment: E misdemeanors seem rather pointless.

**Criminal Offense Classification Proposal “B” – Property Crimes & Frauds
Draft 08-29-2019**

Operate Vehicle on State-Owned Land, Damage	13 VSA 3740	NMT \$500	E misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal?	
Unauthorized Removal of Human Remains	13 VSA 3761	15 yrs/\$10000/both	C felony	C felony	
Grave Markers – Stealing, Removing, Etc	13 VSA 3767	5 yrs /\$5000/both	D felony	D felony	Didn't seem right for tiered valuation due to sentimental value
Grave Flowers/Plants – Stealing, Removing, Etc	13 VSA 3767	1 yr/\$500/both	B misdemeanor	B misdemeanor	Didn't seem right for tiered valuation due to sentimental value
Disturb a Funeral	13 VSA 3771	30 days/\$500/both	D misdemeanor	D misdemeanor	
Tapping Gas Pipeline-Fraud	13 VSA 3781	1 yr/\$1000/both	A misdemeanor	A misdemeanor	Hard to measure volume (value) of gas
Tapping Elec Lines	13 VSA 3782	2 yr/\$300/both	A misdemeanor	A misdemeanor	Hard to measure Kwh (value) of electricity
Interfere w/ Util Meter	13 VSA 3784	3 mo/\$100/both	D misdemeanor	D misdemeanor	
Injuring Lights	13 VSA 3785	3 mo/\$50/both	D misdemeanor	D misdemeanor	
Tapping Cable TV	13 VSA 3786	NMT \$100	E misdemeanor	E misdemeanor	General comment: E misdemeanors seem rather pointless.
Unfenced Holes in Ice	13 VSA 3831	NMT \$50	E misdemeanor	E misdemeanor	General comment: E misdemeanors seem rather pointless.
Removing Survey Marker	13 VSA 3834	NMT \$100	E misdemeanor	E misdemeanor	General comment: E misdemeanors seem rather pointless.
Computer Fraud \$500 or Less	13 VSA 4103	1 yr/\$500/both	B misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	less time

**Criminal Offense Classification Proposal “B” – Property Crimes & Frauds
Draft 08-29-2019**

Computer Fraud \$500 or Less, 2 nd Offense	13 VSA 4103	2yrs/\$1,000/both	A misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	same time
Computer Fraud, More than \$500	13 VSA 4103	10 yrs/\$10,000/both	C felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 100K same time over 100K
Alter/Damage Computer Network, \$500 or Less	13 VSA 4104	1yr/\$5000/both	B misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	less time
Alter/Damage Computer Network, \$500 or Less, 2 nd Offense	13 VSA 4104	2yrs/\$10,000/both	A misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	same time
Alter/Damage Computer Network, More than \$500	13 VSA 4104	10yrs/\$25,000/both	C felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 100K same time over 100K
Unauthorized Access Computer Network	13 VSA 4102	6mo/\$500/both	C misdemeanor	C misdemeanor	
Theft/Destruction Computer Network, \$500 or Less	13 VSA 4105	1yr/\$5000/both	B misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	
Theft/Destruction Computer Network, \$500 or Less, 2 nd Offense	13 VSA 4105	2yrs/\$10,000/both	A misdemeanor	Follow tiered proposal	same time
Theft/Destruction Network, More than \$500	13 VSA 4105	10yrs/\$25,000/both	C felony	Follow tiered proposal	less time under 10K, same time over 10K

Note:

- Arson is a hybrid crime, impacting property, safety, and public order. I did not include it above but can do so if desired.
- Let’s discuss fraud in commercial transactions (T13 Ch 49). Are commercial transaction still done this way? Part of UCC?

Criminal Offense Classification Proposal “B” – Property Crimes & Frauds

Draft 08-29-2019

APPENDIX

- In 2010, South Carolina revised its dollar-value cutoffs to the following. No increase in property crime was observed.
 - Value < \$2,000 : 30 day maximum penalty
 - Value \$2,000 - \$10,000: 5 year maximum penalty
 - Value > \$10,000: 10 year maximum penalty

- What follows is a 50-state survey of felony cutoffs assembled by the Pew Charitable Trusts in 2017. Please note that for purposes of the survey, “felony” means more than *one* year in prison. **Thus, in summary, the chart represents in Vermont crime classification-speak, the dividing line between Class A and Class B misdemeanors.**

Figure 1
At Least 37 States Have Raised Felony Theft Thresholds Since 2000
 Higher sums are designed to take inflation into account

Year of change	State	Previous threshold	Enacted threshold	Legislation
2001	Oklahoma	\$50	\$500	S.B. 397
2002	Missouri	\$150	\$500	H.B. 1888
2003	Alabama	\$250	\$500	H.B. 491
	Mississippi	\$250	\$500	H.B. 1121
2004	Kansas	\$500	\$1,000	H.B. 2271
	Wyoming	\$500	\$1,000	S.F. 66
2005	South Dakota	\$500	\$1,000	S.B. 43
2006	Arizona	\$250	\$1,000	H.B. 2581
	New Mexico	\$250	\$500	H.B. 80
	Vermont	\$500	\$900	S.B. 285
2007	Colorado	\$500	\$1,000	S.B. 260
	Minnesota	\$500	\$1,000	H.F. 829
2009	Connecticut	\$1,000	\$2,000	H.B. 6576
	Delaware	\$1,000	\$1,500	H.B. 113
	Kentucky	\$300	\$500	H.B. 369
	Louisiana	\$300	\$500	H.B. 555
	Maryland	\$500	\$1,000	H.B. 66
	Montana	\$1,000	\$1,500	S.B. 476
	Oregon	\$750	\$1,000	H.B. 2023
	Washington	\$250	\$750	S.B. 6167
2010	California	\$400	\$950	A.B. 2372
	Illinois	\$300	\$500	S.B. 3797
	New Hampshire	\$500	\$1,000	S.B. 205
	South Carolina	\$1,000	\$2,000	S.B. 1154
2011	Utah	\$1,000	\$1,500	S.B. 10
	Arkansas	\$500	\$1,000	S.B. 570
	Nevada	\$250	\$650	A.B. 142
	Ohio	\$500	\$1,000	H.B. 86
2012	Georgia	\$500	\$1,500	H.B. 1176
	Rhode Island	\$500	\$1,500	H.B. 776A
2013	Colorado	\$1,000	\$2,000	H.B. 1160
	Indiana	any amount	\$750	H.B. 1006
	North Dakota	\$500	\$1,000	S.B. 251
2014	Alaska	\$500	\$750	S.B. 64
	Louisiana	\$500	\$750	H.B. 791
	Mississippi	\$500	\$1,000	H.B. 585
	Missouri	\$500	\$750	S.B. 491
2015	Alabama	\$500	\$1,500	S.B. 67
	Nebraska	\$500	\$1,500	L.B. 605
2016	Texas	\$1,500	\$2,500	H.B. 1396
	Alaska	\$750	\$1,000	S.B. 91
	Hawaii	\$300	\$750	H.B. 2561
	Kansas	\$1,000	\$1,500	H.B. 2462
	Maryland	\$1,000	\$1,500	S.B. 1005
	Oklahoma	\$500	\$1,000	H.B. 2751
	Tennessee	\$500	\$1,000	H.B. 2576

Note: The District of Columbia raised its felony theft threshold in 2010 but is not included in this report because its crime data are not directly comparable with state crime statistics.

Source: Pew's analysis of legislative information from the National Conference of State Legislatures
 © 2017 The Pew Charitable Trusts

ATTACHMENT D

§ 5204a. Jurisdiction over adult defendant for crime committed when defendant was under age 18

(a) A proceeding may be commenced in the Family Division against a defendant who has attained 18 years of age if:

(1) the petition alleges that the defendant;

(A) before attaining 18 years of age, violated a crime listed in subsection 5204(a) of this title; or

(B) after attaining 14 years of age but before attaining 18 years of age, committed an offense listed in 13 V.S.A. § 5301(7) but not listed in subsection 5204(a) of this title;

(C) after attaining 17 years of age but before attaining 18 years of age, committed any offense not listed in 13 V.S.A. § 5301(7) or subsection 5204(a) of this title as long as the petition is filed prior to the defendant's 19th birthday;

(2) a juvenile petition was never filed based upon the alleged conduct; and

(3) the statute of limitations has not tolled on the crime which the defendant is alleged to have committed.

(b)(1) The Family Division shall, except as provided in subdivision (2) of this subsection, transfer a petition filed pursuant to subdivision (a)(1)(A) of this section to the Criminal Division if the Family Division finds that:

(A) there is probable cause to believe that while the defendant was less than 18 years of age he or she committed an act listed in subsection 5204(a) of this title;

(B) there was good cause for not filing a delinquency petition in the Family Division when the defendant was less than 18 years of age;

(C) there has not been an unreasonable delay in filing the petition; and

(D) transfer would be in the interest of justice and public safety.

(2)(A) If a petition has been filed pursuant to subdivision (a)(1)(A) of this section, the Family Division may order that the defendant be treated as a youthful offender consistent with the applicable provisions of chapter 52A of this title if the defendant is under 23 years of age and the Family Division:

(i) makes the findings required by subdivisions (1)(A), (B), and (C) of this subsection;

(ii) finds that the youth is amenable to treatment or rehabilitation as a youthful offender; and

(iii) finds that there are sufficient services in the Family Division system and the Department for Children and Families or the Department of Corrections to meet the youth's treatment and rehabilitation needs.

(B) If the Family Division orders that the defendant be treated as a youthful offender, the court shall approve a disposition case plan and impose conditions of probation on the defendant.

(C) If the Family Division finds after hearing that the defendant has violated the terms of his or her probation, the Family Division may:

(i) maintain the defendant's status as a youthful offender, with modified conditions of probation if the court deems it appropriate; or

(ii) revoke the defendant's youthful offender status and transfer the petition to the Criminal Division pursuant to subdivision (1) of this subsection.

(3) The Family Division shall in all respects treat a petition filed pursuant to subdivision (a)(1)(B) of this section in the same manner as a petition filed pursuant to section 5201 of this title, except that the Family Division's jurisdiction shall end on or before the defendant's 22nd birthday, if the Family Division:

(A) finds that there is probable cause to believe that, after attaining 14 years of age but before attaining 18 years of age, the defendant committed an offense listed in 13 V.S.A. § 5301(7) but not listed in subsection 5204(a) of this title; and

(B) makes the findings required by subdivisions (b)(1)(B) and (C) of this section.

(4) In making the determination required by subdivision (1)(D) of this subsection, the court may consider, among other matters:

(A) the maturity of the defendant as determined by consideration of his or her age; home; environment; emotional, psychological, and physical maturity; and relationship with and adjustment to school and the community;

(B) the extent and nature of the defendant's prior criminal record and record of delinquency;

(C) the nature of past treatment efforts and the nature of the defendant's response to them;

(D) whether the alleged offense was committed in an aggressive, violent, premeditated, or willful manner;

(E) the nature of any personal injuries resulting from or intended to be caused by the alleged act;

(F) whether the protection of the community would be best served by transferring jurisdiction from the Family Division to the Criminal Division of the Superior Court.

(c) (3) The Family Division shall in all respects treat a petition filed pursuant to subdivision (a)(1)(C) of this section in the same manner as a petition filed pursuant to section 5201 of this title, except that the Family Division's jurisdiction shall end on or before the defendant's 20th birthday, if the Family Division:

(A) finds that there is probable cause to believe that, after attaining 17 years of age but before attaining 18 years of age, the defendant committed an offense not listed in 13 V.S.A. § 5301(7) or subsection 5204(a) of this title; and

(B) makes the findings required by subdivisions (b)(1)(B) and (C) of this section.

~~(e)~~(d) If the Family Division does not transfer a petition filed pursuant to subdivision (a)(1)(A) of this section to the Criminal Division or order that the defendant be treated as a youthful offender pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, the petition shall be dismissed.