

## **Chronology of \$25.00 Supplemental Unemployment Insurance Benefit Issue**

- 5/13
  - UI Director Cameron Wood reaches out to DOL regarding two possible proposals:
    - administration of a supplemental benefit through another agency (i.e. Tax); and
    - a \$25 supplemental benefit based on the FPUC model (i.e. the additional \$600/\$300/week paid to UI claimants during the Pandemic).
  - With respect to the second option, Director Wood wrote “I am assuming there are no issues with this from a federal UI perspective, but if I am missing something, please let me know.”
- 5/14
  - Bill is referred to House Ways & Means and then House Appropriations.
- 5/19
  - S.62 passes 2<sup>nd</sup> reading in the House.
- 5/20
  - S.62 passes 3<sup>rd</sup> reading in the House and is messaged forthwith to the Senate.
  - Senate passes bill.
- 5/27
  - S.62 is sent to the Governor.
- 6/1
  - Governor signs S.62 into law.
- 6/8
  - USDOL replies to Director Wood’s inquiry and states, in part, that UI Trust Fund dollars cannot be used to fund an FPUC-type benefit.
- 6/14
  - USDOL contacts VDOL regarding a potential nonconformity issue with the \$25 supplemental benefit.
  - The email states that if the State “interprets and implements [the \$25 supplement] provision such that it is changing the formula for calculating an individual’s weekly benefit amount (WBA) uniformly and applies this new calculation to individuals receiving benefits for all programs (e.g., regular UC, Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (UCFE), and Unemployment Compensation for Ex-Servicemembers (UCX)), then it would be permissible under federal law to pay for this benefit using monies in the state’s unemployment trust fund.”
  - The email goes on to state that “if the State of Vermont interprets this provision as not changing the formula for calculating an individual’s WBA, but rather as providing a separate supplementary benefit to individuals receiving regular UC, then the funding source for this supplemental payment would have to originate from a source other than the state’s unemployment trust fund, otherwise it raises a conformity issue with the requirements of additional compensation program.”
  - The email concludes by requesting VDOL’s interpretation of the provision.
- 6/23
  - House convenes for veto session
- 6/24
  - Senate convenes for veto session
- 7/28
  - UI Director Wood responds to USDOL with a letter stating that VDOL interprets the provision to be creating a supplemental FPUC-type benefit.

## **Chronology of \$25.00 Supplemental Unemployment Insurance Benefit Issue**

- 8/6
  - USDOL and VDOL have a phone conference to discuss the issue and USDOL indicates that it would be issuing a formal notice of nonconformance.
- 8/24
  - VDOL contacts legislative leadership regarding the nonconformity issue
- 8/28
  - Email from Senators Balint and Sirotkin to VDOL requesting that VDOL pause its decision on the nonconformity issue to provide an opportunity for the Legislature to provide input regarding the legislative intent.
- 9/1
  - USDOL issues formal notice of nonconformity.
  - VDOL provides response to 8/28 email that explains its understanding of the legislative intent related to the provision and information regarding the inability of the UI Mainframe system to implement a change to the regular UI weekly benefit amount.