

**From:** Vince Illuzzi <[vincentilluzzi@hotmail.com](mailto:vincentilluzzi@hotmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 9, 2022 10:09 AM  
**To:** Jeanette White <[JWhite@leg.state.vt.us](mailto:JWhite@leg.state.vt.us)>  
**Subject:** Fw: S171- Vote Wednesday Afternoon

Jeannette:

This provision would restrict any person from taking employment where the state is a party. That's crazy. I couldn't be a defense attorney or represent anyone if the state is involved. Tax issue. land use issue. getting a license or permit.

There are already a number of laws referenced that already govern future conflicts. This must be a woke approach to government and it will trip up a lot of people who simply want to make a living outside of state service. Remember, in Vermont, you need to do more than one job to survive.

Thanks.

---

**From:** Thomas Abdelnour <[TAbdelnour@VSEA.ORG](mailto:TAbdelnour@VSEA.ORG)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 9, 2022 9:48 AM  
**To:** Steve Howard <[SHoward@VSEA.ORG](mailto:SHoward@VSEA.ORG)>; Vincent (Hot Mail) Illuzzi <[vincentilluzzi@hotmail.com](mailto:vincentilluzzi@hotmail.com)>; Tim Belcher <[TBelcher@VSEA.ORG](mailto:TBelcher@VSEA.ORG)>  
**Subject:** Re: S171- Vote Wednesday Afternoon

The relevant subsection here seems to be (11)(B)(v):

1. (v) Representation restrictions. A public servant shall not, after termination of State service or employment, knowingly make with the intent to influence any communication or appearance before any entity of the State on behalf of any person other than the State in connection with any investigation, application, request for a ruling or determination, rulemaking, contract, controversy, claim, charge, accusation, arrest, quasi-judicial, judicial, or other proceeding;
2. (I) in which the State is a party or has a direct and substantial interest;
3. (II) in which the public servant participated personally and substantially as a public servant; and

(III) that involved the same party or parties as at the time of such participation

I can see why John is suggesting this could be problematic for our DSA members who want to move on to private practice. I'll leave a more sophisticated analysis of whether that would, in fact, be the case to the practicing attorneys on this thread.

Furthermore, I'm not sure what our duty is to our members vis-à-vis their future employment opportunities, but we should determine whether that's an interest of theirs that we have a duty to protect.

Hope that helps get the ball rolling.

Best

---

Thomas Abdelnour  
Legislative Coordinator, Vermont State Employees' Association

(802) 274-2068

---

**From:** Steve Howard <[SHoward@VSEA.ORG](mailto:SHoward@VSEA.ORG)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 9, 2022 9:19 AM  
**To:** Vincent (Hot Mail) Illuzzi <[vincentilluzzi@hotmail.com](mailto:vincentilluzzi@hotmail.com)>; Tim Belcher <[TBelcher@VSEA.ORG](mailto:TBelcher@VSEA.ORG)>; Thomas Abdelnour <[TAbdelnour@VSEA.ORG](mailto:TAbdelnour@VSEA.ORG)>  
**Subject:** S171- Vote Wednesday Afternoon

This bill is in Senate Gov Ops scheduled for a possible vote this afternoon. John Campbell called me and said they have concerns about it regarding the impact on DSA's. He mentioned something about post employment. He had to get off the call so he is sending me a letter he is sending to the Committee. Can you look at this and see if you see any problems? I will share his letter once I get it. I called Annie to see if she had more details, It seems like the concern from the DSA perspective is the bill would limit their ability to go into private practice and handle criminal cases that were pending at the time they worked for the State. Vince, Annie said you could call her and she would talk with you more about it. So please do that. Otherwise if we can give this another look that would be great. We can always ask Jeanette to add us to the list of witnesses for this afternoon.

Steve