

Journal of the House

Friday, March 28, 2025

At nine o'clock and thirty minutes in the forenoon, the Speaker called the House to order.

Devotional Exercises

Devotional exercises were conducted by former Rep. Chip Troiano of Stannard.

House Bills Introduced

House bills of the following titles were severally introduced, read the first time, and referred to committee as follows:

H. 495

By Rep. Hooper of Randolph,
House bill, entitled

An act relating to the consideration of consolidated school district boundaries using existing regional structures

To the Committee on Education.

H. 496

By Reps. Lalley of Shelburne, Austin of Colchester, Cooper of Pownal, Dodge of Essex, Headrick of Burlington, Keyser of Rutland City, Logan of Burlington, Nugent of South Burlington, Pezzo of Colchester, Rachelson of Burlington, Tomlinson of Winooski, and Torre of Moretown,

House bill, entitled

An act relating to continuing care retirement communities

To the Committee on Human Services.

Senate Bills Referred

Senate bills of the following titles were severally taken up, read the first time, and referred to committee as follows:

S. 18

Senate bill, entitled

An act relating to licensure of freestanding birth centers

To the Committee on Health Care.

S. 122

Senate bill, entitled

An act relating to economic and workforce development

To the Committee on Commerce and Economic Development.

S. 123

Senate bill, entitled

An act relating to miscellaneous changes to laws related to motor vehicles

To the Committee on Transportation.

S. 125

Senate bill, entitled

An act relating to workers' compensation and collective bargaining rights

To the Committee on Commerce and Economic Development.

Bill Amended; Third Reading; Bill Passed

H. 342

House bill, entitled

An act relating to protecting the personal information of certain public servants

Was taken up and, pending third reading of the bill, **Reps. Marcotte of Coventry, Carris-Duncan of Whitingham, Duke of Burlington, Graning of Jericho, Olson of Starksboro, Priestley of Bradford, and White of Bethel** moved to amend the bill by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

(a) The General Assembly finds that Vermont's judges, prosecutors, law enforcement officers, and other public servants play an essential role in the functioning of the government of the State of Vermont and that the nature of their official duties regularly places them in danger of death, serious physical injury, and other reprisals from members of the public.

(b) Violence to and intimidation of such public servants and their families is on the rise and public access to the personal information of these individuals can be and has been used to facilitate violence and intimidation. The personal

information of these individuals is of negligible value to the public interest or public discourse.

(c) Accordingly, the provisions of this act are both necessary and appropriate to protect the privacy, safety, and security of public servants and to prevent interference in the administration of justice and the operation of government in the State of Vermont.

Sec. 2. 9 V.S.A. chapter 62 is amended to read:

CHAPTER 62. PROTECTION OF PERSONAL INFORMATION

* * *

Subchapter 5. Data Brokers

* * *

§ 2448. NONDISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC SERVANT
PERSONAL INFORMATION

(a) Definitions. As used in this section:

(1) “Authorized agent” means any of the following persons or entities authorized to submit or revoke a request for the redaction or nondisclosure of protected information on behalf of a covered person and to engage in communications and enforcement related to the request:

(A) a designated trustee or other agent pursuant to a written power of attorney or other legal instrument on behalf of any covered person who is physically or mentally incapacitated;

(B) a parent or legal guardian on behalf of any child who is a minor and who is otherwise entitled to address redaction or nondisclosure pursuant to this section; and

(C) a person or entity who has been appointed pursuant to a notarized document by a covered person to act for the covered person for the submission or revocation of requests for redaction or nondisclosure of protected information.

(2)(A) “Covered person” means any of the following individuals who are either currently or formerly:

(i) a judge, law enforcement officer, federal law enforcement officer, prosecutor, public defender, parole and probation officer, or member of the Vermont Parole Board;

(ii) an employee of:

(I) the Family Services Division of the Department for Children and Families;

(II) the Vermont Human Rights Commission;

(III) the Department of Corrections;

(IV) the Department of Public Safety, including the Vermont State Police;

(V) the Department of State's Attorneys and Sheriffs; or

(VI) any court in the State; and

(iii) an investigator, victims advocate, mental health crisis worker, or embedded crisis specialist that is employed by or works on a contract basis for any of the entities listed in subdivision (ii) of this subdivision (a)(2)(A).

(B) "Covered person" also includes the immediate family of individuals identified in subdivisions (A)(i)–(iii) of this subdivision (a)(2).

(3) "Data broker" has the same meaning as set forth in section 2430 of this title. As used in this section, "data broker" excludes governmental agencies and their representatives acting in their official capacities.

(4) "Disclose," "disclosing," or "disclosure" means to solicit, sell, manufacture, give, provide, lend, trade, mail, deliver, transfer, post, publish, distribute, circulate, disseminate, present, exhibit, advertise, offer, or include within a searchable list or database, regardless of whether any person has actually searched the list or database. "Disclose" does not include an organization maintaining protected information completely inaccessible and unviewable to any person outside of the organization.

(5) "Federal law enforcement officer" has the same meaning as in 18 U.S.C. § 115(c)(1) but is limited to those individuals who work or reside in Vermont.

(6) "Home address" means a partial or complete street address or other information that reveals a home's location, including tax parcel ID, legal property description, or geographic coordinates.

(7) "Home telephone number" means any telephone number used primarily for personal communications, including a landline or cellular telephone number.

(8) "Immediate family" has the same meaning as in 3 V.S.A. § 1201.

(9) "Judge" means any justice, judge, or magistrate of a State court or of a federal court located in Vermont, or any person who serves as a judge,

justice, or magistrate in another state who maintains a home address in Vermont.

(10) “Law enforcement officer” has the same meaning as in 20 V.S.A. § 2351a.

(11) “Parole and probation officer” means:

(A) a corrections services specialist employed by the Department of Corrections; or

(B) a parole or probation officer employed by a Vermont county or municipality.

(12) “Prosecutor” means a Vermont State’s Attorney or Deputy State’s Attorney, the Attorney General or an Assistant Attorney General, or a U.S. Attorney or an Assistant U.S. Attorney who works in Vermont.

(13) “Protected information” means a covered person’s:

(A) home address, including primary residence and any secondary residences;

(B) home telephone number;

(C) personal email address;

(D) Social Security number or driver’s license number; and

(E) license plate number or other unique identifiers of a vehicle owned, leased, or regularly used by a covered person.

(14) “Public defender” means the Defender General, Deputy Defender General, public defenders, or deputy public defenders who provide legal services to persons in need as set forth in 13 V.S.A. chapter 163.

(b) Nondisclosure of protected information.

(1) A covered person or an authorized agent of the covered person has the right through this section to send a notice to a data broker requesting that the data broker cease disclosure or redisclosure of the covered person’s protected information.

(2) Upon a data broker receiving physical or electronic notice from a covered person, or an authorized agent of the covered person, requesting that the data broker cease disclosing or redisclosing protected information of the covered person, the data broker shall cease disclosing the protected information not later than 15 days after receipt of the notice and shall not disclose or redisclose the protected information after that time.

(3) The notice as set forth in subdivision (2) of this subsection shall be in a form and manner provided by the Attorney General, except that:

(A) the notice shall require that the covered person provide the covered person's full name along with the specific protected information of the covered person that is being disclosed by the data broker;

(B) no prior verification of a covered person's or authorized agent's status shall be required for the notice; and

(C) the notice shall include a disclaimer that ceasing disclosure of a covered person's protected information may:

(i) complicate certain business transactions; and

(ii) not result in the covered person's protected information being totally removed from the internet.

(c) Penalties for violations.

(1) Attorney General enforcement.

(A) A data broker that receives a notice from a covered person or the authorized agent of the covered person pursuant to subdivision (b)(2) of this section that discloses or rediscloses the covered person's protected information more than 15 days after receiving the notice is in violation of this section and shall be assessed a civil penalty of not more than \$10,000.00 for each violation.

(B) The Attorney General has the same authority to adopt rules to implement the provisions of this section and to conduct civil investigations, enter into assurances of discontinuance, bring civil actions, and take other enforcement actions as provided under chapter 63, subchapter 1 of this title.

(C) The Attorney General shall create a form on its website where a covered person or an authorized agent of the covered person is able to provide notice to the Attorney General that more than 15 days have passed since the covered person or an authorized agent of the covered person submitted a notice to a data broker pursuant to subdivision (b)(2) of this section and that the data broker continues to disclose or has redisclosed the covered person's protected information. This form shall require, at minimum, that the covered person provide the name of the:

(i) data broker; and

(ii) covered person and the specific protected information of the covered person that is being disclosed by the data broker.

(2) Private action.

(A) Subject to the requirements in subdivision (B) of this subdivision (2), a data broker that receives a notice from a covered person or the authorized agent of the covered person pursuant to subdivision (b)(2) of this section and that discloses or rediscloses the covered person's protected information more than 15 days after receiving the notice is in violation of this section and is subject to a civil action brought in Superior Court by the covered person for the following:

(i) damages, calculated as the greater of actual damages or liquidated damages computed at the rate of \$1,000.00 for each violation of this section;

(ii) punitive damages upon proof of willful or reckless disregard of the law;

(iii) reasonable attorney's fees and other litigation costs reasonably incurred; and

(iv) any other preliminary and equitable relief as the court determines to be appropriate.

(B) A data broker that ceases disclosing the protected information of a covered person not more than 15 days after being served with process in a civil suit brought by the covered person pursuant to subdivision (A) of this subdivision (2) shall only be liable to the covered person for reasonable attorney's fees and court costs in the civil action. A data broker is not eligible for the exception provided this subdivision (B) if the data broker:

(i) more than 15 days after receiving notice from a covered person or the authorized agent of a covered person pursuant to subdivision (b)(2) of this section discloses additional protected information of the covered person; or

(ii) rediscloses protected information of the covered person after having received notice pursuant to subdivision (b)(2) of this section.

(3) Standard of fault. In any judicial proceeding pursuant to this section, the standard of fault shall be ordinary negligence. It shall not be a defense to liability in a judicial proceeding that the covered person's protected information is or was available to the public from other sources, on the internet or otherwise, or available by inspection of public records.

(d) Accessing information. A covered person or an authorized agent accessing a data broker's website or other public application for the purpose of determining whether the covered person's protected information is being disclosed shall not, as a result of such access, be deemed to have agreed on

behalf of the covered person to any website terms and conditions with respect to the covered person's rights under this section.

(e) Limitations.

(1) A disclosure of protected information shall not constitute a violation of this section if the disclosure is:

(A) made with the express or standing authorization of the covered person, provided that the authorization is provided subsequent to the relevant nondisclosure request; or

(B) for the sole purpose of facilitating a transaction initiated by the covered person.

(2) This section does not apply to a data broker in a disclosure pursuant to subdivision (1) of this subsection.

(3) Nothing in this section shall be construed as prohibiting an employer from providing employee information to the Vermont Labor Relations Board or to employee organizations that is required under Vermont law.

(4) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require a data broker to delete protected information.

Sec. 3. FORM OF NOTICE

The Attorney General shall publish the form of notice pursuant to 9 V.S.A. § 2448(b)(3) not later than 90 days after July 1, 2025, provided that until such form is published, covered persons and their authorized agents may use their own form of written notice that:

(1) references this section;

(2) identifies the sender as a covered person or an authorized agent acting on behalf of a covered person;

(3) provides the covered person's full name along with the specific protected information of the covered person that is being disclosed by the data broker; and

(4) requests that the data broker cease disclosing the specific protected information of the covered person.

Sec. 4. STUDY AND REPORT ON PUBLIC AGENCY COMPLIANCE

(a) Study. The Agency of Digital Services, in consultation with the Agency of Administration, the Office of the Secretary of State, the Office of the Attorney General, and with other State agencies as requested by the Agency, shall conduct a study to determine the various considerations and impacts on State public agencies if public agencies were required to conform

to the disclosure policies set forth in this act. The Agency shall meet with and receive input from relevant stakeholders in conducting its study, including the Vermont League of Cities and Towns and the Vermont Municipal Clerks' and Treasurers' Association. The Agency shall consider the following in its study:

(1) if public agencies were required to cease disclosing the protected information of covered persons:

(A) the extent to which public agencies would currently be able to accommodate these requests;

(B) the fiscal and resource impact on public agencies;

(C) whether additional staffing or training would be needed to comply;

(D) the degree to which risk can be mitigated through State or local policy; and

(E) determining which statutes, regulations, and administrative policies require amending in order to accomplish the goal of public agencies being able to cease the disclosure of protected information of covered persons;

(2) how other states have implemented similar requirements on their public agencies, including the types of penalties levied for noncompliance;

(3) the feasibility of creating a State office to manage all statewide requests to cease disclosing protected information; and

(4) any additional related areas of study as determined by the Agency.

(b) Report. On or before December 1, 2026, the Agency of Digital Services shall submit a written report to the House Committee on Government Operations and Military Affairs and the Senate Committee on Government Operations with a summary of its findings pursuant to the study set forth in subsection (a) of this section. The Agency shall also include in its report its recommendations for legislative action and policy modification as well as a suggested timeline for the implementation of the disclosure policies on public agencies.

Sec. 5. DELAYED START FOR PRIVATE ACTION

The private action provided to a covered person pursuant to 9 V.S.A. § 2448(c)(2) shall take effect on January 1, 2026.

Sec. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE

This act shall take effect on July 1, 2025.

Pending the question, Shall the bill be amended as offered by Representative Marcotte of Coventry and others?, **Rep. Harvey of Castleton** 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 be amended as offered by Representative Marcotte of Coventry and others?, was decided in the affirmative. Yeas, 106. Nays, 38.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Arsenault of Williston	Eastes of Guilford	Mihaly of Calais
Austin of Colchester	Emmons of Springfield	Minier of South Burlington
Bartholomew of Hartland	Feltus of Lyndon	Morris of Springfield
Berbeco of Winooski	Garofano of Essex	Morrow of Weston
Birong of Vergennes	Goldman of Rockingham	Mrowicki of Putney
Bishop of Colchester	Goodnow of Brattleboro	Nigro of Bennington
Black of Essex	Graning of Jericho *	Noyes of Wolcott
Bluemle of Burlington	Greer of Bennington	Nugent of South Burlington
Bosch of Clarendon	Gregoire of Fairfield	O'Brien of Tunbridge
Bos-Lun of Westminster	Hango of Berkshire *	Ode of Burlington
Boutin of Barre City	Harple of Glover	Olson of Starksboro
Boyden of Cambridge	Headrick of Burlington	Page of Newport City
Brady of Williston	Holcombe of Norwich	Pezzo of Colchester
Brown of Richmond	Hooper of Randolph	Pouech of Hinesburg
Burke of Brattleboro	Hooper of Burlington	Priestley of Bradford
Burkhardt of South Burlington	Houghton of Essex Junction	Quimby of Lyndon
Burrows of West Windsor	Howard of Rutland City	Rachelson of Burlington
Campbell of St. Johnsbury	Hunter of Manchester	Satcowitz of Randolph
Carris-Duncan of Whitingham	James of Manchester	Scheu of Middlebury
Casey of Montpelier	Kascenska of Burke	Sheldon of Middlebury
Chapin of East Montpelier	Kimbell of Woodstock	Sibilia of Dover
Charlton of Chester	Kleppner of Burlington	Southworth of Walden
Cina of Burlington	Kornheiser of Brattleboro	Squirrell of Underhill
Coffin of Cavendish	Krasnow of South Burlington	Stevens of Waterbury
Cole of Hartford	Lalley of Shelburne	Surprenant of Barnard
Conlon of Cornwall	LaLonde of South Burlington	Sweeney of Shelburne
Cooper of Pownal	LaMont of Morristown	Taylor of Milton
Corcoran of Bennington	Lipsky of Stowe	Tomlinson of Winooski
Cordes of Bristol	Logan of Burlington	Torre of Moretown
Critchlow of Colchester	Long of Newfane	Waszazak of Barre City
Dodge of Essex	Marcotte of Coventry	Waters Evans of Charlotte
Dolan of Essex Junction	Masland of Thetford	Wells of Brownington
Donahue of Northfield	McCann of Montpelier	White of Waitsfield
Duke of Burlington	McGill of Bridport	White of Bethel
Durfee of Shaftsbury	Micklus of Milton	Wood of Waterbury
		Yacovone of Morristown

Those who voted in the negative are:

Bailey of Hyde Park	Higley of Lowell	Nelson of Derby
Bartley of Fairfax	Howland of Rutland Town	Nielsen of Brandon

Branagan of Georgia	Keyser of Rutland City	North of Ferrisburgh
Burditt of West Rutland	Labor of Morgan	Oliver of Sheldon
Canfield of Fair Haven	Laroche of Franklin	Parsons of Newbury
Casey of Hubbardton	Luneau of St. Albans City	Pinsonault of Dorset
Demar of Enosburgh	Maguire of Rutland City	Powers of Waterford
Dobrovich of Williamstown	Malay of Pittsford	Pritchard of Pawlet
Dolgin of St. Johnsbury	McCoy of Poultney *	Steady of Milton
Galfetti of Barre Town	McFaun of Barre Town	Tagliavia of Corinth
Goslant of Northfield	Morgan, L. of Milton	Walker of Swanton
Harrison of Chittenden	Morgan, M. of Milton	Winter of Ludlow
Harvey of Castleton	Morrissey of Bennington	

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:

Burt of Cabot	Dickinson of St. Albans	Stone of Burlington
Christie of Hartford	Town	Toof of St. Albans Town

Rep. Graning of Jericho provided the following vote explanation:

“Madam Speaker:

H.342 is designed to be limited in scope, provide a safe harbor for businesses that act in good faith, and offer some protection to our public servants who stand on the front line to protect all Vermonters.”

Rep. Hango of Berkshire provided the following vote explanation:

“Madam Speaker:

Although I have serious reservations about the private right of action that remains in this bill, I vote yes on the amendment to acknowledge the work done by the Committee.”

Rep. McCoy of Poultney provided the following vote explanation:

“Madam Speaker:

I look forward to passing a data privacy bill. Unfortunately, I cannot support this amendment as it contains a private right of action.”

Thereupon, the bill was read the third time and pending the question, Shall the bill pass? **Rep. Harvey of Castleton** demanded the Yeas and Nays, which demand was sustained by the Constitutional number.

Pending the call of the roll, **Rep. Harvey of Castleton** asked and was granted leave to withdraw his request for a roll call.

Thereafter, the bill passed.

Third Reading; Bill Passed**H. 106**

House bill, entitled

An act relating to selling real property within a FEMA mapped flood hazard area

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

Third Reading; Bill Passed**H. 218**

House bill, entitled

An act relating to fiscal year 2026 appropriations from the Opioid Abatement Special Fund

Was taken up and read the third time.

Pending the question, Shall the bill pass?, **Rep. Steady of Milton** 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?, was decided in the affirmative. Yeas, 119. Nays, 24.

Those who voted in the affirmative are:

Arsenault of Williston	Emmons of Springfield	McCoy of Poultney *
Austin of Colchester	Feltus of Lyndon	McFaun of Barre Town
Bartholomew of Hartland	Galfetti of Barre Town	McGill of Bridport *
Bartley of Fairfax	Garofano of Essex	Micklus of Milton *
Berbeco of Winooski	Goldman of Rockingham	Mihaly of Calais
Birong of Vergennes	Goodnow of Brattleboro	Minier of South Burlington
Bishop of Colchester	Goslant of Northfield	Morris of Springfield
Black of Essex	Graning of Jericho	Morrissey of Bennington
Bluemle of Burlington	Greer of Bennington *	Morrow of Weston
Bosch of Clarendon	Gregoire of Fairfield	Mrowicki of Putney
Bos-Lun of Westminster	Hango of Berkshire	Nigro of Bennington
Boutin of Barre City *	Harple of Glover	Noyes of Wolcott
Boyden of Cambridge	Harrison of Chittenden	Nugent of South Burlington
Brady of Williston	Headrick of Burlington	O'Brien of Tunbridge
Branagan of Georgia	Holcombe of Norwich	Ode of Burlington
Brown of Richmond	Hooper of Randolph	Olson of Starksboro
Burditt of West Rutland	Hooper of Burlington	Page of Newport City
Burke of Brattleboro	Houghton of Essex Junction	Pezzo of Colchester
Burkhardt of South	Howard of Rutland City	Pouech of Hinesburg
Burlington	Hunter of Manchester	Priestley of Bradford
Burrows of West Windsor	James of Manchester	Pritchard of Pawlet
Campbell of St. Johnsbury	Kascenska of Burke	Quimby of Lyndon
Carris-Duncan of	Keyser of Rutland City	Rachelson of Burlington
Whitingham	Kimbell of Woodstock	Satcowitz of Randolph

Casey of Montpelier	Kleppner of Burlington	Scheu of Middlebury
Chapin of East Montpelier	Kornheiser of Brattleboro	Sheldon of Middlebury
Cina of Burlington	Krasnow of South	Sibilia of Dover
Cole of Hartford	Burlington	Squirrell of Underhill
Conlon of Cornwall	Lalley of Shelburne	Stevens of Waterbury
Corcoran of Bennington	LaLonde of South	Surprenant of Barnard
Cordes of Bristol	Burlington	Sweeney of Shelburne
Critchlow of Colchester	LaMont of Morristown	Taylor of Milton *
Demar of Enosburgh	Laroche of Franklin	Tomlinson of Winooski
Dobrovich of Williamstown	Lipsky of Stowe	Torre of Moretown
Dodge of Essex *	Logan of Burlington *	Waszazak of Barre City
Dolan of Essex Junction	Long of Newfane	Waters Evans of Charlotte
Dolgin of St. Johnsbury	Luneau of St. Albans City	White of Waitsfield
Donahue of Northfield	Maguire of Rutland City	White of Bethel
Duke of Burlington	Marcotte of Coventry	Winter of Ludlow
Durfee of Shaftsbury	Masland of Thetford	Wood of Waterbury
Eastes of Guilford	McCann of Montpelier	Yacovone of Morristown

Those who voted in the negative are:

Bailey of Hyde Park	Labor of Morgan	Parsons of Newbury
Canfield of Fair Haven	Malay of Pittsford	Pinsonault of Dorset
Casey of Hubbardton	Morgan, L. of Milton	Powers of Waterford
Charlton of Chester	Morgan, M. of Milton	Southworth of Walden
Coffin of Cavendish *	Nelson of Derby	Steady of Milton *
Harvey of Castleton	Nielsen of Brandon	Tagliavia of Corinth
Higley of Lowell	North of Ferrisburgh	Walker of Swanton
Howland of Rutland Town	Oliver of Sheldon	Wells of Brownington

Those members absent with leave of the House and not voting are:

Burt of Cabot	Dickinson of St. Albans	Toof of St. Albans Town
Christie of Hartford	Town	
Cooper of Pownal	Stone of Burlington	

Rep. Boutin of Barre City provided the following vote explanation:

“Madam Speaker:

I voted yes. However, I need to express my deep concern with safe injection sites. My yes vote is not a yes to safe injection sites and I want to make that very clear.”

Rep. Coffin of Cavendish provided the following vote explanation:

“Madam Speaker:

I cannot with good conscience support this bill. Although I agree with much of this bill, I believe that the 1.1 million dollars for the safe injection site (overdose prevention center) could be better used by funding beds for true drug addiction recovery and transitional housing. The additional 1.1 million

dollars toward recovery would serve those with addiction better than providing people a place to continue to use illegal drugs. We should consider that there is a difference between just being alive and really living a full life.”

Rep. Dodge of Essex provided the following vote explanation:

“Madam Speaker:

I vote yes in favor of Gaetano and all the many family and friends who miss you every single day.”

Rep. Greer of Bennington provided the following vote explanation:

“Madam Speaker:

Though I have my reservations with a particular item in H.218, I want to thank the Committee on Human Services for working to organize the Opioid Abatement Special Fund. Too many Vermonters and Americans have been devastated by the opioid crisis, and this fund will support many important provisions.”

Rep. Logan of Burlington provided the following vote explanation:

“Madam Speaker:

I vote yes in memory of my sister.”

Rep. McCoy of Poultney provided the following explanation:

“Madam Speaker:

While disappointed that the safe injection site funding remains in this bill, I vote yes for all of the prevention programs that will be funded in this bill with the Opioid Settlement Fund money.”

Rep. McGill of Bridport provided the following vote explanation:

“Madam Speaker:

I voted yes because we must act with compassion and urgency to save our neighbors from preventable deaths and to meet people where they are with dignity and care. I voted yes with unwavering support of this investment in public health in our communities, and in the inherent worth of every Vermonter.”

Rep. Micklus of Milton provided the following vote explanation:

“Madam Speaker:

While I don’t agree with everything in this bill, the majority of programs this does fund makes it worth my yes.”

Rep. Steady of Milton provided the following vote explanation:

“Madam Speaker:

My no vote is due to Section 1 Subdivision (a)(5) regarding the City of Burlington’s overdose prevention center. I support Governor Scott’s veto of this bill last session. I believe the millions of dollars being appropriated for the safe injection site would be better used on recovery sites and/or centers to help people with addiction – many loved ones may be here today. However, I agree with other pieces of the bill.”

Rep. Taylor of Milton provided the following vote explanation:

“Madam Speaker:

Although I would have rather seen the 1.1 million dollars of opioid settlement money, earmarked for the Opioid Prevention Center, go to other harm reduction methods and beds for treatment, I voted yes because this bill will fund other much needed initiatives to treat those in need.”

Third Reading; Bill Passed

H. 491

House bill, entitled

An act relating to setting the homestead property tax yields and the nonhomestead property tax rate

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

Committee Bill; Favorable Report; Second Reading; Third Reading Ordered

H. 494

Rep. Emmons of Springfield spoke for the Committee on Corrections and Institutions.

House bill, entitled

An act relating to capital construction and State bonding

Rep. Laroche of Franklin, for the Committee on Appropriations, recommended the bill ought to pass.

The bill, having appeared on the Notice Calendar, was taken up, read the second time, and third reading ordered.

Bill Amended; Third Reading; Bill Passed**H. 493**

House bill, entitled

An act relating to making appropriations for the support of the government

Was taken up and, pending third reading of the bill, **Rep. Donahue of Northfield** moved to amend the bill in Sec. E.131, 3 V.S.A. chapter 18, in section 532, in subsection (c), by striking out subdivision (2) in its entirety and inserting in lieu thereof a new subdivision (2) to read as follows:

(2) The Treasurer shall provide for, on a uniform basis, an annual increase of each active participant's contribution rate, by not less than one percent, but not more than eight percent, of salary or wages each year. Any such increases shall apply to active participants, including participants by default with an option to opt out or participants who are initiated by affirmative participant election, provided that any increase is subject to the IRA contribution and eligibility limits applicable under the Internal Revenue Code.

Which was agreed to. Thereupon, the bill was read the third time and passed.

Message from the Senate No. 33

A message was received from the Senate by Ms. Gradel, its Assistant Secretary, as follows:

Madam Speaker:

I am directed to inform the House that:

The Senate has on its part passed Senate bills of the following titles:

S. 46. An act relating to the taxation of vehicles used for forestry operations.

S. 71. An act relating to consumer data privacy and online surveillance.

S. 126. An act relating to health care payment and delivery system reform.

In the passage of which the concurrence of the House is requested.

The Senate has on its part adopted concurrent resolutions originating in the House of the following titles:

H.C.R. 63. House concurrent resolution congratulating the Brattleboro Food Co-op on its 50th anniversary and extending best future wishes.

H.C.R. 64. House concurrent resolution congratulating Caitlin MacLeod-Bluver of Winooski High School on her selection as the 2025 Vermont Teacher of the Year and Jeremy DeMink of Edmunds Middle School in Burlington and Sonya Shedd of Wolcott Elementary School on their recognition as Distinguished Finalists.

H.C.R. 65. House concurrent resolution recognizing May 2025 as Progressive Supranuclear Palsy Awareness Month in Vermont.

H.C.R. 66. House concurrent resolution celebrating the role of tourism in the Vermont economy and designating April 10, 2025 as Tourism Economy Day at the State House.

H.C.R. 67. House concurrent resolution commemorating the 250th anniversary of Ethan Allen's planning, in Bennington in 1775, of the successful Vermont initiation of the American War of Independence and the associated expedition to Ticonderoga.

H.C.R. 68. House concurrent resolution celebrating the role of the manufacturing industry in the Vermont economy and designating April 2, 2025 as Manufacturing Day at the State House.

H.C.R. 69. House concurrent resolution designating April 2, 2025 as Early College Day at the State House.

Adjournment

At eleven o'clock and fifty-three minutes in the forenoon, on motion of **Rep. McCoy of Poultney**, the House adjourned until Tuesday, April 1, 2025, at ten o'clock in the forenoon, pursuant to the provisions of J.R.S. 19.

Concurrent Resolutions Adopted

The following concurrent resolutions, having been placed on the Consent Calendar on the preceding legislative day, and no member having requested floor consideration as provided by Rule 16b of the Joint Rules of the Senate and House of Representatives, are hereby adopted on the part of the House:

H.C.R. 63

House concurrent resolution congratulating the Brattleboro Food Co-op on its 50th anniversary and extending best future wishes

H.C.R. 64

House concurrent resolution congratulating Caitlin MacLeod-Bluver of Winooski High School on her selection as the 2025 Vermont Teacher of the Year and Jeremy DeMink of Edmunds Middle School in Burlington and Sonya Shedd of Wolcott Elementary School on their recognition as Distinguished Finalists

H.C.R. 65

House concurrent resolution recognizing May 2025 as Progressive Supranuclear Palsy Awareness Month in Vermont

H.C.R. 66

House concurrent resolution celebrating the role of tourism in the Vermont economy and designating April 10, 2025 as Tourism Economy Day at the State House

H.C.R. 67

House concurrent resolution commemorating the 250th anniversary of Ethan Allen's planning, in Bennington in 1775, of the successful Vermont initiation of the American War of Independence and the associated expedition to Ticonderoga

H.C.R. 68

House concurrent resolution celebrating the role of the manufacturing industry in the Vermont economy and designating April 2, 2025 as Manufacturing Day at the State House

H.C.R. 69

House concurrent resolution designating April 2, 2025 as Early College Day at the State House

[The full text of the concurrent resolutions appeared in the House Calendar Addendum on the preceding legislative day and will appear in the Public Acts and Resolves of the 2025 Biennial Session.]