The Governor’s Budget

On Tuesday, Governor Phil Scott presented his budget to the legislature. Until the governor gives his budget speech there is little framework in which to discuss the priorities in his January 9 State of the State Address. Therefore, as soon as the governor concludes his budget speech, members of the administration promptly visit the committees of jurisdiction to describe how they propose to pay for his priorities.

The budget ostensibly would not raise taxes. “It is my belief the state budget should not grow any faster than people’s paychecks,” Scott said. “Our goal should be to do our work in ways that help Vermonters keep more of what they earn, making it easier and not harder for every family to live a secure and stable life.”

The proposed FY21 budget totals $6.3 billion, an increase of 2 percent over last year’s budget. Federal funds account for $2.1 billion of total revenues, the General Fund is $1.7 billion, and the Transportation Fund totals $291 million. The Education Fund is expected to increase by 5 percent ($87 million) to $1.8 billion.

When federal and other dedicated dollars are added, total spending on general education is projected to be $2.14 billion. (We have heard that the Corrections Department Community High School costs are proposed to be returned to the Education Fund. This, of course, is an expense over which local school districts have absolutely no control).

The governor highlighted Vermont’s continuing demographic trend of an aging population and the likelihood that, without action, the greater Burlington area will continue to grow while population in the rest of the state declines. He said that Vermont will to continue to advocate for legal immigration as a way to increase the population and workforce, and he reiterated Vermont’s commitment to the idea that “America is still a land of opportunity for all who seek freedom from oppression, security for their families, or in some cases, just a fresh start.”

Scott emphasized the need to invest in communities far from the economic engine of Chittenden County. Addressing needs in those municipalities, his budget also:

• recommended an additional $1.4 million in downtown and village center tax credits to spur activity in regional economic centers;
• proposed reforms to Act 250;
• recommended an expanded tax increment financing program to enable smaller towns to build infrastructure to attract economic growth to their downtowns;
• would invest in Newport City’s downtown recovery from the EB-5 fraud;
• complete the Lamoille Valley Rail Trail, which runs through 18 towns and villages; and
• recommend funds to rehabilitate older homes into affordable and energy efficient rental properties.
All of these initiatives will help local governments to increase locally sustainable economies and invest in housing to support that growth.

However, while overall revenues in the state continue to grow, demand for funds increases even faster. Thus, even in a year of a funding surplus, choices must be made among program priorities. A new Report on Unfunded Budget Pressures explains obligations in several funds that exceed revenues to pay for them.

The budget is enormous, and our initial review has been only cursory. Elsewhere in this report we summarize the transportation fund, and we previously discussed education funding. Much more about how the proposed budget will affect towns and cities will follow in future Weekly Legislative Reports.

Resources
• FY21 Executive Budget Summary
• Report on Unfunded Budget Pressures (Jan. 21, 2020)
• FY21 State of Vermont Executive Budget Recommendation

Transportation Budget Proposal

Always an important source of funding to local governments is the Transportation Fund. While the requirements to comply with the Municipal Roads General Permit, general stormwater management that affects roads, along with regular construction and maintenance needs increase significantly every year, revenues from the Transportation Fund to help pay for those obligations do not. VLCT and our municipal members understand, relate to, and appreciate the budgetary pressures the Agency of Transportation (VTrans) faces year in and year out, however it is unacceptable to shift those budgetary constraints to local governments.

The proposed FY21 Transportation Budget would be $641,329,744, a $25,510,077 increase over FY20’s $615,819,667 figure. However, the allocation for combined town highway programs would decrease yet again – from $69.3 million in FY19 to $63.6 million in FY20 to $62.1 million in FY21 – a ten-percent decrease since FY19.

Here is how some of the numbers break down:

• Decrease of $2.8M for Town Highways Bridge Program (from $23M in FY16 to $16.5M in FY18 to $11.1M in FY21)
• Decrease of $2.9M in FEMA’s Public Assistance Program
• Decrease of $505K for the Transportation Alternatives Program (from $4.6M in FY17 to $3.6M in FY19 to $2.8M in FY21)
• Increase of $442.6K for Town Highway Aid (the increase reflects a statutory formula level)
• Level funding of the following:
  • Town Highway Structure grants ($6.33M)
  • Town Highway Class 2 grants ($7.65M)
  • Town Highways non-federal disasters ($1.15M)
  • Town Highway federal disasters ($118K)
  • Town Highways Class 1 Supplemental ($128.75K)
• Transfer of $3.7M of Clean Water Fund monies from the Agency of Natural Resources to VTrans for the Municipal Mitigation Grant Program for MRGP compliance projects

While the agency’s coordination, assistance and partnership with our towns and cities is very much appreciated, funding levels to municipalities nevertheless remains grossly inadequate. The slack that communities try to pick up through the municipal property tax increases every year, and communities struggle to keep up. Local projects get shelved, maintenance is delayed, and economic development and housing projects remain distant dreams because
there is simply not enough money to maintain, upgrade, or build the roads, sidewalks, utilities, and other necessary transportation infrastructure to support those projects.

Stormwater management is a hugely expensive obligation for local governments, even with assistance from the Clean Water Fund. According to the Vermont Clean Water Initiative 2019 Performance Report, out of a total of 13,000 municipal road miles, only 169 miles of municipal road drainage and erosion control improvements have been implemented and only 525 hydrologically-connected municipal road miles have been identified that require water quality improvements. That’s in spite of all the state investment of dollars in clean water initiatives for municipal roads. We obviously still have a long way to go.

Resources
- Vermont Clean Water Initiative 2019 Performance Report
- Vermont Agency of Transportation FY2021 Budget as presented to the House and Senate Transportation committees on January 22, 2020

Senate Natural Resources Ponders Proposed Energy Efficiency Bill

For the last two weeks, the Senate Natural Resources and Energy Committee has been taking testimony on a draft bill relating to energy efficiency entities. The bill proposes a three-year pilot program that allows energy efficiency utilities (EEUs) operating in the electricity sector (such as Efficiency Vermont and Burlington Electric Department) to use a portion of their budgets on programs that reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with transportation and thermal (heat) energy production. That targeted portion of the EEU budget would be determined by the Public Utility Commission (PUC) and would not exceed $2 million per year, provided that the EEU’s total acquisition budget for 2021-2023 does not exceed its budget for the previous three-year period.

According to the PUC’s preliminary report on all-fuels energy efficiency required by Act 62 of last year, transportation and thermal energy cause more than 70 percent of the state’s greenhouse gas emissions and represent 80 percent of household energy costs. Act 62 requires the PUC to issue a final report considering an energy efficient program model for all-fuels, the expansion of services efficiency utilities may provide, and long-term funding mechanisms. That report is due next January.

The preliminary report focusses on the laws, goals, policies, and current energy programs and funding mechanisms that guide Vermont’s existing energy programs. It does not recommend expanding the programs and services that current EEUs may provide. Conversely, the committee’s draft energy efficiency bill does just that by directing the PUC to authorize electric energy efficiency utilities to spend a portion of their annual budgets on services that:

1. reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the thermal energy or transportation sectors, or both;
2. result in the largest possible greenhouse gas emissions reductions in a cost-effective manner;
3. demonstrate a nexus with electricity usage;
4. are complementary to and do not replace or compete with electric utility energy transformation project calculations that retail electric providers must meet under the Vermont Renewable Energy Standards; and
5. ensure that the benefits realized in a retail electricity provider’s territory are in proportion to the energy efficiency charge collected there.

Committee Chair Christopher Bray opined that the proposed bill would be an interim step to focus on what works in anticipation of the goals identified in the PUC’s 2021 final report. Stakeholders, including the energy efficiency utilities and retail electric providers that testified on the proposed bill, generally agreed with this approach.

Committee discussions prompted many questions, including:
• What portion of the energy efficiency utilities’ budget should go toward greenhouse gas emission reductions in the transportation and thermal energy sectors? Should legislation offer guidance to the PUC to help determine this?

• Would an energy efficiency program focusing on reductions in the transportation and thermal energy sectors disadvantage rural areas and the poor? How could the law guarantee equitable distributions? It was noted that very few Vermonters with the highest car mileage needs currently purchase electric vehicles, and electric rates in sparsely populated areas tend to be higher than in dense population centers.

• What should be the state’s priorities? Energy efficiency and greenhouse gas reduction don’t always go hand in hand. Revenue used to meet the goals of the bill could lessen the amount of money going back to rate payers and eliminate other energy efficiency projects.

Although the committee’s goal was to release the bill by today, at the time of this writing they were still taking testimony and clarifying language.

References:
• Draft Bill 8 (dr req 20-0811, Jan. 23, 2020)
• Act 62 – Preliminary Report on All-Fuels Energy Efficiency, a PUC Report

**Vermont Addresses Global Warming**

On Wednesday, VLCT advocacy staff testified in the House Energy and Technology Committee regarding legislation to establish a Vermont Global Warming Solutions Act, which is a priority of the legislative Vermont Climate Solutions Caucus.

We cited numerous actions taken by cities and towns – mostly through the work of volunteers – to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and address both climate change and the resiliency of municipalities in the wake of extreme weather events, which are occurring with more frequency in Vermont.

Two and a half years ago, the VLCT Board of Directors voted to join the Vermont Climate Pledge Coalition, which is affiliated with the national America’s Pledge on Climate. Last November, the National League of Cities – which counts VLCT as a member – adopted a resolution that supports and advances “… Resilient Communities to Prepare for Changing Climate and Extreme Weather Events., The resolution urges Congress to take immediate action to address climate change.

At last count, 130 cities and towns in Vermont have established energy committees. Three towns have submitted energy plans to the Public Service Department pursuant to provisions of Act 174 (the Energy Development Improvement Act of 2016) for determinations of energy compliance in order to receive “enhanced consideration” before the Public Utility Commission when it considers an application for a renewable energy project. (The enhanced consideration standard has not yet been tested before the PUC). An additional 46 towns completed enhanced energy plans that have been approved by their regional commissions. In 2018 and 2019, 55 Vermont towns adopted the Climate Solutions Resolution of 350Vermont, a statewide organization that advocates against the continued use of fossil fuels. These and other efforts indicate the commitment that towns and villages across the state have to address climate change. Municipalities continue to increase their use of and contributions to the Energy Action Network’s Vermont Energy Dashboard.

However, much more needs to be done by everyone to successfully transition to a viable new economy that accounts for the needs of Vermonters in all parts of the state and walks of life. One new bill, H.688, attempts to do so.

The bill would establish new goals for greenhouse gas reductions by not less than:
The bill would create a new Vermont Climate Council, much as the nearby states of Connecticut, New York, and Maine have done. Members would include the secretaries and commissioners of most agencies and several departments, representatives of municipal government and rural communities, the fuel and clean energy sectors, climate change scientists and representatives from many other interest groups. The council would identify strategies to transition Vermont to a resilient and reduced greenhouse gas emissions economy. It would adopt a Vermont Climate Action Plan by July 1, 2021 and update it every four years. The Secretary of the Agency of Natural Resources (ANR) would report to the legislature every January. The council, a part of ANR, would create several subcommittees, including:

- Cross-Sector Mitigation, for finding greenhouse gas emission reductions in the most cost-effective manner;
- Just Transitions, to ensure strategies to reduce greenhouse gas also build resiliency and do not unfairly burden any groups, communities, or geographic locations; and
- Rural Resiliency and Adaptation, which would focus on pressures climate change will impose on rural transportation, electricity, housing, and emergency services.

As introduced, H.688 would mandate that every municipality file a report with the Director of Vermont Emergency Management concerning municipal emergency preparedness, infrastructure resiliency, and infrastructure investment.

If the Secretary failed to adopt or update rules in accordance with the schedule in the bill, “any person may commence an action in the Civil Division of the Superior Court”. Before going to court the person would need to give the secretary 60 days’ notice of his or her intent. Likewise, court action could be initiated if a person thought the adopted rules failed to meet the established greenhouse gas emissions reductions. The court could also award reasonable costs and attorney’s fees. Local officials’ experience, however, has been that citizen rights of action in the clean water arena typically served the purpose of spending a tremendous amount of money on litigation and caused years of delay in implementing remediation measures, when that money could have instead been spent on bringing water projects to fruition.

While VLCT supports the impetus for the legislation, we believe that as written, the bill likely won’t achieve its goals. If climate change is Vermont’s most urgent priority, any such program and attendant council must be attached to the governor’s office, where it can require coordinated action from all state agencies.

The council and new climate resiliency office should be required to first assess current energy efficiency, energy planning, renewable energy, and climate adaptation programs, determine where there are redundancies, and ensure that new and existing programs do not conflict, overlap, or require unnecessary duplicative work from the regulated community. Local officials have ample experience with programs that disregard each other and create impossible outcomes for the regulated community.

For instance, municipalities’ responsibilities already include:

- Municipal Roads General Permit annual reports, road erosion inventories, and implementation plans (due by December 31, 2020);
- Local Hazard Mitigation Plans required in order to receive federal funds from the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s Hazard Mitigation Grant and Pre-Disaster Mitigation programs; and
- Local Emergency Preparedness Plans, which must be updated and readopted annually in order to receive federal preparedness funds and increased state reimbursement through the Emergency Relief and Assistance Fund.
• Also, the approximately 200 municipalities adopting a municipal plan must update them and secure approval from the regional commission every eight years and include an energy element in the plan.

The council and its subcommittees must focus on how implementing global warming actions will affect rural areas where transportation costs are higher, communication networks are frequently lacking, fewer people are available to volunteer for vital jobs such as emergency medical and fire services, and economies are more fragile.

Local governments are often leaders in the “Think globally, act locally” movement. They provide a low-risk laboratory for action that demonstrates the way to enact innovative solutions to intractable problems if they are authorized to do so. H.688 should authorize cities and towns to enact ordinances that address climate change and resiliency locally.

Much more discussion is to come in the House Energy and Technology Committee about how to most effectively combat climate change in Vermont. The committee will be interested in hearing from local officials about this issue at Local Government Day.

**Tree Warden – The Most Powerful Gig in Town?**

If Vermont’s Department of Forests, Parks and Recreation has its way, your town’s tree warden will be in line to get the biggest job promotion in the history of local government. It’s unclear why the department is taking the unprecedented step of pushing controversial legislation that redefines and restructures roles and responsibilities of municipal officials, but every municipality in the state needs to pay close attention to H.673, an act relating to tree wardens. Don’t let the simplistic title of the bill fool you. though, because the legislation is about so much more. VLCT sees this legislation as a gross overstep of authority from the department and strongly opposes it.

While H.673 on its face appears to simply update tree warden laws, it goes much further by making substantive changes to the roles and responsibilities of selectboards, road commissioners, public works directors, and other officials who work within a town’s right-of-way and on municipal properties. Old terminology in statute relating to “public shade” and “ornamental” trees is replaced with a new term, “public tree,” now defined as any tree “within, or on the boundary of, a public way or public place.” The new terminology and broad definition exponentially increases the scope of authority tree wardens have over trees on certain municipal property, and along every town road and right-of-way. In so doing, long-held selectboard powers over town roads, bridges, structures, and rights-of-way are being infringed upon by unelected and often untrained tree wardens. The bill provides tree wardens and “unencumbered or abutting land owners” new powers and authority that at best conflict with and at worst infringe upon a selectboard’s authority over town roads and municipal infrastructure.

If the position of tree warden is to remain in municipal law, a tree warden’s authority needs to be limited to public shade and ornamental trees. Those terms were chosen for specific reasons when tree warden laws were developed. Previous legislatures did not use the term “public tree” but instead specifically used “shade tree” and “ornamental tree” to carve out trees of distinct aesthetic and shade value. Twenty-four V.S.A. § 2502, passed in 1969, supports this reading of law, specifying that a tree warden may implement a program “for the purpose of shading and beautifying public ways and places by planting new trees and shrubs; by maintaining the health, appearance, and safety of existing trees through feeding, pruning, and protecting them from noxious insect and disease pests…” In other words, a shade or ornamental tree is one that is either planted for shade or ornamentation or is one that already exists and is maintained to support its health, appearance and safety.

H.673 conflates Parks and Shade Tree laws in Chapter 67 of Title 24 with Town Highways laws in Title 19. These are wholly different and distinct areas of municipal law that should not be merged in any manner. Where tree wardens currently have authority over public shade and ornamental trees, selectboards have authority over all municipally owned property, and all roads and rights-of-way. The bill proposes to implant tree wardens into town
highway law and even states “trees located in whole or in part within the limits of a town highway or right-of-way shall not be removed without the prior approval of the tree warden.” Selectboards would need to receive a tree warden’s approval to remove trees and bushes on town roads and rights-of-way. Tree wardens would also need to approve the cutting of trees by town highways for the construction, maintenance, or repair of utility lines. These are unacceptable and unworkable changes to municipal highway laws that gives unprecedented power to tree wardens alongside roads and highways.

Road crews and public works officials need the authority to maintain the public right-of-way for transportation, utility and public safety purposes without being subject to another’s authority. Every Vermont town has regular and ongoing maintenance issues, and the ability to manage vegetation and trees in rights-of-way is a core function of a selectboard’s authority roads. Tree wardens are being pulled into the competing demand that public works has in maintaining the public right-of-way that will be amplified in light of stormwater regulations and towns needing to comply with Municipal Roads General Permit mandates. New notice and public hearing requirements by tree wardens to remove public trees greater than six inches in diameter are unworkable and handcuff our road crews and public works officials seeking to do their jobs. Hearings for the cutting of shade and ornamental trees in residential areas is one thing, but public hearings for the cutting of all small-diameter public trees along a right of way is simply unfeasible.

In the coming weeks, H.673 will be taken up again in the House Agriculture Committee and VLCT hopes to hear from selectboard members, road commissioners, highway foreman, town managers, and public works directors on their views. We also urge you to voice your concerns of and opposition to this bill to your representatives.

Local Government Day

Thursday, February 13, 2020, 8:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., at the Capitol Plaza Hotel and Vermont State House in Montpelier.

Learn the status of pending legislation that affects local government, attend legislative hearings, and speak with your representatives and senators. You can see the most up-to-date agenda and register at vlct.org/event/local-government-day.

Energy, Emissions, and Action. Meeting Vermont’s energy and emissions commitments requires targeted action at all levels. Reducing emissions and growing the economy go hand in hand. Learn how action can benefit a small, predominantly rural place-based economy, and how we measure success. Speaker: Jared Duval, Executive Director, Energy Action Network

Tax Department Grand List Software Provider (just added)
Speakers: Douglas Farnham, Economist and Director of Policy, Vermont Department of Taxes; and Jill Remick, Director, Property Valuation and Review

Attend legislative committee meetings that specifically address the concerns of local government A Joint House and Senate Transportation Committee Hearing is scheduled for 10:30 to noon. The Joint Government Operations Committee – which is addressing locally voted charter changes and self-governance – will meet after lunch. The House Energy and Technology Committee will discuss climate resiliency and broadband. Floor action in both the House and Senate will occur after one o’clock, and more meetings will be added to our schedule.

And, if you haven’t already done so, be sure to tour the State House with Vermont State House Curator Extraordinaire David Schütz.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILL NUMBER</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF NEW BILLS</th>
<th>CURRENT LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.761</td>
<td>Would extend by two years the required date by which coverage under a general permit must be sought for a discharge of stormwater from impervious surface of three or more acres in size when the previous discharge was not permitted or was permitted under an individual permit that did not incorporate the requirements of the 2002 Stormwater Management Manual.</td>
<td>House Nat. Resources, Fish, and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.766</td>
<td>Would establish a comprehensive regulatory system for the production and sale of cannabis and cannabis products in Vermont and create a Cannabis Control Board as the independent regulatory authority for a commercial cannabis market.</td>
<td>House Government Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.771</td>
<td>Would impose restrictions on the manufacture, sale, and distribution of residential rugs and carpets to which perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) have been added, and include PFAS on the list of chemicals of high concern to children.</td>
<td>House Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.782</td>
<td>Would make numerous changes to the state and municipal land use laws in order to increase housing.</td>
<td>House Gen., Housing, and Military Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.793</td>
<td>Would amend the powers and duties of the auditor of accounts, including those relating to Vermont state colleges, the Vermont Student Assistance Corporation, and county budgets.</td>
<td>House Government Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.794</td>
<td>Would make providers of agritourism activities immune from civil liability if a participant is injured as a result of risks inherent in the activity and the provider has posted a warning about those risks.</td>
<td>House Agriculture and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.808</td>
<td>Would create a statewide policy for the use of deadly force by law enforcement.</td>
<td>House Judiciary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.828</td>
<td>Would amend the Vermont Water Quality Standards (VWQS) to clarify that the standards apply to wetlands and discharges to wetlands. Would amend the VWQS to require that any federal Clean Water Act section 401 certification issued by the state for waters or wetlands include an evaluation of water quality impacts on waters and wetlands and an evaluation of alternative means of accomplishing the proposed action for which certification is sought.</td>
<td>House Nat. Resources, Fish, and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.830</td>
<td>Would require the Agency of Agriculture, Food and Markets to regulate compost foraging as farming and amend the definition of “farming” under Act 250 and the Required Agricultural Practices to include compost foraging.</td>
<td>House Agriculture and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.831</td>
<td>Would delay by two years the deadline for coverage under the stormwater general permit for discharges of stormwater from impervious surface of three or more acres in size, when the stormwater discharge previously was not permitted or was permitted under an individual permit or general permit that did not incorporate the requirements of the 2002 Stormwater Management Manual or any subsequently adopted Stormwater Management Manual.</td>
<td>House Nat. Resources, Fish, and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.833</td>
<td>Would require the Secretary of Natural Resources to convene a Surface Water Diversions and Transfers Study Group to investigate and make recommendations to the General Assembly regarding the environmental, economic, and recreational impacts of transferring surface water between watershed basins and of diversions of surface water in general.</td>
<td>House Nat. Resources, Fish, and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.836</td>
<td>Would create a private right of action for damages against a person who causes a law enforcement officer to arrive at a location in with the intent to infringe on another person’s constitutional rights, unlawfully discriminate against another person, harass or embarrass another person, cause another person to be expelled from a place where the person has a lawful right to be, or damage another person’s reputation.</td>
<td>House Judiciary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.838</td>
<td>Would create an exception to the prohibition on firearms possession by persons convicted of violent crimes if the conviction is for violating an abuse prevention order and the offense was committed before July 1, 2015.</td>
<td>House Judiciary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.841</td>
<td>Would remove the current sales and use tax exemption for prewritten software accessed remotely; and reallocate 3% of the current meals and rooms tax revenue from the Education Fund to the General Fund.</td>
<td>House Ways and Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL NUMBER</td>
<td>SUMMARY OF NEW BILLS</td>
<td>CURRENT LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.842</td>
<td>Prior to the release from confinement of a sex offender who has offended against a minor, would make the Department of Corrections notify neighbors whose property abuts the property where the sex offender will reside of the offender’s registry status and his or her plans to reside at the specific location.</td>
<td>House Corrections and Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.848</td>
<td>Would require the State Treasurer to create a new State Employees’ Retirement System and State Teachers’ Retirement System for employees and teachers hired after July 1, 2022.</td>
<td>House Government Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.850</td>
<td>Would prohibit employers from discriminating or retaliating against employees who are absent from work while performing duties as volunteer firefighters.</td>
<td>House Gen., Housing, and Military Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.851</td>
<td>Would establish a good cause standard for termination of employment in Vermont.</td>
<td>House Gen., Housing, and Military Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.853</td>
<td>Would permit off-road vehicles to use discontinued highways, legal trails, and impassable or untraveled highways.</td>
<td>House Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.858</td>
<td>Would impose a tax on the transfer of tax-exempt property.</td>
<td>House Ways and Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.867</td>
<td>Would establish a work group to propose remediation measures for Vermont cemeteries at risk due to underlying environmental causes. Would create an At-Risk Cemetery Fund to fund the remediation of cemeteries with environmental damage or that are at risk of future damage due to underlying environmental causes.</td>
<td>House Gen., Housing, and Military Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.868</td>
<td>Would require the state to develop a regenerative economy roadmap by 2023.</td>
<td>House Commerce and Econ. Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.872</td>
<td>Would increase the cumulative capacity of net metering systems allocated to a municipality from 500 kW to 1 MW.</td>
<td>House Energy and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.877</td>
<td>Would impose a property transfer tax surcharge of one additional percentage point on transfers of high-value real property located in Vermont. The surcharge would be imposed at a rate of 2.25% of the value of the property transferred in excess of $1 million.</td>
<td>House Ways and Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.882</td>
<td>Would extend the time period that the Town of Hartford can incur indebtedness for its tax increment financing district for three years, beginning on March 31, 2021.</td>
<td>House Ways and Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.887</td>
<td>Would require the Criminal Justice Training Council to amend the model fair and impartial policing policy to prohibit information sharing between law enforcement and federal immigration authorities.</td>
<td>House Judiciary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.310</td>
<td>Would alter two definitions to ensure the addition of an accessory on-farm business did not trigger a use value appraisal penalty, change the period of certifying agricultural land from annually to every three years, and require that recipients of use value appraisals be in good standing with the Department of Taxes on their taxes.</td>
<td>Senate Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.311</td>
<td>Would create a Vermont Green New Deal Fund to curb climate change by funding energy conservation programs such as weatherization, thermal efficiency, renewable heating systems, public transportation, and the use of electric vehicles. The fund would be funded with revenue raised by an income tax surcharge on high incomes.</td>
<td>Senate Natural Resources and Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.312</td>
<td>Would extend by two years the required date by which coverage under a general permit must be sought for a discharge of stormwater from impervious surface of three or more acres in size when the stormwater discharge previously was not permitted or was permitted under an individual permit or general permit that did not incorporate the requirements of the 2002 Stormwater Management Manual.</td>
<td>Senate Natural Resources and Energy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VLCT’s *Weekly Legislative Report* is now an all-digital publication with this exception: Readers without reliable internet service can continue to receive paper copies if they notify us at mailings@vlct.org. Thanks for reading!