

2023 Weekly Legislative Report #13

This was a very active week in the legislature. The House took up the budget bill, capital bill, transportation bill, and property tax yield rates – and passed all of them. Dispatch and housing were also on the docket, and the Senate finally passed a watered-down S.100.

Expand All

[House Takes Up Appropriations Bill H.494](#)

2023 is shaping up to be a very expensive year for the Vermont taxpayer. The House has passed several bills that have been priorities for some time, and there are hefty price tags attached to many of them. The budget bill, H.494, which is being taken up Friday, brings some of those expenditures into focus. The total budget as introduced by the House Appropriations Committee equals \$8,530,939,484. The long Appropriations table attached to this article shows the items of most concern to local officials.

Housing

We note that housing development at every income level is a top priority for local officials. We have not included those appropriations in the table as they do not fund town projects. Appropriations for housing include:

Category	Amount
Adverse Weather & Emergency Housing	\$18.9 million
VT Housing Conservation Board Affordable Housing	\$50 million
VT housing Improvement Program	\$10 million
Housing Opportunity Grants	\$2.5 million

Missing Middle Housing

\$ 0

A related appropriation is \$500,000 for municipal bylaw modernization grants to fund the updating of bylaws so as to encourage housing development. The bill would allocate \$6.2 million to regional commissions, an increase from the Governor's proposal of \$4.7 million.

Education

Of the appropriations total amount, \$2,099,013,162 is Education Fund. Readers should remember that almost two thirds of the Education Fund Revenues are education property tax dollars. H.492, the property yield bill, was also introduced this week and is on the House floor. It establishes the property dollar equivalent yield at \$15,477. The income dollar equivalent yield would be \$17,577, and the non-homestead property tax rate would be \$1.388 per \$100 of equalized education property value. Moreover, in FY24, \$22 million would be reserved in the Education Fund to offset property tax rate increases in FY25.

Based on that bill, the Education Fund Outlook (linked below) projects that \$1,296,900,000 will come from property taxes (\$515.8 million from homestead properties and \$781.1 from non-homestead properties). That contribution from property taxes represents a \$98 million increase from FY23. The total appropriations from the Education Fund for FY24 equal \$2,099,000,000. The new expense of \$29 million for universal school meals is included in the Education Fund this year, as was widely predicted last year.

Federal Funding and Its Matching Funds

Last year there were several appropriations of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) dollars that are not available this year, although the efforts to spend those dollars for broadband, climate response investments, and water and wastewater continue. H.494 provides \$3 million from the General Fund for the Clean Heat Homes initiative and \$900,000 to the Agency of Natural Resources Climate office. It also reallocates \$900,000 in ARPA funds to the Healthy Homes Initiative.

H.494 authorizes \$4 million for the Department of Environmental Conservation to spend on Municipal Pollution Control Grants and \$9.7 million for the state match to the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) for the Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund. Those dollars are allocated from the Capital Infrastructure Reserve Fund, which in the current circumstance is transferred from the General Fund.

The Agency of Administration has asked for funds to be set aside this year to provide the match for those additional IIJA funds and Bipartisan Infrastructure Act, in FY 26 and 27, the two fiscal years beyond the timeframe for the current two-year capital bill (H.493). The Agency of Natural Resources indicated they expect the match need over the next four fiscal years will be \$27,154,420. That request is somewhat unusual but made with an eye to the facts that many more federal dollars will be available to local governments for environmental infrastructure, those funds require matches, and it is likely that the economy will be weaker and Vermont's revenues reduced in the next few years.

Childcare and Parental Leave

H.66 as passed by the House contains an appropriation of \$37 million from the General Fund to the Division of Family and Medical Leave for FY24 to be used for establishment of the Family and Medical Leave Insurance Fund. S.56, the childcare and parental leave bill passed Friday on the Senate side, would come with a price tag of approximately \$76 million.

Resources for this article:

- [H.494 Summary and Highlights](#)
- [H.494 Budget One-Time Expenditures](#)
- [H.494 Web Report \(Searchable Report of All Appropriations Items\)](#)
- [H.492 Education Fund Outlook March 2023](#)
- [Capital Bill](#)

[H.494 – Appropriations FY24 \(in millions of dollars\)](#)

Budget Item	FY 23 As Adjusted by H. 145	Governor Proposed FY24	House Passed FY24
(GF) Homeowner Rebate (B137)	\$16.5	\$16.25	\$16.25
(GF) Renter Rebate (B138)	9.50	9.50	9.50
(GF) Tax Dept. Reappraisal and Listing (B139)	3.39	3.39	3.39
(GF) Municipal Current Use (B140)	17.80	18.60	18.60
(LOT 30%) PILOT State Buildings (B142)	10.575	10.68	10.68
(LOT 30%) PILOT Montpelier (B143)	0.18	0.18	0.18
(LOT 30%) PILOT Correctional Facilities (B144)	0.04	0.04	0.04
(GF) Special Investigative Units (B206)	2.16	2.23	2.23
(GF/Interdept. Transfer) Criminal Justice Council (B221)	3.46	4.07	4.07
(SF) E-911 Board (B235)	4.59	4.80	4.80
(SF) Cannabis Control Board (B240)	4.88	4.77	5.17
(GF, EF, FF, Other) Education Finance & Admin. (B500)	35.81	36.84	37.34
(EF) Special Education Formula Grants (B502)	208.07	226.20	226.20

(EF) State-Placed Students (B503)	17.50	19.00	19.00
(GF, EF) Flexible Pathways (B504.1)	9.14	10.14	10.14
(EF) Adjusted Education Payment (B505)	1,577.65	1,711.92	1,703.31
(EF) Education Transportation (B506)	21.79	23.52	23.52
(EF) Small Schools Grants (B507)	8.20	8.30	8.30
(EF) Education Universal School Meals	0	29.00	29.00
(EF) Essential Early Education Grant (B510)	7.51	8.35	8.35
(EF) Technical Education (B511)	16.25	17.03	17.03
(GF, EF) Teachers' Retirement (B514, E514, E514.1 – 514.3) ¹	188.07	184.81	184.81
(GF EF) Retired Teachers' Health/ Medical (B515, E515) ²	35.09	29.60	44.71
(GF, Inter-Dept. Transfer) ANR Lands PILOT (B701)	2.66	2.67	2.67
(Property Transfer Tax) Municipal Planning Grants (D100)	0.87	0.90	0.90
(TF) Town Highway Structures (B911, E911)	7.20	7.42	7.42
(TF, FF) Better Roads Program (B912)	0.41	0.48	0.48

(TF) Town Highway Class 2 Roadway (B913)	8.6	8.86	8.86
(TF, TIB, FF) Town Highway Bridges (B914) ³	29.16	36.01	36.01
(TF) Town Highway Aid (B915)	27.84	28.67	28.67
(TF) Town Highway Class 1 Supplemental (B916)	0.13	0.13	0.13
(TF) Town Highway Non-federal Disaster Aid (B917)	1.15	1.15	1.15
(TF, FF) Town Highway Federal Disaster Aid (B918)	0.18	0.18	0.18
(TF, FF, Special) Municipal Mitigation Assistance (B919)	6.45	6.45	10.49
(CIRF) State Match Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (B1105) ⁴			9.70
(CIRF) Municipal Pollution Control Grants ⁴			4.00

Table Notes:

1. \$159,455,378 is the accrued liability contribution, and \$34,825,673 is the normal contribution, paid from the Education Fund. \$9,470,000 is paid by local educational entities.
2. \$43,701,482 is the accrued liability contribution, and \$17,550,000 is the normal contribution paid from the Education Fund. \$7,550,000 is paid by employers (school districts).
3. This amount does not include local match dollars.

4. These appropriations are part of what is ordinarily in the Capital bill (H. 493). The transfer is effected here.

Citations in parentheses refer to the section in the budget bill where those items are found:

GF = General Fund

LOT = 30% local option tax share remitted to state

PILOT = Payment in lieu of taxes

SF = Special Funds

EF = Education Fund

FF= Federal Funds

TF = Transportation Fund

TIB = Transportation Infrastructure Bond

ARPA = American Rescue Plan Act

CIRF = Capital Infrastructure Reserve Fund

[State Transportation Program and Budget FY2024](#)

The House passed [H.479](#), the FY 2024 Transportation bill which adopts and amends the state's annual Transportation Program and includes various amendments and funding authorizations related to transportation. The bill as voted out of the House Transportation Committee differs only slightly from the Governor's budget proposal as it relates to funding that affects municipalities and municipal programs. The overall budget proposal totals \$850,815,297. The House Ways and Means Committee, however, incorporated an amendment to the bill that essentially tacked on a "Fee Bill," tailored to address only [Department of Motor Vehicle \(DMV\) fees](#) which have not been updated in over six years. The Ways and Means Committee stated on the floor of the House that the increases to DMV fees will provide the state with an additional \$20.5 million in revenues. The Governor continues to oppose any increases to fees and opposes this addition to the bill.

The bill makes significant investments in carbon reduction measures – a theme we've seen in Transportation bills in recent years. H.479 continues such greenhouse gas emission reduction measures. Regarding municipal programs, the House did not adjust funding from the Governor's recommended budget, except to make a technical correction to funding to the Municipal Mitigation Assistance Program, which resulted in a net increase in funding levels. The following are some of the highlights of the bill as they relate to the overall state

transportation budget and the programs and funding to local governments.

Carbon Reduction Investments

For more than three years, the legislature has passed transportation budgets that have made significant investments in carbon reduction measures and are designed to more broadly develop a 21st century transportation system that is clean, accessible, and affordable. Last year's FY23 Transportation budget made significant investments in many of these programs. The FY24 budget proposal reallocates \$550,000 of FY23 one-time General Fund appropriations from Replace Your Ride Program to the e-Bike Incentive Program (\$50,000) and a newly created Electrify Your Fleet program (\$500,000).

The new Replace Your Fleet program that's proposed in H.479 would provide incentives to Vermont municipalities and business entities that maintain fleets of motor vehicles to switch to electric vehicles. The program would provide \$2,500 for the purchase or lease of electric vehicles including EV bicycles, motorcycles and snowmobiles. No single applicant is eligible for more than 20 incentives over the life of the program.

The bill proposes that Go! Vermont receive \$405,000 and the Mobility and Transportation Innovations (MTI) Grant Program receive \$500,000. Go! Vermont provides carpool and rideshare services, and the MTI program is designed to support innovative strategies and projects that improve mobility and access to services for transit dependent Vermonters, reduce the use of single occupancy vehicles, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Pursuant to the federal Infrastructure and Jobs Act (IIJA), states are required to develop a carbon reduction program. Under the Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Effective and Cost-Saving Transportation program (PROTECT), states are also required to develop resilience improvement plans in order to access these federal funds. VTrans must measure and calculate Vermont's actual emissions and compare them to the required reduction outlined in Vermont's Global Warming Solutions Act. Based on these actual emissions, VTrans is required to evaluate and recommend program modifications, additions, and funding sources needed to address emission reduction gaps. The agency must then develop a Resilience Improvement Plan to establish how Vermont will use federal monies under the IIJA and PROTECT. VTrans must report back to the House and Senate

Transportation Committee on this work in late 2023 and again by January 15, 2024.

Mileage Based User Fee

The bill authorizes VTrans to create a new mileage-based user fee (MБУF) for plug-in electric vehicles that do not contribute to the gas tax in the manner gasoline fueled vehicles do. The goal is to implement such an MБУF by July 1, 2025. Plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (PHEVs) will not be subject to the fee but will be subject to an annual or biennial registration fee that is 175% of the rate of pleasure cars as set forth in 23 V.S.A. § 361. The bill also includes legislative intent language that the State must work toward collecting a fee on kWhs that are dispensed through electric vehicle supply equipment available to the public so as to supplant lost gas tax revenue from plug-in electric vehicles that are not registered in Vermont but use Vermont highways. It authorizes VTrans to apply for and use federal funds to pay to create and implement the new MБУF.

It's important to note that the bill does not implement an MБУF but sets the wheels in motion. VTrans must return to the legislature next year with a comprehensive plan and report. The report must outline the design of the system and set a plan for implementation, as well as make recommendations for an MБУF rate and estimates on revenue projections from the suggested rate. Next year, the legislature must authorize and codify the MБУF into statute to fully implement it for going live by July 1, 2025.

Complete Streets

H.429 updates statute that requires state transportation projects and certain municipal projects to consider "Complete Streets" principles in project design. Complete Streets means streets that provide safe and accessible options for multiple travel modes for individuals of all ages and abilities, including walking, cycling, public transportation, and motor vehicles. In 2011 the state first added Complete Streets language to law, and the bill proposes to modernize and strengthen statutory language. In all municipal transportation projects on paved roads that use state funds, municipalities must incorporate complete streets principles in the planning, development, construction, and maintenance. However, a municipality may

not be subject to this requirement if a written determination is made, with supporting documentation, that one or more of the following is true:

- the use of the transportation facility by pedestrians, bicyclists, or other users is prohibited by law,
- the cost of incorporating Complete Streets principles is disproportionate to the need or probable use, or
- incorporating Complete Streets principles is outside the scope of the project as defined in VTrans’s Complete Streets Guidance.

In order to educate and encourage municipalities to incorporate Complete Streets principles into more local transportation projects, the bill directs VTrans to work with regional planning commissions and VLCT to design and implement a program to provide training on Complete Streets to towns, cities, and villages.

Municipal Program Funding

H.429 made no changes to the Governor’s recommended budget proposed back in January, except for one technical correction to the Municipal Mitigation Assistance Program. Municipal programs are funded as follows:

PROGRAM	FY23 AS PASSED	FY24 GOVERNOR RECOMMEND	FY24 HOUSE	FY23 AS PASSED VS. FY24 HOUSE
Town Highway Bridges	30,314,187	37,201,775	37,201,775	22.7%
TH Structures	7,200,000	7,416,000	7,416,000	3%
TH Class 2 Roadway	8,600,000	8,858,000	8,858,000	3%

TH – Nonfederal Disasters	1,150,000	1,150,000	1,150,000	0%
TH – Federal Disasters	180,000	180,000	180,000	0%
TH Aid Program	27,837,624	28,672,753	28,672,753	3%
Class 1 Supplemental	128,750	128,750	128,750	0%
Vermont Local Roads	414,481	477,915	477,915	15.3%
Municipal Mitigation Assistance Program	6,450,498	8,060,523	10,488,523	62.6%
TH Public Assistance Grants	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	0%
TOTALS	83,525,540	93,395,716	95,823,716	14.7%

The bill now heads to the Senate Transportation Committee for Senate consideration.

Resources for this article:

- [Transportation Budget Spreadsheet](#)
- [DMV Fees](#)
- [H.429](#)

[Miscellaneous DMV Bill?](#)

Last week the Senate passed [S.99](#), this year's miscellaneous DMV bill. The following provisions in the bill affect local governments.

Speed Limits

The bill proposes to lower the speed limit from 50 MPH to 35 MPH on unpaved and unposted municipal roads. Currently, under 23 V.S.A. § 1081, all maximum speed limits on all state and

municipal roads are set at 50 MPH unless otherwise posted. The bill proposes to set a lower maximum speed limit on unposted, unpaved town highways as defined in 19 V.S.A. § 301(7) and those appearing on the official town highway maps. This change is proposed by the committee as a safety measure in response to requests from municipal officials managing, and residents living, on rural roads throughout Vermont. VLCT supports the proposal.?

The bill mandates VTrans to consult with VLCT and regional planning commissions and prepare materials disseminating information on the new statutory default speed limits to municipalities, law enforcement, and the general public by March 1, 2024. The new lower maximum speed limit on unpaved and unposted roads would take effect on July 1, 2024.??

Removal of Abandoned Vehicles?

S.99 would amend 23 V.S.A. § 2151 to make clear that a law enforcement officer has the authority to request an abandoned motor vehicle be removed by a towing business. Current law does not specify this.??

This bill would further amend 23 V.S.A. § 2153(a) to

- increase the amount of time a towing company has to complete the paperwork with the DMV to remove an abandoned motor vehicle on private property and??
- increase the maximum time to complete the paperwork from 30 days to 90 days.??

S.99 also increases the fees a towing company may charge for removal of abandoned motor vehicles on public property from a maximum of \$40 to \$125.?

Overweight Permits

The bill would have VTrans collaborate with the Commissioner of Forest, Parks, and Recreation; VLCT; the Vermont Forest Products Association; and DMV to examine adding additional special annual permits to 23 V.S.A. § 1392 to allow for the operation of motor vehicles at a gross vehicle weight over 99,000 pounds. The study would consider:?

- Allowing for truck trailer combinations or truck tractor, semi-trailer combinations to transport cargo of legal dimensions that can be separated into units of legal weight without affecting the physical integrity of the load to bear a maximum of 107,00 pounds on six axles or a maximum of 117, 000 pounds on seven axles by special annual permit.?
- Limitations for any additional special annual overweight permits based on highway type, including limited access State highway, non-limited-access State highway, class 1 town highway, and class 2 town highway.?
- Limitations for any additional special annual overweight permits based on axle spacing and axle-weight provisions.?
- Reciprocity treatment for foreign trucks from a state or province that recognizes Vermont vehicles permitted at increased gross weights.?
- Additional penalties for gross vehicle weight violations.?
- The impact that additional overweight permits may have on the forest economy and the management and forest cover of Vermont’s landscape.?

The report is due back to the legislature by January 15, 2024.??

S.99 is currently in the House Transportation Committee and the committee began review of the bill this week.

[Elsewhere in the State House](#)

Regional Dispatch and Emergency Communications

The Senate Finance Committee took more testimony this week on [S.139](#), a bill that would create statewide oversight over emergency communications and dispatching. As we wrote

last week, VLCT has many concerns with the bill and testified last week that there is enough in the bill for almost every town to oppose it. Municipalities and agencies that run dispatch centers would lose their budget and operational control. Municipalities that contract out for dispatch services would lose negotiating position and be subject to a base rate established by the state. Additionally, municipalities would all be paying more because they would pay for not only their dispatching services but also the statewide oversight system that they no longer have control over.

The bill is still in the Senate Finance Committee, which plans to take testimony again next week. Nonetheless, several House committees took testimony on the issue of regional dispatch even though they did not have possession of the bill and the bill did not reach the crossover deadline. The House Government Operations and Military Affairs Committee spent Thursday morning taking testimony on dispatching. VLCT Advocacy staff testified in the House Ways and Means Committee on the funding aspects of dispatching and is invited back to the Senate Finance Committee next week.

Charters

The House Government Operations and Military Affairs Committee is working on several municipal charters, and a few have made it to the House floor for consideration. The Towns of Springfield ([H.271](#)) and Barre ([H.418](#)) and the Village of Alburgh ([H.150](#)) have charters up for consideration today on the House floor. The committee is also working on charters from the Town of Brattleboro ([H.386](#)).

S.100 Housing

During the last thirteen days, according to the Chair of the Senate Natural Resources and Energy Committee, negotiations have been ongoing between that committee and the Senate Economic Development, Housing and General Affairs Committee to see if they could agree

on an amendment to the latter committee's housing bill as it was introduced. Debate was supposed to commence on Wednesday, but was delayed due to Chair of Economic Development, Housing and General Affairs Senator Ram Hinsdale's absence.

On Thursday, the Senate was presented the compromise amendment from the two committees. Your VLCT staff have been clear for weeks that the proposals in the latest amendment are entirely inadequate to address the impediment that Act 250 poses to building the housing that the present crisis demands. The compromise amendment would:

- Strike out the language in the bill as introduced that would remove duplicative state permitting for connections of property to municipal water supply or wastewater permits.
- Amend zoning statute to provide that any ten persons "who allege a common injury to a particularized interest protected by this chapter" (Title 24 Chapter 117) may appeal a zoning permit decision. A "particularized interest" would not include character of the area.
- Allow a municipality to apply for a Master Permit from Act 250 for a designated downtown or neighborhood development area.
- Include a provision in Act 250 that until July 1, 2026, the construction of housing projects with 25 or more units "constructed or maintained on a tract or tracts of land, located entirely within a designated downtown development district, a designated neighborhood development area, or a designated growth center, owned or controlled by a person within a radius of five miles of any point on any involved land and within any continuous period of five years" would be exempt from Act 250. Likewise, construction of a priority housing project "located entirely within a designated downtown development district or a designated growth center" would be exempt until July 1, 2026.
- Require the developer of the proposed 25 units or priority housing project to apply to Act 250 for a jurisdictional opinion, which "shall require that the project be substantially complete by June 30, 2029 in order to remain exempt.

- Allow a designated village center to apply to the state Downtown Board for an enhanced designation if the village center had adopted zoning and subdivision bylaws; municipal sewer, community or alternative wastewater system, or a public community water system; and adequate municipal staff to support coordinated comprehensive and capital planning, development review, and zoning administration. If enhanced designation was secured, until July 1, 2026, an Act 250 permit would not be required for a priority housing project with 50 or fewer units in the designated village center.

The compromise amendment was adopted on a vote of 19 yea and 11 nays. Then the Senate Appropriations Committee removed the appropriations in the bill, as is their wont, because all appropriations should end up in the appropriations bill. And freshmen senators in particular got a lesson in the machinations of crafting controversial legislation.

The bill was up for third reading in the Senate on Friday. Senator Chittenden offered the one amendment that local officials support – to allow for the development of 25 housing units without triggering Act 250 in those towns with adopted zoning and subdivision. That amendment was subsequently superseded with an additional study so the 25 unit provision itself, never came to a vote. And in the end, after everyone made their speeches, the watered down bill passed with only two dissenting votes.

Thank you to all the local officials who contacted their senators about the intense housing crisis and urged support for the original compromise bill out of Senate Economic Development, Housing and General Affairs. We are not finished with the process yet – the bill goes to the House now that it has passed the Senate. In that chamber, the discussion about how to actually address the housing crisis, and how to provide local governments with flexibility in zoning and delegation of programs to effective, dedicated and professional local governments.

H. 480 Reappraisal

H. 480 as introduced sought to address the trigger of the common level of appraisal resulting in a town being ordered to reappraise its properties, the sheer number of local governments

currently or about to be ordered to do so as a result of increasing property values (165 of 254 municipalities), and the difficulty securing appraisal firms to do that work. The bill also included a provision moving the responsibility of contracting for and conducting property reappraisals away from municipalities and to the Department of Taxes division of Property Valuation and Review (PVR) in 2025.??

The House Appropriations Committee recognized that to yank reappraisals from local governments and establish an obligation for the Department of Taxes to conduct statewide reappraisals before studies assessing that potential were completed, was premature. On Tuesday, the committee proposed, and the House adopted, an amendment that would push out for one year a requirement that the department implement a statewide reappraisal system. It would also delay for one year a repeal of the requirement for municipalities to conduct reappraisals; repeal of the \$8.50 per parcel fee for reappraisal and maintenance of the grand list; and increasing the \$1 per parcel fee to \$2 paid to each town for maintenance of the grand list.

H. 480 goes next to the Senate Finance Committee.

S. 60 Local Option Tax

The Senate Finance Committee unanimously voted out S.60, a bill that would grant general authority to municipalities to adopt a one percent local option tax on sales, meals and alcoholic beverages, or room upon a majority vote of the registered voters of the town two weeks ago. The requirement to thereafter seek approval from the legislature would be eliminated.

The committee added an amendment that would establish a charter for the Town of South Hero and bless the vote that town took at Town Meeting 2022 to establish a local option tax on meals and alcoholic beverages. The town would be able to implement the local option tax voters had approved.

This week the chair of the Senate Government Operations Committee proposed a further amendment to the bill that would require the town to revote the question because they had not

followed correct procedure for *their* municipality to adopt a local option tax. Not being one of the 76 municipalities authorized to adopt local option taxes without legislative approval, South Hero was supposed to adopt a charter, vote a local option tax, and then seek approval from the legislature.

On Friday, members of the Senate Finance Committee offered an alternative amendment, stating that the General Assembly authorizes a municipality to assess any local option tax that was approved by the voters at the municipality's 2022 municipal meeting. Thus, if S. 60 and the general authorization for adoption of local option taxes is passed, South Hero will also be authorized to implement the previously voted local option tax.

Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

On Wednesday, the House Ways and Means Committee took up S.35 and S.94, two bills that would extend TIFs in Hartford and Barre City respectively to grant those communities time to recover from the fallout of the pandemic and the current inflationary environment. Representatives from both communities spoke eloquently and clearly about the pandemic circumstances that have led to their request.

VLCT advocacy staff, the Montpelier City Manager, and Executive Director of the Vermont Economic Progress Council took the opportunity to talk about the need for a project-based TIF program that would help cities and towns advance projects that implement state goals for compact settlement, housing development, wastewater and water supply, and more. Approximately 20 towns have expressed interest in a project-based TIF program to date.

Unfortunately, the Senate Finance Committee did not complete work on the TIF bill in their committee, S.83. Thus, if a program is to be created, it will likely need to be part of another bill. **Local officials may want to contact their legislators again to emphasize the need for economic and housing growth tools.**

TIF-related resources:

- [Summary of testimony from Abbie Sherman, Executive Director Vermont Economic Progress Council](#)
- [Karen Horn's Testimony to House Ways and Means Committee](#)
- [Tax Increment Financing Primer](#)
- Comparison of Current TIF Program and Project Based TIF Proposal

[New Bills of Interest to Municipalities](#)

Number	Summary	Current Location
H.492	Would set property tax yields and property tax rates	House Floor
H.493	Capital Bill	House Floor
H.494	Appropriations (Big) Bill	House Floor
H.495	Charter Amendment Town of Middlebury	H. Government Operations and Military Affairs
H.497	Would require that when appraising a property that includes accessibility or environmental features, an appraiser who cannot identify comparable properties within the market area shall either expand the area to include sales of properties with the same or similar features or use the cost approach to value, and shall not exclude the features from the appraisal valuation.	H. Ways and Means

Number Summary

Current Location

[H.499](#) Charter Amendment City of Winooski

H. Government Operations and Military Affairs

[H.503](#) Charter Amendment Town of St. Johnsbury

H. Government Operations and Military Affairs

[S.141](#) Charter Fairfax Fire District No. 1

S. Government Operations

[Join Us on April 3 at 11 AM for the Advocacy Chat!](#)

The next Advocacy Chat is Monday, April 3 at 11 AM.

[Learn More and Register](#)

[Contributors](#)

The *Weekly Legislative Report* is authored by

Karen Horn, VLCT Public Policy & Advocacy Director

Gwynn Zakov, VLCT Municipal Policy Advocate

Editing and proofreading provided by

Ione L. Minot, Content Specialist