

From: London, Sarah [Sarah.London@vermont.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2016 8:47 AM
To: Allen, Susan
CC: Pepper, James; Springer, Darren
Subject: Re: DLS reform

Thanks all around!!!

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 12, 2016, at 7:57 AM, Allen, Susan <Susan.Allen@vermont.gov> wrote:

Sounds like Governor would share Chris's concern (dependent upon individual SAs). I'll talk to Chris later today to get a clearer description of HIS view of the legislation.
Sue

From: Pepper, James
Sent: Tuesday, April 12, 2016 7:47 AM
To: London, Sarah <Sarah.London@vermont.gov>
Cc: Allen, Susan <Susan.Allen@vermont.gov>; Springer, Darren <Darren.Springer@vermont.gov>
Subject: Re: DLS reform

Thanks for forwarding that. I can keep an eye on this but probably can't sit in on the committee. S. Judiciary will be taking it up on Friday. I'll work with Geoff to make sure the hearings are covered and get updates from Sears.

James Pepper
Director of Intergovernmental Affairs
802-279-1086 (c)
802-828-6403 (o)

On Apr 11, 2016, at 10:59 PM, London, Sarah <Sarah.London@vermont.gov> wrote:

FYI, below is what I have said to Chris. I'm sorry I don't have most recent on this bill. I don't think we need to weigh in on Chris's legal concerns below, but just FYI if either of you are able to track this bill going forward.

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: "London, Sarah" <Sarah.London@vermont.gov>
Date: April 11, 2016 at 8:20:51 PM EDT
To: "Curtis, Chris" <ccurtis@vtlegalaid.org>
Subject: Re: DLS reform

Thanks Chris. The House obviously made a lot of changes to the original version of this bill. I will pass this on to legislative folks on my end and one way or another we'll connect. Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 11, 2016, at 4:27 PM, Christopher Curtis <CCurtis@vtlegalaid.org> wrote:

Hi Sarah,

Just checking in with you on the DLS reform bill. It appears that the latest version in Senate Judiciary would really limit the effectiveness or general applicability of the restoration day program by making it contingent on a county's state's attorney for approval. I'm concerned about that provision for a number of reasons: first, it deprives Vermonters of their right to participate if a state's attorney objects for political or personal reasons (thus thwarting the intent of the program for a large number of Vermonters for whom it is designed to help clear backlogs of tickets). I wonder if there is a common benefits clause, or equal protection problem there? Second, how does a constituent who wishes to avail themselves of the proposed remedy to know it is not actually available to them? And, how would the judicial bureau be able to keep track? Finally, I know it's a priority for AOT to peel off some of the outdated "collateral consequences" of license suspension for infractions that are not public safety related. It appears the committee is undecided as yet on those aspects of the bill.

Does the Administration have a perspective on the bill and its current progress? How can members of the Poverty Council help?

Best, Christopher

Christopher J. Curtis
Staff Attorney
Vermont Legal Aid, Inc.
802-223-6377 x335
802-223-7281 (fax)