

From: Peterson, Mary [Mary.Peterson@vermont.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2012 10:52 AM
To: MacLean, Alex; Ross, Chuck; Recchia, Chris
Subject: FW: Current Use and Statutory Parking Provision

I am not sure the current status of current use, but we have the lingering parking provision language.

Finance is taking up Misc. and plans to vote out this week - I have a meeting with Ann tomorrow. Now is the time to raise repeal.

Are we all of the mind that the parking provision needs to be repealed - I copy the exchange below just as a reminder how badly the permit piece blew up after legislators went home last year. I am not sure Senate Finance even knows what an uproar there was. I have heard rumor that Westman is digging in his heels, but we would have to be very cautious to offer any "fix" to his language versus repeal - we risk some more unintended consequences and current use advocate backlash.

Thoughts?
Mary

>-----Original Message-----

>From: MacLean, Alex
>Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2011 10:20 AM
>To: Ross, Chuck; Peterson, Mary; Spaulding, Jeb; Markowitz, Deb;
>Robinson, Beth; Lofy, Bill
>Cc: Costa, Michael; Bachman, Molly; Johnson, Bill
>Subject: Re: Possible Talking Points
>
>Hi All -
>
>I am afraid that I have a few concerns with the first sentence and I
>know that Mary and Beth share those concerns. A couple of you missed
>yesterday's call and I think it is very important that we all get on
>the same page on this one. Also think it would be helpful to have
>Westman's perspective and hopefully Mary will be in touch with him at
>some point today. Can we please schedule another quick phone call for
>this afternoon at 4:00?
>
>Does that work for everyone?
>
>Alex
>
>On 5/24/11 12:45 AM, "Ross, Chuck" <Chuck.Ross@state.vt.us> wrote:
>
>>Mary and others,

>>Thanks. The talking points are helpful. I, however, think we need to
>>be prepared to answer the following questions with clarity: Are you
>>going to implement this law? Are properties and their owners who have
>>triggered the provisions of this law going to be subject to this tax?
>>
>>I would suggest we say:
>>No, not for the foreseeable future and maybe never. We do not plan to
>>implemented this law anytime prior to the next legislative session.
>>This is a complicated law with many unknown consequences which will
>>require the state do some more research as to the nature of the
>>unknown consequences. Once those consequences are better understood
>>the state will have to promulgate rules for this law. The promulgation
>>and adoption of rules typically takes months to complete and requires
>>the participation of the Administrative Rules Committee of the legislature.
>>This process will take the time line for implementation into the
>>legislative session. Once the legislature is in session, it would be
>>appropriate to consult with the Legislature about any findings about
>>the law that has been discovered which might lead them to change the
>>law. If the Legislature changes the law then it will not be
>>implemented. If the Legislature has no concerns with the law or any
>>issues that have arisen then the law will most likely have to wait
>>until the spring of 2012 to implement the law.

>>
>>Not sure if this helps or not but it is how i see this. Happy to
>>discuss further.

>>
>>Chuck

>>
>>chuck

>>
>>_____

>>From: Peterson, Mary
>>Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2011 12:20 AM
>>To: Spaulding, Jeb; Markowitz, Deb; Robinson, Beth; MacLean, Alex;
>>Ross, Chuck; Lofy, Bill
>>Cc: Costa, Michael; Bachman, Molly; Johnson, Bill
>>Subject: RE: Possible Talking Points

>>
>>Here are some thoughts - could be trimmed.

>>
>>I did not reach Richie (his voicemail is full, so I could not even
>>leave message - fyi, at the end of the session, his father apparently
>>was quite ill). I did speak to Tom Vickery, member of VT Assoc. of
>>Listers & Assessors (VALA). Without prompting, he recited what we
>>have been discussing - that folks understood that this was very
>>complex, and that it would not be sorted out and enforced prior to the

>>next legislative session. He mentioned that both VALA and the Current
>>Use Coalition have meetings coming up, their first since the bill
>>passed - we should discuss any outreach.
>>
>>He said that the provision caught everyone by surprise. He only
>>learned of it in the very final days of the session. His view was
>>that this type of approach had been considered for the Current Use
>>bill, and they could not come up with a feasible solution. Instead
>>they decided to get at the problem by increasing the LUCT. He suggested, as have others, that
Sen.
>>Westman may have seen this as a way to stave off such an increase.
>>
>>I am back in Vermont - and will be in the office tomorrow!
>>
>>Mary
>>Mary Peterson
>>Commissioner
>>Vermont Department of Taxes
>>133 State Street
>>Montpelier, VT 05633
>>802-828-2505
>>_____
>>From: Richards, Alyson
>>Sent: Monday, May 23, 2011 12:06 PM
>>To: Spaulding, Jeb; Markowitz, Deb; Peterson, Mary; Robinson, Beth;
>>MacLean, Alex; Ross, Chuck
>>Cc: Lofy, Bill
>>Subject: 4:00pm Current Use Conference Call Info
>>
>>Bill is on the road for a meeting, but he wanted me to follow-up on
>>his conversations with you all and confirm today's current use call.
>>
>>4:00pm today works for everyone, and the call-in info is as follows:
>>
>>Conference dial-in: 218-339-4300
>>Access code: 600495#
>>
>>Thanks!
>>
>>Aly
>