TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 1649

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 1649, which directs the Board of Medicine to require unconscious bias and cultural competency training as part of the requirements for licensure renewal.

I remain committed to working with the General Assembly on our collective goals of improving maternal health and outcomes for mothers and mothers-to-be. Our administration has made meaningful investments in prenatal care and has strengthened partnerships with maternal health hubs in areas such as Petersburg as well as re-established the Task Force on Maternal Health Data and Quality Measures last June.

Additionally, we have expanded access to doulas who are specially trained professionals who provide critical support before, during, and after childbirth. I also signed legislation to increase the number of doula visits covered under Medicaid and other legislation that will create a partnership between DMAS and a pregnancy mobile application to promote awareness of maternal and infant health programs to pregnant and postpartum mothers.

I also signed legislation to require cooperation with the Virginia Neonatal and Perinatal Collaborative to implement standard protocols at all birthing hospitals and centers around the Commonwealth for identifying and responding to obstetric emergencies. I have also directed the Virginia Department of Health (VDH) to enhance the Maternal Child Health Data Dashboard, which they recently launched enhancements to, to include actionable data on pregnancy-associated and pregnancy-related mortality.

The preliminary maternal mortality data from VDH from 2024 suggests a significant decline in maternal mortality, from 45 deaths in 2021 to 23 in 2024. Every death is a tragedy and a call for action. The data highlights the importance of continued monitoring and early action. Statistically, the reality is that Black, Hispanic, and Indian mothers and mothers in our rural communities, have a higher mortality rate. The data reveals that the top three causes of maternal mortality cardiac conditions, mental health challenges and substance use, and none of these conditions would be addressed by the training mandate in this legislation.

Regrettably, the General Assembly did not adopt my amendment, which would have directed the Board of Medicine to require licensed professionals who provide care to maternal populations—including in fertility, prenatal, birth, and postpartum care—to complete two hours of continuing education on pregnancy and postpartum health, with a focus on populations at higher risk for maternal and infant mortality.

I believe the Commonwealth can and must effectively address these disparities while promoting the health and dignity of every woman before, during, and after birth. This legislation, however, does not achieve that objective in its current form.

TO: SENATE OF VIRGINIA

SENATE BILL NO. 740

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto Senate Bill 740, which directs the Board of Medicine to require unconscious bias and cultural competency training as part of the requirements for licensure renewal.

I remain committed to working with the General Assembly on our collective goals of improving maternal health and outcomes for mothers and mothers-to-be. Our administration has made meaningful investments in prenatal care and has strengthened partnerships with maternal health hubs in areas such as Petersburg as well as re-established the Task Force on Maternal Health Data and Quality Measures last June.

Additionally, we have expanded access to doulas who are specially trained professionals who provide critical support before, during, and after childbirth. I also signed legislation to increase the number of doula visits covered under Medicaid and other legislation that will create a partnership between DMAS and a pregnancy mobile application to promote awareness of maternal and infant health programs to pregnant and postpartum mothers.

I also signed legislation to require cooperation with the Virginia Neonatal and Perinatal Collaborative to implement standard protocols at all birthing hospitals and centers around the Commonwealth for identifying and responding to obstetric emergencies. I have also directed the Virginia Department of Health (VDH) to enhance the Maternal Child Health Data Dashboard, which they recently launched enhancements to, to include actionable data on pregnancy-associated and pregnancy-related mortality.

The preliminary maternal mortality data from VDH from 2024 suggests a significant decline in maternal mortality, from 45 deaths in 2021 to 23 in 2024. Every death is a tragedy and a call for action. The data highlights the importance of continued monitoring and early action. Statistically, the reality is that Black, Hispanic, and Indian mothers and mothers in our rural communities, have a higher mortality rate. The data reveals that the top three causes of maternal mortality cardiac conditions, mental health challenges and substance use, and none of these conditions would be addressed by the training mandate in this legislation.

Regrettably, the General Assembly did not adopt my amendment, which would have directed the Board of Medicine to require licensed professionals who provide care to maternal populations—including in fertility, prenatal, birth, and postpartum care—to complete two hours of continuing education on pregnancy and postpartum health, with a focus on populations at higher risk for maternal and infant mortality.

I believe the Commonwealth can and must effectively address these disparities while promoting the health and dignity of every woman before, during, and after birth. This legislation, however, does not achieve that objective in its current form.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 1675

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 1675, which directs the Board of Medicine to require unconscious bias and cultural competency training as part of the requirements for licensure renewal.

I remain committed to working with the General Assembly on our collective goals of improving maternal health and outcomes for mothers and mothers-to-be. Our administration has made meaningful investments in prenatal care and has strengthened partnerships with maternal health hubs in areas such as Petersburg as well as re-established the Task Force on Maternal Health Data and Quality Measures last June. Additionally, we have expanded access to doulas who are specially trained professionals who provide critical support before, during, and after childbirth.

While I strongly support the intent of improving maternal health, mandating specific training through this legislation limits the Board of Medicine's flexibility to set appropriate continuing education standards for a diverse medical workforce. A one-size-fits-all requirement does not reflect the varied needs across medical specialties and lacks demonstrated improvements in patient outcomes.

I also signed legislation to require cooperation with the Virginia Neonatal and Perinatal Collaborative to implement standard protocols at all birthing hospitals and centers around the Commonwealth for identifying and responding to obstetric emergencies. I have also directed the Virginia Department of Health (VDH) to enhance the Maternal Child Health Data Dashboard, which they recently launched enhancements to, to include actionable data on pregnancy-associated and pregnancy-related mortality.

Additionally, we have expanded access to doulas who are specially trained professionals who provide critical support before, during, and after childbirth. I also signed legislation to increase the number of doula visits covered under Medicaid and other legislation that will create a partnership between DMAS and a pregnancy mobile application to promote awareness of maternal and infant health programs to pregnant and postpartum mothers.

The preliminary maternal mortality data from VDH from 2024 suggests a significant decline in maternal mortality, from 45 deaths in 2021 to 23 in 2024. Every death is a tragedy and a call for action. The data highlights the importance of continued monitoring and early action. Statistically, the reality is that Black, Hispanic, and Indian mothers and mothers in our rural communities, have a higher mortality rate. The data reveals that the top three causes of maternal mortality cardiac conditions, mental health challenges and substance use, and none of these conditions would be addressed by the training mandate in this legislation.

Regrettably, the General Assembly did not adopt my amendment, which would have directed the Board of Medicine to require licensed professionals who provide care to maternal populations—including in fertility, prenatal, birth, and postpartum care—to complete two hours of continuing education on pregnancy and postpartum health, with a focus on populations at higher risk for maternal and infant mortality.

I believe the Commonwealth can and must effectively address these disparities while promoting the health and dignity of every woman before, during, and after birth. This legislation, however, does not achieve that objective in its current form.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 1716

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 1716, which seeks to establish a statutory right to obtain and use contraception in the Commonwealth.

I support contraception access. There is no question that access is protected today under the Constitution, as recognized in *Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479 (1965), and *Eisenstadt v. Baird*, 405 U.S. 438 (1972). Contraception remains a vital part of women's health care, and it plays an essential role in reducing abortions and promoting a culture of life. Thus, this legislation is unnecessary in its current form.

The General Assembly refused to adopt my reasonable amendments which included the addition of a conscience clause exemption that would protect religious freedom. Conscience clause exemptions have been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States on multiple occasions, including in the *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores*, 573 U.S. 682 (2014) and *Little Sisters of the Poor v. Pennsylvania*, 140 S. Ct. 2367 (2020) cases.

This bill contains significant flaws by creating overly broad rights of action, potentially subjecting parents, political subdivisions, and medical professionals to litigation even when acting within their legal rights and professional bounds and further, would subvert a medical professional's judgment if a patient's well-being could be jeopardized. The legislation also fails to include adequate conscience clause protections for health care providers and weakens the fundamental right of parents to guide the upbringing and care of their children, which the General Assembly refused to adopt. By reintroducing a bill previously vetoed without addressing any concerns, the General Assembly is disregarding legitimate objections, creating legislation that would result in legal challenges that are unnecessary given the reality at hand.

As this issue continues to be debated, any legislative action on contraception must be coupled with clear conscience protections and must preserve the rights of families to make personal decisions in accordance with their beliefs.

TO: SENATE OF VIRGINIA

SENATE BILL NO. 1105

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto Senate Bill 1105, which seeks to establish a statutory right to obtain and use contraception in the Commonwealth.

I support contraception access. There is no question that access is protected today under the Constitution, as recognized in *Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479 (1965), and *Eisenstadt v. Baird*, 405 U.S. 438 (1972). Contraception remains a vital part of women's health care, and it plays an essential role in reducing abortions and promoting a culture of life. Thus, this legislation is unnecessary in its current form.

The General Assembly refused to adopt my reasonable amendments which included the addition of a conscience clause exemption that would protect religious freedom. Conscience clause exemptions have been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States on multiple occasions, including in the *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores*, 573 U.S. 682 (2014) and *Little Sisters of the Poor v. Pennsylvania*, 140 S. Ct. 2367 (2020) cases.

This bill contains significant flaws by creating overly broad rights of action, potentially subjecting parents, political subdivisions, and medical professionals to litigation even when acting within their legal rights and professional bounds and further, would subvert a medical professional's judgment if a patient's well-being could be jeopardized. The legislation also fails to include adequate conscience clause protections for health care providers and weakens the fundamental right of parents to guide the upbringing and care of their children, which the General Assembly refused to adopt. By reintroducing a bill previously vetoed without addressing any concerns, the General Assembly is disregarding legitimate objections, creating legislation that would result in legal challenges that are unnecessary given the reality at hand.

As this issue continues to be debated, any legislative action on contraception must be coupled with clear conscience protections and must preserve the rights of families to make personal decisions in accordance with their beliefs.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 2371

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 2371, which prohibits health insurance plans that cover outpatient prescription drugs from charging co-pays, co-insurance, or fees for contraceptive drugs and devices.

I support contraception access, but the General Assembly failed to adopt my commonsense amendments which included the addition of an explicit conscience clause exemption for those with sincerely held religious or ethical beliefs. Without such protections, many organizations would be forced to violate their religious or ethical beliefs about contraception should this bill have become law. These entities would thus be forced to choose between following the law or following their deeply and sincerely held beliefs— a choice the Commonwealth must not require them to make.

In addition, the legislation is not fully aligned with U.S. Code, particularly related to coverage of preventive health services, and may create confusion or inconsistency in implementation.

TO: SENATE OF VIRGINIA

SENATE BILL NO. 780

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto Senate Bill 780, which prohibits health insurance plans that cover outpatient prescription drugs from charging co-pays, co-insurance, or fees for contraceptive drugs and devices.

I support contraception access, but the General Assembly failed to adopt my commonsense amendments which included the addition of an explicit conscience clause exemption for those with sincerely held religious or ethical beliefs. Without such protections, many organizations would be forced to violate their religious or ethical beliefs about contraception should this bill have become law. These entities would thus be forced to choose between following the law or following their deeply and sincerely held beliefs— a choice the Commonwealth must not require them to make.

In addition, the legislation is not fully aligned with U.S. Code, particularly related to coverage of preventive health services, and may create confusion or inconsistency in implementation.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 2350

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 2350, which directs the Department of Emergency Management to develop various standardized guidelines, implement biennial training for agency heads, and provide health and safety training for volunteer organizations incorporated into the Virginia Emergency Support Team (VEST).

Although robust mental health support is vitally important for the heroes who put their lives on hold and take the risks involved with responding to an emergency, the implementation of these requirements would impose additional costs not covered in the approved budget. The imposition of rigid statutory mandates may limit a department's ability to adapt strategies based on evolving needs, lessons learned, and operational realities. Much of the work envisioned by this bill can be pursued through existing agency authority and collaboration, without the need for codified requirements. A more flexible, agency-driven approach would better support the development of effective and responsive emergency preparedness systems.

In the coming weeks, I will direct the Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM), in coordination with other VEST agencies, to provide health and safety training, implement a health monitoring system, and review all guidance documents and training materials to ensure best practices for protecting the health and safety of volunteer organizations incorporated into VEST.

TO: SENATE OF VIRGINIA

SENATE BILL NO. 1386

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto Senate Bill 1386, which directs the Department of Emergency Management to develop various standardized guidelines, implement biennial training for agency heads, and provide health and safety training for volunteer organizations incorporated into the Virginia Emergency Support Team (VEST).

Although robust mental health support is vitally important for the heroes who put their lives on hold and take the risks involved with responding to an emergency, the implementation of these requirements would impose additional costs not covered in the approved budget. The imposition of rigid statutory mandates may limit a department's ability to adapt strategies based on evolving needs, lessons learned, and operational realities. Much of the work envisioned by this bill can be pursued through existing agency authority and collaboration, without the need for codified requirements. A more flexible, agency-driven approach would better support the development of effective and responsive emergency preparedness systems.

In the coming weeks, I will direct the Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM), in coordination with other VEST agencies, to provide health and safety training, implement a health monitoring system, and review all guidance documents and training materials to ensure best practices for protecting the health and safety of volunteer organizations incorporated into VEST.

TO: SENATE OF VIRGINIA

SENATE BILL NO. 1393

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto Senate Bill 1393, regarding Department of Medical Assistance Services (DMAS) and maternal health programs.

I have signed House Bill 1929, which directs DMAS to implement a pregnancy resource application, which will accomplish the bulk of what Senate Bill 1393 sets out to do. However, Senate Bill 1393 goes further by authorizing Medicaid to cover food benefits. While nutritional care for pregnant and postpartum mothers is critically important, both of these services are well outside the core mission of providing healthcare.

There is an estimated fiscal impact from this expansion of \$66.5 million in FY 2026. However, the budget that the General Assembly passed did not provide the necessary appropriation to expand services in this manner nor did it provide funding for nutritional counseling.

Importantly, the Commonwealth already offers robust nutrition programs like SNAP and WIC, which serve the same population. Medicaid Managed Care also includes enhanced services, such as postnatal meal delivery, at no added cost to the state.

Medicaid should not duplicate existing social programs or divert limited healthcare dollars.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 1824

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 1824, which permits the substitution of World History I or World Geography with African American History or the Advanced Placement African American Studies to satisfy history and social studies credit requirements.

A thorough, sequential study of world history is critical to preparing students for informed citizenship and global awareness. Substituting World History I or World Geography would cause students to miss key concepts essential to understanding how historical world events have shaped our modern economy, government, and international relations.

While I am supportive of expanding choices in what elective classes students may take to satisfy graduation requirements, we must ensure that classes that replace others are germane to the comprehensive goals of high school education standards. Currently, U.S. history, Virginia and U.S. government, and one course in either world history or geography are required for a standard diploma, and both are required for an advanced diploma. Furthermore, four electives are required for a standard diploma which allows students to choose any class that they are interested in, which can include African American History or Advanced Placement African American Studies.

TO: SENATE OF VIRGINIA

SENATE BILL NO. 1462

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto Senate Bill 1462, which permits the substitution of World History I or World Geography with African American History or the Advanced Placement African American Studies to satisfy history and social studies credit requirements.

A thorough, sequential study of world history is critical to preparing students for informed citizenship and global awareness. Substituting World History I or World Geography would cause students to miss key concepts essential to understanding how historical world events have shaped our modern economy, government, and international relations.

While I am supportive of expanding choices in what elective classes students may take to satisfy graduation requirements, we must ensure that classes that replace others are germane to the comprehensive goals of high school education standards. Currently, U.S. history, Virginia and U.S. government, and one course in either world history or geography are required for a standard diploma, and both are required for an advanced diploma. Furthermore, four electives are required for a standard diploma which allows students to choose any class that they are interested in, which can include African American History or Advanced Placement African American Studies.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 2157

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6, of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 2157, which establishes a stand-alone Board of Visitors for Richard Bland College.

The General Assembly accepted my amendments for Senate Bill 742, which has already become law. Therefore, this bill is now unnecessary.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 2161

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6, of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 2161, which makes changes to the governing structure of the VCU Health System Authority Board of Directors.

In a letter to General Assembly leaders in September 2023, I referred to VCU Health's Clay Street project's over \$73 million failure as a wake-up call.

That is to say, I support the General Assembly's underlying effort to expand the relevant expertise required of Board members to manage the third-largest public health system in Virginia. However, this proposal includes a material and unnecessary shift in the governmental balance of powers, changing the Board from a majority of executive appointments to a majority of legislative appointments, with a further imbalance between House of Delegates and Senate appointments.

Unfortunately, the General Assembly did not accept my amendments, which would have achieved the goal of expanding the qualifying expertise necessary for Board representation while preserving the balance of powers. Even without this legislation, I have made appointments of highly qualified individuals with extensive experience managing large organizations with complex financial and real estate transactions and will continue to do so throughout my term for the betterment of the Health System and the Commonwealth.

Although I am vetoing this proposal, my hope remains that a solution to restructure the governance of the VCU Health System will be accomplished next session.

TO: SENATE OF VIRGINIA

SENATE BILL NO. 1259

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6, of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto Senate Bill 1259, which makes changes to the governing structure of the VCU Health System Authority Board of Directors.

In a letter to General Assembly leaders in September 2023, I referred to VCU Health's Clay Street project's over \$73 million failure as a wake-up call.

That is to say, I support the General Assembly's underlying effort to expand the relevant expertise required of Board members to manage the third-largest public health system in Virginia. However, this proposal includes a material and unnecessary shift in the governmental balance of powers, changing the Board from a majority of executive appointments to a majority of legislative appointments, with a further imbalance between House of Delegates and Senate appointments.

Unfortunately, the General Assembly did not accept my amendments, which would have achieved the goal of expanding the qualifying expertise necessary for Board representation while preserving the balance of powers. Even without this legislation, I have made appointments of highly qualified individuals with extensive experience managing large organizations with complex financial and real estate transactions and will continue to do so throughout my term for the betterment of the Health System and the Commonwealth.

Although I am vetoing this proposal, my hope remains that a solution to restructure the governance of the VCU Health System will be accomplished next session.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 1699

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 1699, eliminating tax exemptions for specific organizations.

The Commonwealth should pass necessary reforms regarding exemptions from local property and recordation taxes.

Historically, the Constitution of Virginia permitted the General Assembly to grant exemptions from local taxation to specific nonprofit organizations through classification or designation, with a three-fourths vote in each chamber. In 2003, a constitutional amendment altered the process to ordinance-based exemptions, but those established before January 1, 2003, remained in force.

The property tax exemption by designation is ripe for reform, delineated by inconsistencies and discrepancies. Specific civic associations and for-profit businesses are exempted, while others are not. Among these groups, some organizations have titles offensive in contemporary discourse, such as outdated references to the intellectually or developmentally disabled—some organizations reference political affiliations and engage in political contributions like the Ocean View Democratic and Social Club, and others are historical societies whose lineage is connected to very divisive periods in our history such as the Civil War, illustrated by the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

Narrowly targeting specific organizations to gain or lose such tax exemptions sets an inappropriate precedent. Initially, the General Assembly granted exemptions through a three-quarters vote of both chambers, but now, a simple majority can revoke them. Choosing winners and losers is imprudent and undermines the tax system's fairness. A more effective approach to reform would involve broad-based measures, allowing local governments autonomy in determining tax exemptions and considering the locality's tax base and deed transfers. These considerations would be permitted when a county or city sets its real estate tax levy, helping to reduce effective tax increases through assessments.

Unfortunately, the General Assembly rejected my recommendations, which would have accomplished broad-based reform to address the issue of tax exemptions effectively.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 1601

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 1601, which would mandate new requirements for local governments when reviewing land use applications for high energy use facilities.

This bill limits local discretion and creates unnecessary red tape. While well-intentioned, the legislation imposes a one-size-fits-all approach on communities that are best positioned to make their own decisions. Data centers represent an immense opportunity for localities around the Commonwealth, especially those that don't already have them. For FY23, data centers provided \$733 M, of tax revenue, 31% of total tax revenue for Loudoun County. According to the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) data center report, in FY 23, capital investment in Virginia's data centers exceeded \$24 billion.

An independent economic impact analysis of Virginia's data center industry conducted for the JLARC study, estimates that it provides approximately 74,000 jobs, \$5.5 billion in labor income, and \$9.1 billion to GDP annually. Virginia is the data center capital of the world, and we should not enact legislation to allow other states to pass us by nor to restrict local government from developing data centers based on their community's specific circumstances.

This year, I signed into law legislation that directed the State Corporation Commission to determine whether Dominion Energy and Appalachian Power are using rates, tolls, charges, or schedules that reasonably classify utility customers. Dominion Energy in their biennial rate case filed this year proposed a new rate class for high load factor customers, including data centers, in order to ensure that costs associated with servicing such customers are properly allocated.

My proposed amendments preserved the spirit of the bill while allowing localities flexibility. The General Assembly's rejection of those amendments leaves behind a rigid framework that could chill investment and hinder economic development.

TO: SENATE OF VIRGINIA

SENATE BILL NO. 1449

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto Senate Bill 1449, which would mandate new requirements for local governments when reviewing land use applications for high energy use facilities.

This bill limits local discretion and creates unnecessary red tape. While well-intentioned, the legislation imposes a one-size-fits-all approach on communities that are best positioned to make their own decisions. Data centers represent an immense opportunity for localities around the Commonwealth, especially those that don't already have them. For FY23, data centers provided \$733 M, of tax revenue, 31% of total tax revenue for Loudoun County. According to the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) data center report, in FY 23, capital investment in Virginia's data centers exceeded \$24 billion.

An independent economic impact analysis of Virginia's data center industry conducted for the JLARC study, estimates that it provides approximately 74,000 jobs, \$5.5 billion in labor income, and \$9.1 billion to GDP annually. Virginia is the data center capital of the world, and we should not enact legislation to allow other states to pass us by nor to restrict local government from developing data centers based on their community's specific circumstances.

This year, I signed into law legislation that directed the State Corporation Commission to determine whether Dominion Energy and Appalachian Power are using rates, tolls, charges, or schedules that reasonably classify utility customers. Dominion Energy in their biennial rate case filed this year proposed a new rate class for high load factor customers, including data centers, in order to ensure that costs associated with servicing such customers are properly allocated.

My proposed amendments preserved the spirit of the bill while allowing localities flexibility. The General Assembly's rejection of those amendments leaves behind a rigid framework that could chill investment and hinder economic development.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 1883

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6, of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 1883, which expands the distributed and behind the meter carveout of the renewable portfolio standard (RPS) and delays the 75% in-state renewable energy credits (RECs) requirement for Dominion Virginia.

This bill, like many others this session, seeks to make piecemeal changes to fix the discredited Virginia Clean Economy Act (VCEA). Democrats failed to pass legislation that would meaningfully free Virginia's ratepayers and businesses from this misguided path. Additionally, expanding the distributed portion of the RPS subjects ratepayers to higher compliance costs than they will already face under the existing framework in order to support more projects that may have otherwise been financially unviable. Increasing the distributed portion of the RPS from one to three percent over the next two years, and increasing to five percent in 2028 and thereafter, could increase compliance costs associated with the distributed carveout by 200% to 400%. In 2026, it is expected that Dominion Energy will be required to generate or procure 168,977 MWH of distributed RECs—if this were to change, that value would increase to 506,930. Associating the deficiency payment value for the distributed RECs of \$75 plus the one percent annual adjustment as the cost of compliance per unit energy results in a compliance cost of more than \$13 million under the existing framework and almost \$40 million under the proposed framework for.

Dominion is requesting a \$2.99 per month rate increase to customers' bills as part of costs for RPS compliance. In their latest RPS filing, Dominion Energy disclosed that they expected to bill customers \$5.5 billion dollars for REC purchases related to RPS compliance costs over the next ten years. In their IRP, Dominion forecasted that by 2035, they expected that the REC portion of RPS Compliance alone will cost the average residential Dominion Energy customer an extra \$5 per month or \$63 per year. At a time when prices are increasing for all aspects of life, elected leaders should be focused on solutions to decrease rather than unnecessarily increase electricity prices.

The attempt to protect ratepayers from deficiency payments flies in the face of the reality that Virginians shouldn't be forced to pay for RECs at all. Furthermore, the concern for deficiency payments incurred from Dominion Energy in its 2024 Integrated Resource Plan is misplaced as with part of the Coastal Virginia Offshore Wind project expected to enter service this year, Dominion Energy expects to not incur said charges. Dominion has been banking in-state generated RECs, approximately 12,104,079 as of October 2024, with the expectation that some of them would be retired to help meet the in-state compliance portion that begins this year. Even if the compliance date were to change, some of these RECs would have to be retired regardless, as Dominion Energy can only bank RECs for a five-year period. Accordingly, I veto this bill.

TO: SENATE OF VIRGINIA

SENATE BILL NO. 1040

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6, of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto Senate Bill 1040, which expands the distributed and behind the meter carveout of the renewable portfolio standard (RPS) and delays the 75% in-state renewable energy credits (RECs) requirement for Dominion Virginia.

This bill, like many others this session, seeks to make piecemeal changes to fix the discredited Virginia Clean Economy Act (VCEA). Democrats failed to pass legislation that would meaningfully free Virginia's ratepayers and businesses from this misguided path. Additionally, expanding the distributed portion of the RPS subjects ratepayers to higher compliance costs than they will already face under the existing framework in order to support more projects that may have otherwise been financially unviable. Increasing the distributed portion of the RPS from one to three percent over the next two years, and increasing to five percent in 2028 and thereafter, could increase compliance costs associated with the distributed carveout by 200% to 400%. In 2026, it is expected that Dominion Energy will be required to generate or procure 168,977 MWH of distributed RECs—if this were to change, that value would increase to 506,930. Associating the deficiency payment value for the distributed RECs of \$75 plus the one percent annual adjustment as the cost of compliance per unit energy results in a compliance cost of more than \$13 million under the existing framework and almost \$40 million under the proposed framework for.

Dominion is requesting a \$2.99 per month rate increase to customers' bills as part of costs for RPS compliance. In their latest RPS filing, Dominion Energy disclosed that they expected to bill customers \$5.5 billion dollars for REC purchases related to RPS compliance costs over the next ten years. In their IRP, Dominion forecasted that by 2035, they expected that the REC portion of RPS Compliance alone will cost the average residential Dominion Energy customer an extra \$5 per month or \$63 per year. At a time when prices are increasing for all aspects of life, elected leaders should be focused on solutions to decrease rather than unnecessarily increase electricity prices.

The attempt to protect ratepayers from deficiency payments flies in the face of the reality that Virginians shouldn't be forced to pay for RECs at all. Furthermore, the concern for deficiency payments incurred from Dominion Energy in its 2024 Integrated Resource Plan is misplaced as with part of the Coastal Virginia Offshore Wind project expected to enter service this year, Dominion expects to not incur said charges. Dominion has been banking in-state generated RECs, approximately 12,104,079 as of October 2024, with the expectation that some of them would be retired to help meet the in-state compliance portion that begins this year. Even if the compliance date were to change, some of these RECs would have to be retired regardless, as Dominion Energy can only bank RECs for a five-year period. Accordingly, I veto this bill.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 2087

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6, of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 2087, which would permit Phase I and Phase II electric utilities to develop, own, maintain, and operate public-fast charging stations beyond a radius set by the State Corporation Commission (SCC).

Passing this bill would give explicit instruction to the SCC, effectively putting the General Assembly's thumb on the scale to allow our regulated electric utilities to participate and compete with private charging stations. Our electric utilities should not be involved in developing or owning electric vehicle charging stations and spreading those costs to ratepayers across the Commonwealth. My amendment would have protected ratepayer funds from being used to participate in a business model that should be met with a private market. Private industry continues to develop and operate charging stations, and they should be the only ones to do so.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 2537

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6, of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 2537, which would increase the energy storage targets for which Appalachian Power and Dominion Energy are required to petition the State Corporation Commission (SCC).

The Virginia Clean Economy Act (VCEA) is failing Virginians. Adding in requirements for the petitioning of additional storage technologies will not change the fact that the law is misguided and does not work. Long-duration energy storage is an expensive technology and if utilities believed it to be the best technology to meet demand, they would be actively seeking permission to build them.

We must be vigilant to limit cost increases to Virginia's residents. Dominion Energy's recently filed biennial rate and fuel case is requesting a monthly increase to residential customers' bills of nearly \$20 starting in January 2026. On top of this, in their latest RPS filing, Dominion Energy disclosed that they expect to bill customers \$5.5 billion for costs associated with renewable energy credits (REC) purchases for RPS compliance costs over the next ten years. By 2035, it is expected that costs associated with REC purchases for RPS compliance will cost the average residential Dominion Energy customer an extra \$5 per month or at least \$60 per year. These costs for REC purchases are above and beyond the cost to reliably serve customers electricity load and will result in consumers paying more for their electricity.

TO: SENATE OF VIRGINIA

SENATE BILL NO. 1394

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6, of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 2537, which would increase the energy storage targets for which Appalachian Power and Dominion Energy are required to petition the State Corporation Commission (SCC).

The Virginia Clean Economy Act (VCEA) is failing Virginians. Adding in requirements for the petitioning of additional storage technologies will not change the fact that the law is misguided and does not work. Long-duration energy storage is an expensive technology and if utilities believed it to be the best technology to meet demand, they would be actively seeking permission to build them.

We must be vigilant to limit cost increases to Virginia's residents. Dominion Energy's recently filed biennial rate and fuel case is requesting a monthly increase to residential customers' bills of nearly \$20 starting in January 2026. On top of this, in their latest RPS filing, Dominion Energy disclosed that they expect to bill customers \$5.5 billion for costs associated with renewable energy credits (REC) purchases for RPS compliance costs over the next ten years. By 2035, it is expected that costs associated with REC purchases for RPS compliance will cost the average residential Dominion Energy customer an extra \$5 per month or at least \$60 per year. These costs for REC purchases are above and beyond the cost to reliably serve customers electricity load and will result in consumers paying more for their electricity.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 1630

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 1630, which requires electronic delivery of materials, mandates earlier disclosure of police reports in district court, and clarifies ongoing discovery obligations under existing Supreme Court Rules.

The imposition of rigid timelines and procedural requirements would strain the limited resources of many law enforcement agencies and prosecutors, particularly in rural and high-volume jurisdictions.

Moreover, this legislation could potentially compromise the personal information of victims and witnesses. While the bill adds some protections for district court cases, no similar safeguards were included for circuit court proceedings. As a result, sensitive materials, including private details in cases involving child abuse or sexual assault, could be disclosed without proper redaction. We must never sacrifice the security and dignity of victims and witnesses for administrative efficiency. Earning victims' trust in the legal system requires that we prioritize their protection at every step.

Additionally, Virginia law imposes no statutory reciprocal discovery requirement on defense counsel. This bill creates an uneven playing field where prosecutors must comply with burdensome new standards, while defense attorneys may circumvent the balance established by Supreme Court Rule 3A:11.

Mandating strict production timelines without regard to complexity or staffing risks unintended consequences that could hinder the fair administration of justice.

TO: SENATE OF VIRGINIA

SENATE BILL NO. 963

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto Senate Bill 963, which requires electronic delivery of materials, mandates earlier disclosure of police reports in district court, and clarifies ongoing discovery obligations under existing Supreme Court Rules.

The imposition of rigid timelines and procedural requirements would strain the limited resources of many law enforcement agencies and prosecutors, particularly in rural and high-volume jurisdictions.

Moreover, this legislation could potentially compromise the personal information of victims and witnesses. While the bill adds some protections for district court cases, no similar safeguards were included for circuit court proceedings. As a result, sensitive materials, including private details in cases involving child abuse or sexual assault, could be disclosed without proper redaction. We must never sacrifice the security and dignity of victims and witnesses for administrative efficiency. Earning victims' trust in the legal system requires that we prioritize their protection at every step.

Additionally, Virginia law imposes no statutory reciprocal discovery requirement on defense counsel. This bill creates an uneven playing field where prosecutors must comply with burdensome new standards, while defense attorneys may circumvent the balance established by Supreme Court Rule 3A:11.

Mandating strict production timelines without regard to complexity or staffing risks unintended consequences that could hinder the fair administration of justice.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 1678

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 1678, which would have required school boards to notify parents regarding the safe storage of firearms and prescription drugs.

As I stated last year, this proposal is unnecessary for responsible parents and ineffective in persuading the irresponsible. Furthermore, I do not believe it is the responsibility of a school district or school administrator to lecture parents on responsibilities of safe gun or prescription drug storage.

I have spoken with leaders at the largest gun retailers in Virginia and they have voluntarily agreed to place signage in their stores and include information about safe storage for all firearms sold at their facilities beginning July 1, 2025. Combined, these retailers sell most of the guns purchased in the Commonwealth. A copy of the draft sign is included below.

This bill has a narrow focus on two parental responsibilities, which apply to a subset of parents, omitting other legal obligations, like providing an environment free of abuse, neglect, and exploitation. This relegates such a duty to second-tier status choosing to highlight these two specific responsibilities of parents over all others.

Furthermore, the General Assembly failed to adopt my amendments, which included the addition of Sage's Law, an important bill that allows parents to be informed of the decisions relating to the mental health of their child. Sage's Law, much like many other common-sense bills that were patroned by Republicans, was not heard in committee during the 2025 legislative session.

Current law already prohibits leaving loaded, unsecured firearms accessible to children under 14 and mandates adult supervision for children under 12 handling firearms. Violations carry serious penalties, including up to 12 months in jail or a \$2,500 fine. Safe storage practices—such as locking unloaded firearms, storing ammunition separately, and supervising children—are essential to protecting our families

TO: SENATE OF VIRGINIA

SENATE BILL NO. 1048

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto Senate Bill 1048, which would have required school boards to notify parents regarding the safe storage of firearms and prescription drugs.

As I stated last year, this proposal is unnecessary for responsible parents and ineffective in persuading the irresponsible. Furthermore, I do not believe it is the responsibility of a school district or school administrator to lecture parents on responsibilities of safe gun or prescription drug storage.

I have spoken with leaders at the largest gun retailers in Virginia and they have voluntarily agreed to place signage in their stores and include information about safe storage for all firearms sold at their facilities beginning July 1, 2025. Combined, these retailers sell most of the guns purchased in the Commonwealth. A copy of the draft sign is included below.

This bill has a narrow focus on two parental responsibilities, which apply to a subset of parents, omitting other legal obligations, like providing an environment free of abuse, neglect, and exploitation. This relegates such a duty to second-tier status choosing to highlight these two specific responsibilities of parents over all others.

Furthermore, the General Assembly failed to adopt my amendments, which included the addition of Sage's Law, an important bill that allows parents to be informed of the decisions relating to the mental health of their child. Sage's Law, much like many other common-sense bills that were patroned by Republicans, was not heard in committee during the 2025 legislative session.

Current law already prohibits leaving loaded, unsecured firearms accessible to children under 14 and mandates adult supervision for children under 12 handling firearms. Violations carry serious penalties, including up to 12 months in jail or a \$2,500 fine. Safe storage practices—such as locking unloaded firearms, storing ammunition separately, and supervising children—are essential to protecting our families.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 1989

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6, of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 1989, which relates to delivery options for medical cannabis and labeling requirements for such products.

While accurate labeling is essential to ensure patients receive consistent and safe medical cannabis, this bill would codify the ability to deliver medical cannabis to commercial businesses and temporary residences, raising public safety and regulatory concerns. Permitting deliveries to businesses—including locations where substance abuse, gambling, or other high-risk activities may occur—creates unnecessary risks for diversion, theft, and unintended access by minors.

Current regulations already provide for safe, tightly controlled home delivery of medical cannabis. This framework ensures access for patients while maintaining strong safeguards to prevent misuse.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 2158

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6, of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 2158, which establishes a functional literacy program within the Virginia Department of Corrections.

I remain committed to fostering a correctional system that promotes rehabilitation and successful reentry into our communities. This is evidenced by my signature on the bipartisan reforms enacted during the 2023 legislative session that improved the Department of Corrections' utilization of restorative housing and Executive Order 36, *Stand Tall – Stay Strong – Succeed Together* Initiative—a proactive, dynamic, data-driven and comprehensive across-government approach, to support reentry success and prevent recidivism. Executive Order 36 includes an emphasis on accelerated programs for low-level learners, continuing education for those incarcerated, and expanded collaborations with the community college system through Pell grants.

Additionally, this year I was proud to sign bipartisan legislation to reform our probation system and incentivize positive behavior and activities.

However, this bill fails to properly consider several factors that must be addressed before implementing new correctional education initiatives. Unfortunately, the General Assembly did not accept my amendments to delay the enactment of this bill until after the current JLARC corrections education review study is complete. The Department of Corrections already provides an evidence-based literacy program, and deferring new legislative mandates does not prevent core services from being delivered. Consequently, this legislation would duplicate a number of efforts currently underway to review and improve upon correctional education while diverting taxpayer dollars, state resources, and the time of high-level state leaders and their agencies for the next six years.

While I agree with the underlying desire to constantly innovate and improve the effectiveness of our correctional system, we must ensure that all factors are considered and the input of all stakeholders is accounted for before we act prematurely and introduce an unpredictable number of unintended consequences. This bill is unnecessary given the comprehensive JLARC study already in progress which will better inform future legislative efforts.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 2351

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 2351, which increases the total allowable amount of a suspending bond from \$25 million to \$200 million.

The financial barrier to appellate review would be significantly raised by this legislation, disproportionately impacting small and mid-sized businesses that may lack the financial ability to post such a large bond.

Virginia is home to manufacturers and other businesses that support critical operations. Some of these firms work with hazardous materials and could be exposed to extraordinarily high products liability judgments. Raising the appeal bond cap would put these businesses at risk of financial ruin if they are unable to appeal adverse judgments. Virginia's judicial system is one of the best in the nation thanks in part to our strong appellate bench. The right to appeal is meaningless if a party faces an artificially high barrier blocking important judicial review of judgments from trial court juries. In my view, a \$200 million bond limit would be such a barrier.

Virginia is currently one of 15 states with a \$25 million appeal bond cap, including economic competitors such as North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Georgia. This bill would make Virginia less competitive for job creators and less fair to those seeking access to appellate courts.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 2520

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6, of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 2520, which establishes the Sexual Offense Prevention and Response Program within the Virginia Military Forces and creates a full-time sexual offense prevention and response officer position.

The Commonwealth shares the goal of preventing and responding effectively to incidents of sexual assault within the Virginia National Guard. However, this bill duplicates an existing, federally mandated program—the Department of Defense's Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) program—which already applies to all National Guard units, including those in Virginia. The SAPR program provides comprehensive training, victim support services, investigative procedures, and data reporting requirements governed by federal law.

Establishing a separate state-level program could introduce legal and operational conflicts, as the state cannot impose mandates that supersede or interfere with federal military requirements. Moreover, the bill does not provide additional authority or tools to enhance current prevention or response efforts, rendering its effectiveness unclear.

Additionally, as the enrolled bill is written, the same officer assigned to advocate for the victim is also responsible for deciding whether to issue the protective order. This dual role undermines the due process rights of the accused, who—like the victim—is entitled to a fair and impartial process. Just as victims deserve an advocate, the accused deserves a neutral decision-maker.

Rather than creating duplicative structures, I proposed an amendment to explore actionable solutions that work within the legal framework and improve outcomes for service members. Unfortunately, that amendment was rejected. Additionally, the bill contains other issues that were hastily added in the conference report which creates significant due process concerns for the victim and alleged offender.

Given the bill's redundancy, potential for legal challenge, and lack of enforceable improvements to existing federal protections, it does not represent a practical or effective policy approach. However, in the coming weeks I will be issuing an executive directive to direct the Virginia National Guard to share data from the already existing program with the General Assembly to help ensure transparency and effectiveness.

TO: SENATE OF VIRGINIA

SENATE BILL NO. 881

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto Senate Bill 881, which establishes a felony for knowingly possessing certain firearms or materials.

During the 2024 General Assembly Session, Senate Bill 363, developed through a bipartisan process and enacted with my recommendations, built upon existing law to further restrict ghost guns. In contrast, this bill introduces confusing and overly broad changes that could unintentionally impact law-abiding individuals and businesses, including those involved in manufacturing or distributing industrial parts.

Additionally, the General Assembly rejected my amendments to clarify these concerns. As written, this legislation would not improve public safety with numerous unintended consequences.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 1721

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6, of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 1721, which relates to the compensation for conservation or open-space easement.

Unfortunately, the General Assembly failed to accept my amendments which would exempt state agencies from having to pay the Commonwealth for lost revenue, preventing unnecessary and burdensome intrastate transfers of funds and provide legislators more time to address concerns from state agencies about language from Senate Bill 1435, which was inserted into this bill after failing in the General Assembly this session.

More time is necessary to review the potential implications of this legislation.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 1796

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 1796, which creates a regulatory framework for decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs) in Virginia.

DAOs—blockchain-based entities governed by self-executing code—lack the legal safeguards, fiduciary standards, and transparency expected of business entities operating in the Commonwealth. Their decentralized nature and absence of physical presence make enforcement difficult and have already drawn federal scrutiny for fraud, the sale of unregistered securities, and other abuses.

While emerging technologies deserve thoughtful consideration, prematurely recognizing this structure in Virginia law would expose the Commonwealth and its citizens to unnecessary risk. In the coming weeks, I will be asking the Secretary of Finance to convene a stakeholder group with representatives from corporate finance, banking, the Virginia State Bar, the Office of the Attorney General, among others, to conduct a comprehensive study of DAOs and provide recommendations by December 1, 2025.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 2779

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 2779, which expands the Office of New Americans Advisory Board.

Expanding the board by adding multiple Cabinet secretaries as ex officio members, increasing the total number of appointed members to address quorum concerns, and allowing meetings anytime at the call of the chair are unnecessary and impractical. The bill would be better served by the amendments that I proposed to streamline its scope and operations.

TO: SENATE OF VIRGINIA

SENATE BILL NO. 940

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6, of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto Senate Bill 940, which revises the process and deadlines for legal challenges to candidate qualifications.

The deadlines imposed through this bill create unnecessary complexity and risk undermining voters' confidence in the election process. Additionally, prohibiting challenges on a primary winner based on known facts before the primary could prevent legitimate issues from being raised. This restriction could allow unqualified candidates to remain on the ballot, even when serious concerns arise. We are in the middle of a state election year, including for the statewide officeholders and the Virginia House of Delegates—we should not change these laws in the middle of that process.

The integrity of Virginia's elections depends on processes that are both efficient and fair to candidates, voters, and election officials alike.

TO: HOUSE OF DELEGATES

HOUSE BILL NO. 2134

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 2134, which establishes definitions related to tribal recognition and makes technical updates throughout the Code of Virginia to reflect the federal recognition of Virginia tribes.

While the intent to ensure consistency in terminology across the Code is appropriate, the bill includes language referring to a "government-to-government" relationship between the Commonwealth and federally recognized tribes. This phrase introduces a legal framework that does not align with Virginia's current statutory or constitutional structure and may have unintended implications for the Commonwealth's legal and financial responsibilities.

To address this concern and allow the many other updates in this bill to be enacted this year, I proposed a targeted amendment to remove the "government-to-government" designation, which the General Assembly declined to adopt. Without this change, the legislation poses serious risks to ongoing litigation.

TO: SENATE OF VIRGINIA

SENATE BILL NO. 949

Pursuant to Article V, Section 6 of the Constitution of Virginia, I veto House Bill 2134, which establishes definitions related to tribal recognition and makes technical updates throughout the Code of Virginia to reflect the federal recognition of Virginia tribes.

While the intent to ensure consistency in terminology across the Code is appropriate, the bill includes language referring to a "government-to-government" relationship between the Commonwealth and federally recognized tribes. This phrase introduces a legal framework that does not align with Virginia's current statutory or constitutional structure and may have unintended implications for the Commonwealth's legal and financial responsibilities.

To address this concern and allow the many other updates in this bill to be enacted this year, I proposed a targeted amendment to remove the "government-to-government" designation, which the General Assembly declined to adopt. Without this change, the legislation poses serious risks to ongoing litigation.