



2025 Veto Package

By: Alyssa Santos, Legislative Analyst II
July 18, 2025 | 2025-R-0081

Overview

This report lists the vetoed acts from the 2025 regular legislative session and provides for each a brief summary, the final vote tallies, and excerpts from the governor’s veto message. It also includes the number of acts from each prior session that the current governor vetoed.

By law, the governor may veto (1) an entire act or (2) any provision making appropriations of money for distinct items while approving the remainder of the act (i.e. “line-item veto”). A vetoed act or provision will not become law unless it is reconsidered and passed again by a two-thirds vote of each legislative chamber. The legislature will meet for a veto session on July 21, 2025.

Table 1 below lists the 2025 acts vetoed by the governor and provides their respective vote tallies.

Table 1: 2025 Vetoed Acts

Act No. (Bill No.)	Title	Vote Tally (Date Taken)	Report Page
PA 25-1 (HB 7066) Line item veto	<i>An Act Concerning Interactions Between School Personnel and Immigration Authorities, the Purchase and Operation of Certain Drones, Grants to Certain Nonprofit Organizations, and Student Athlete Compensation Through Endorsement Contracts and Revenue Sharing Agreements</i>	House: 94 to 49 (February 24) Senate: 25 to 9 (February 25)	4
PA 25-2 (HB 7067) Line item veto	<i>An Act Concerning an Emergency Certificate of Need Application Process for Transfers of Ownership of Hospitals That Have Filed for Bankruptcy Protection, the Assessment of Motor Vehicles for Property Taxation, a Property Tax Exemption for Veterans who are Permanently and Totally Disabled and Funding of the Special Education Excess Cost Grant</i>	House: 140 to 5 (February 24) Senate: 34 to 0 (February 25)	5
PA 25-64 (SB 8)	<i>An Act Concerning Protections for Workers and Enhancements to Workers’ Rights</i>	House: 87 to 59 (May 30) Senate: 24 to 11 (May 28)	6

Table 1 (continued)

Act No. (Bill No.)	Title	Vote Tally (Date Taken)	Report Page
PA 25-49 (HB 5002)	<i>An Act Concerning Housing and the Needs of Homeless Persons</i>	House: 84 to 67 (May 27) Senate: 20 to 15 (May 31)	7
PA 25-169 (HB 7004)	<i>An Act Authorizing Municipal Referenda to Challenge Certain Permit Approvals</i>	House: 104 to 43 (June 3) Senate: 25 to 11 (June 4)	9

Summaries and Governor's Explanations

PA 25-1: An Act Concerning Interactions Between School Personnel and Immigration Authorities, the Purchase and Operation of Certain Drones, Grants to Certain Nonprofit Organizations, and Student Athlete Compensation Through Endorsement Contracts and Revenue Sharing Agreements

Among other things, the act makes several changes to fiscal year (FY) 25 General Fund appropriations, including making appropriations to the (1) Judicial Department to make grants to various nonprofits and (2) Department of Public Health for certain community health services ([PA 25-1](#), §§ 9-11, effective upon passage).

Excerpts from the governor's line item [veto message](#)

Our state operates under a constitutional spending cap, designed to ensure fiscal discipline and safeguard taxpayer dollars. The appropriations outlined in these sections circumvent the established budget process, allocating funds without the rigorous scrutiny typically applied to state expenditures. This not only undermines the transparency of our fiscal operations but also sets a precedent for bypassing budgetary controls.

By adhering to the spending cap, we maintain a balanced budget that prioritizes essential state services, including education, public safety, and healthcare. Every dollar spent must be justified through a transparent, strategic budgeting process that reflects the needs of all residents. These sections do not meet that standard.

The veto message further addresses concerns regarding decision making as to how taxpayer dollars should be effectively allocated.

The arbitrary nature of these allocations not only raises questions about fairness but also about effectiveness. Taxpayer dollars should be allocated based on demonstrable need and measurable outcomes, not on political considerations or geographic distribution.

I am committed to supporting community organizations that provide essential services to our residents. However, this must be done through a transparent and accountable process that includes clear criteria for funding decisions and competitive grant processes to ensure fairness and effectiveness.

PA 25-2: An Act Concerning an Emergency Certificate of Need Application Process for Transfers of Ownership of Hospitals That Have Filed for Bankruptcy Protection, the Assessment of Motor Vehicles for Property Taxation, a Property Tax Exemption for Veterans who are Permanently and Totally Disabled and Funding of the Special Education Excess Cost Grant

Among other things, the act makes a change to FY 25 appropriations to the state Department of Education for the excess cost grant ([PA 25-2](#), § 7, effective upon passage).

Excerpts from the governor's line item [veto message](#)

Our state operates under a constitutional spending cap, designed to ensure fiscal discipline and safeguard taxpayer dollars. The appropriations outlined in these sections circumvent the established budget process, allocating funds without the rigorous scrutiny typically applied to state expenditures. This not only undermines the transparency of our fiscal operations but also sets a precedent for bypassing budgetary controls. This line-item veto is about ensuring that we provide for our children without jeopardizing their financial future and the financial future of our state.

Including this \$40,000,000 would push the budget well over the spending cap, creating a fiscal imbalance that could force cuts to critical programs or lead to higher taxes for hard working Connecticut families.

The veto message further addresses concerns with making appropriations outside of the usual budgetary and committee process.

In addition, this \$40,000,000 appropriation was introduced outside the established budget process, bypassing the scrutiny and prioritization exercised by the Appropriations Committee. I cannot endorse an appropriation that follows a dangerous precedent of fiscal irresponsibility. We cannot afford to make budget decisions based on short-term political considerations at the expense of long-term fiscal health.

PA 25-64: An Act Concerning Protections for Workers and Enhancements to Workers' Rights

For labor disputes that start on or after December 14, 2026, this act generally makes striking workers eligible for unemployment benefits after they have been on strike for 14 consecutive days. Current law generally disqualifies claimants for benefits during any week in which their unemployment is due to a labor dispute. The act lifts this disqualification once the labor dispute has been continuous for 14 days.

Existing law also allows claimants to qualify for benefits during a labor dispute, with no waiting period, if the (1) unemployment is due to a lockout (e.g., the employer closed the workplace) or (2) claimant is not participating in the dispute and does not belong to a trade, class, or organization of workers that is participating in, financing, or directly interested in the dispute (e.g., non-union employees at a business temporarily closed by a strike) ([PA 25-64](#), effective October 1, 2025).

Excerpts from the governor's [veto message](#)

This message addresses concerns with the effect this act's provisions could have on existing resources for employees who are out of work.

The Unemployment Trust Fund exists to provide support to individuals who are out of work through no fault of their own, and its long-term sustainability is critical. Extending benefits to individuals actively participating in labor disputes, even after a period of time, alters the fundamental purpose of the program.

The veto message also raises concerns about implementation.

Additionally, the bill's staggered timelines and reliance on subjective determinations would create implementation challenges for the Department of Labor, potentially resulting in inconsistent administration and legal uncertainty for all parties involved.

PA 25-49: An Act Concerning Housing and the Needs of Homeless Persons

This act would, among other things, create a first-time homebuyer savings program generally allowing individuals and employers to contribute into specialized savings accounts to be used for a beneficiary's eligible homebuying expenses and receive tax benefits for doing so.

It also generally (1) makes it an unlawful practice in violation of the Connecticut Antitrust Act for anyone to use a revenue management device to set rental rates or occupancy levels for residential dwelling units and (2) requires municipalities with a population of at least 15,000, by January 1, 2028, to create a fair rent commission or join a joint or regional commission.

Further, the act makes various changes to parking laws, such as (1) prohibiting having minimum off-street parking requirements for residential developments, (2) requiring parking needs assessments for certain larger residential developments, and (3) eliminating a current authorization for planning and zoning bodies to adopt regulations on paying fees instead of providing parking.

Additionally, the act establishes a framework for prioritizing certain discretionary state funding to specified municipalities, including those with relatively high property wealth per capita with Office of Policy and Management-approved plans, to, among other things, allow for the creation of affordable housing units needed to meet 25% of their fair share allocation.

It further requires that municipalities eligible for priority for certain discretionary infrastructure funding under the act's (1) fair share allocation planning and (2) transit-oriented development district provisions receive the highest priority for this funding. Municipalities that are eligible under both frameworks receive priority over municipalities that are eligible under only one framework.

Lastly, the act helps people experiencing homelessness in various ways, such as by requiring the Department of Housing to administer a pilot program to provide them portable showers and laundry facilities in certain municipalities ([PA 25-49](#), various effective dates).

Excerpts from the governor's [veto message](#)

As well-intentioned as this bill may be, it requires revision before it can form the foundation of a durable and equitable statewide housing strategy. Most importantly, I believe there is a better path forward—one rooted in partnership, collaboration, and action.

The message addresses the governor's opinion that achieving statewide housing goals must include more engagement with and allow flexibility to meet the individual priorities of Connecticut's towns and cities.

This bill establishes ambitious statewide housing goals—and I agree we need them. But I believe we can better achieve these goals through local engagement and providing towns the tools they need to do the job. I believe we should reward towns that take the lead: for example, by offering relief from 8-30g when municipalities adopt their own middle housing overlays or pre-zone near transit and downtown centers. That's why I appreciate the proposal in this bill to prioritize discretionary funding for communities that do the right thing.

In its current form, however, the bill imposes requirements that do not reflect the complexity or diversity of Connecticut's towns and cities. For example, it limits the ability of municipalities to manage parking requirements. While I agree that parking mandates have been used to discourage development, we cannot ignore that there are communities that need parking to support additional housing development. Parking requirements should be based on specific needs.

Similarly, the veto message emphasizes that the state should, rather than mandate housing goals, collaborate with municipalities to establish them.

In addition, state-imposed housing goals for each municipality have clearly created a significant amount of anxiety. I believe that unit-based planning goals for communities is an important step forward. But those goals must reflect both ambition and flexibility, and they must be grounded in a renewed commitment to collaboration. The state should partner with municipalities to establish these targets, and then help the towns execute those plans, including through investment in infrastructure.

PA 25-169: An Act Authorizing Municipal Referenda to Challenge Certain Permit Approvals

This act expands when people can petition for a town referendum to reverse a Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) commissioner decision on whether to grant a permit to a facility in an environmental justice community. It does so by (1) making this process available in municipalities with populations up to 16,000, based on the most recent decennial census (rather than only those with populations up to 10,000) and (2) allowing referenda to challenge the commissioner's approval of a facility.

Under existing law, an elector or voter of a municipality with a population below the set threshold can petition for a town referendum on the DEEP commissioner's denial of a permit. An affirmative vote at the referendum constitutes a reversal of the commissioner's decision (meaning a permit is approved even if the commissioner denied it). Under the act, a referendum may also challenge and reverse approvals (meaning the permit is denied) ([PA 25-169](#), most provisions effective upon passage).

Excerpts from the governor's [veto message](#)

Ensuring the public is heard in these processes is a priority I share. However, it's important to note that today's permitting process offers extensive opportunity for public engagement. I am concerned that the mechanism proposed in this bill, [that is] allowing a local referendum to reverse certain permit approvals or denials issued by the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP), could have unintended consequences that weaken critical protections for environmental justice communities and create harmful uncertainty for our business community that could hamper investment in Connecticut.

The veto message details the aforementioned existing framework for public engagement.

All of DEEP's permitting processes offer opportunities for the public to submit comments and request hearings. In addition to those standard opportunities, CGS section 22a-20a requires applicants seeking to construct and operate certain types of facilities in environmental justice areas to do additional, robust community engagement before submitting an application. Moreover, regulations adopted pursuant to subsection (g) of that law will require careful consideration of cumulative impacts on public health and the environment in our state's environment justice communities, including small municipalities. In 2023, the Connecticut General Assembly directed DEEP to craft these regulations to ensure that the most overburdened and vulnerable neighborhoods in our state are not left

behind in decisions that shape their environmental and health future, while also ensuring that the regulated community has the tools it needs to take cumulative impacts into account at the beginning of its permitting process.

Lastly, the veto message raises concerns regarding uncertainty in the permitting process that may result from the act's provisions.

The bill will create uncertainty in an otherwise structured, science-based permitting process that businesses, municipalities, and residents alike rely on for predictability and fairness. The Department's process, both in its current state and after the adoption of environmental justice regulations, balances the important goal of enabling overburdened and vulnerable neighborhoods to participate in the permitting process, with the need for clear standards and a predictable process to support economic development. Predictability is critical for those seeking to do business in our state. Allowing permitting decisions to be overturned by referenda undermines the principles of objectivity embedded in our state permitting processes, will discourage important investments in infrastructure, and ultimately will drive up cost of living for residents.

Historical Context

Table 2 below lists the number of vetoes for the current governor by legislative session. Prior veto packages can be found under [“Veto Packages” on OLR’s website](#).

Table 2: Vetoes by Legislative Session Since 2019

Governor	Legislative Session	Vetoes	Vetoes Overridden	OLR Veto Package Report
Lamont	2019 Regular Session	3	0	2019-R-0155
Lamont	2019 July Special Session	0	0	-
Lamont	2019 December Special Session	0	0	-
Lamont	2020 Regular Session*	0	0	2020-R-0241
Lamont	2020 July Special Session	0	0	-
Lamont	2020 September Special Session	0	0	-
Lamont	2021 Regular Session	4	0	2021-R-0118
Lamont	2021 June Special Session	0	0	-
Lamont	2022 Regular Session	2	0	2022-R-0126
Lamont	2022 November Special Session	0	0	-
Lamont	2023 Regular Session	5	0	2023-R-0142
Lamont	2023 September Special Session	0	0	-
Lamont	2024 Regular Session	2	0	2024-R-0101
Lamont	2024 June Special Session	0	0	-

*suspended due to COVID-19

AS:co