

No. 94  
STATE OF MICHIGAN  
**Journal of the Senate**  
102nd Legislature  
REGULAR SESSION OF 2023

---

---

Senate Chamber, Lansing, Thursday, October 26, 2023.

10:00 a.m.

The Senate was called to order by the President, Lieutenant Governor Garlin D. Gilchrist II.

The roll was called by the Secretary of the Senate, who announced that a quorum was present.

Albert—present  
Anthony—present  
Bayer—present  
Bellino—present  
Brinks—present  
Bumstead—present  
Camilleri—present  
Cavanagh—present  
Chang—present  
Cherry—present  
Daley—present  
Damoose—present  
Geiss—present

Hauck—present  
Hertel—present  
Hoitenga—present  
Huizenga—present  
Irwin—present  
Johnson—present  
Klinefelt—present  
Lauwers—present  
Lindsey—present  
McBroom—present  
McCann—present  
McDonald Rivet—present  
McMorrow—present

Moss—present  
Nesbitt—present  
Outman—present  
Polehanki—present  
Runestad—present  
Santana—present  
Shink—present  
Singh—present  
Theis—present  
Victory—present  
Webber—present  
Wojno—present

Senator Jonathan Lindsey of the 17th District offered the following invocation:

Heavenly Father, the protector of all who trust in You, I come before You mindful of the increasing conflict around the world and that at this moment many American military members are serving in dangerous locations or will be soon. Lord, be with all Your warriors who defend Your truth and peace, that they may vanquish injustice and wrong. Give wisdom to their leaders and commanders that they may be a force for good on earth. Embrace their enemies and those who wish them harm; turn their hearts toward love. Be with their chaplains, medics, and all who work to alleviate their suffering.

Lord, sustain the anxious and fearful. Grant them courage from on high. Comfort all worried families whose loved ones are in danger. Surround them with Your love and protect them from all harm. Be with the sick and wounded, with the prisoners and captives. Let Your mercy shine and Your salvation be known.

Lord, with your infinite grace and mercy, receive those fallen in battle and all innocents who have died in war. Surround their loved ones with compassion and grant them a patient faith. Bring healing and wholeness to people and nations. I pray this in Jesus' name. Amen.

The President, Lieutenant Governor Gilchrist, led the members of the Senate in recital of the *Pledge of Allegiance*.

### Motions and Communications

The following communication was received:  
Office of Senator John Cherry

October 25, 2023

I would like to request my name be added as a co-sponsor of Senate Bills 613, 614, 615, and 616. Please feel free to reach out to my office by emailing [SenJCherry@senate.michigan.gov](mailto:SenJCherry@senate.michigan.gov) or calling 517-373-0142 if you have any other questions. Thank you and we appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely,  
John Cherry  
State Senator, District 27

The communication was referred to the Secretary for record.

The following communication was received:  
Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy

October 25, 2023

In accordance with Sections 17303(9) and 17317(9) of Part 173, Electronics, of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, 1994 PA 451, as amended, attached is the Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy's (EGLE) biennial report on the Electronic Waste Recycling Fund Revenue and Expenses for fiscal years 2022 and 2023.

If you need further information, please contact Elizabeth M. Browne, Director, Materials Management Division, at 517-242-2746 or [BrowneE@Michigan.gov](mailto:BrowneE@Michigan.gov); or you may contact me at 517-614-6873.

Phillip D. Roos  
Director

The communication was referred to the Secretary for record.

Senator Singh moved that Senators Camilleri and Cavanagh be temporarily excused from today's session. The motion prevailed.

Senator Geiss entered the Senate Chamber.

Senator Singh moved that the rules be suspended and that the following bills, now on Committee Reports, be placed on the General Orders calendar for consideration today:

**Senate Bill No. 271**

**Senate Bill No. 273**

**Senate Bill No. 502**

The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

**Recess**

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.  
The motion prevailed, the time being 10:05 a.m.

11:38 a.m.

The Senate was called to order by the President, Lieutenant Governor Gilchrist.

During the recess, Senators Camilleri and Cavanagh entered the Senate Chamber.

**Messages from the House**

**Senate Bill No. 174, entitled**

A bill to amend 1979 PA 94, entitled “The state school aid act of 1979,” by amending sections 11, 17b, 201, 206, 236, and 241 (MCL 388.1611, 388.1617b, 388.1801, 388.1806, 388.1836, and 388.1841), sections 11 and 236 as amended by 2022 PA 212, section 17b as amended by 2007 PA 137, and sections 201, 206, and 241 as amended by 2022 PA 144.

The House of Representatives has substituted (H-3) the bill.

The House of Representatives has passed the bill as substituted (H-3), ordered that it be given immediate effect and amended the title to read as follows:

A bill to amend 1979 PA 94, entitled “An act to make appropriations to aid in the support of the public schools, the intermediate school districts, community colleges, and public universities of the state; to make appropriations for certain other purposes relating to education; to provide for the disbursement of the appropriations; to authorize the issuance of certain bonds and provide for the security of those bonds; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments, the state board of education, and certain other boards and officials; to create certain funds and provide for their expenditure; to prescribe penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” by amending sections 11, 17b, 201, and 236 (MCL 388.1611, 388.1617b, 388.1801, and 388.1836), sections 11, 201, and 236 as amended by 2023 PA 103 and section 17b as amended by 2007 PA 137.

Pending the order that, under rule 3.202, the bill be laid over one day,

Senator Singh moved that the rule be suspended.

The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

The question being on concurring in the substitute made to the bill by the House,

The substitute was not concurred in, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 593**

**Yeas—3**

Albert

Bellino

Hoitenga

**Nays—35**

Anthony  
Bayer  
Brinks  
Bumstead  
Camilleri  
Cavanagh  
Chang  
Cherry  
Daley

Damoose  
Geiss  
Hauck  
Hertel  
Huizenga  
Irwin  
Johnson  
Klinefelt  
Lauwers

Lindsey  
McBroom  
McCann  
McDonald Rivet  
McMorrow  
Moss  
Nesbitt  
Outman  
Polehanki

Runestad  
Santana  
Shink  
Singh  
Theis  
Victory  
Webber  
Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: President

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of  
**Motions and Communications**

The following communication was received and read:  
Office of the Senate Majority Leader

October 26, 2023

Pursuant to Joint Rule 3, the Senate having non-concurred in the House Substitute (H-3) to Senate Bill 174,  
I appoint as conferees:

Senator Sarah Anthony, Chair  
Senator Sean McCann  
Senator Jon Bumstead

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,  
Winnie Brinks  
Senate Majority Leader

The communication was referred to the Secretary for record.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of  
**Third Reading of Bills**

Senator Singh moved that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following bills:

**Senate Bill No. 593**  
**House Bill No. 4520**  
**House Bill No. 4521**  
**Senate Bill No. 350**  
**Senate Bill No. 555**  
The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 593, entitled**

A bill to list certain constitutional rights related to reproductive freedom; to prohibit the violation of certain rights and provide remedies; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state and local governmental officers and entities; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Albert offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 1, line 1, after "1." by striking out "As" and inserting "Except as otherwise provided in section 9, as".

2. Amend page 2, line 10 after "3." by striking out "(1)".

3. Amend page 3, line 5, by striking out all of subsection (2).

4. Amend page 3, following line 26, by inserting:

"Sec. 9. (1) Before performing an abortion, except in the case of a medical emergency, an attending health care professional shall perform an examination to determine the probable gestational age. If the gestational age is after fetal viability, the attending health care professional shall not perform an abortion unless medically indicated to protect the life or physical health or mental health of the pregnant individual.

(2) A person who violates subsection (1) is guilty of a felony punishable by imprisonment for not more than 4 years or a fine of not more than \$10,000.00, or both.

(3) As used in this section:

(a) "Attending health care professional" means an individual who is licensed to engage in the practice of medicine or the practice of osteopathic medicine and surgery under article 15 of the public health code, 1978 PA 368, MCL 333.16101 to 333.18838.

(b) “Extraordinary medical measures” means interventions, therapies, and professional services that are not commonly rendered or recognized throughout this state’s neonatal intensive care inpatient facilities as supporting premature births.

(c) “Fetal viability” means the point in pregnancy when, in the professional judgment of an attending health care professional and based on the particular facts of the case, there is a significant likelihood of the fetus’s sustained survival outside the uterus without the application of extraordinary medical measures. Fetal viability is at minimum a gestational age of 21 weeks and 1 day but may be fewer than 21 weeks and 1 day with medical advancements.

(d) “Medical emergency” means a condition that, on the basis of the attending health care professional’s good-faith clinical judgment, so complicates the medical condition of a pregnant individual as to necessitate the immediate abortion of the pregnant individual’s pregnancy to avert the pregnant individual’s death or for which a delay will create serious risk of substantial and irreversible impairment of a major bodily function.

(e) “Mental health” means that a pregnant individual has been deemed by an attending health care professional to be an imminent and life-threatening danger to the pregnant individual with no alternative care available.

(f) “Physical health” means a life-threatening or lifelong debilitating and chronic medical condition.”.

5. Amend page 3, line 27, after “1.” by striking out the balance of enacting section 1 and inserting “The legal birth definition act, 2004 PA 135, MCL 333.1081 to 333.1085, is repealed.”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 594**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: President

**Protests**

Senators Geiss, Moss, McMorrow, Chang, Shink, Polehanki, Cavanagh, Santana, McCann, Hertel and Anthony, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the adoption of the amendments offered by Senator Albert to Senate Bill No. 593.

Senator Geiss moved that the statement she made during the discussion of the amendments be printed as her reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Geiss’ statement, in which Senators Moss, McMorrow, Chang, Shink, Polehanki, Cavanagh, Santana, McCann, Hertel and Anthony concurred, is as follows:

I rise to urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment that is neither based in obstetric medicine or reality. This amendment disrupts again the health care provider-patient relationship. It would hamstring doctors from making the medical decisions they need to make based upon their expertise, and it would return this state to a position of criminalizing the health care providers who perform abortions. The amendment itself is in fact contradictory in its phrasing of what would and would not be permissible depending upon when one does or does not determine gestational age and viability. In short, the amendment is too confusing, too extreme. Let’s leave medical decisions to the medical professionals and not to legislators who have none of the following: the ability to practice obstetric medicine or midwifery or a uterus. I urge a “no” vote on this amendment to Senate Bill No. 593.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 595**

**Yeas—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Nays—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: President

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Senator Albert asked and was granted unanimous consent to make a statement and moved that the statement be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

Proposal 3 has language noting that the state may regulate abortion after fetal viability has been reached as long as the abortion is not medically necessary to protect the mother. When this bill received a hearing in committee, the bill sponsor stated it affirms the state can regulate the provision of abortion care after fetal viability with a list of qualifiers and exemptions that are outlined in the State Constitution. I am offering this amendment in the spirit of ensuring this provision is upheld and that life after fetal viability has been reached is supported.

This amendment would require that, except in the case of a medical emergency, an attending health care professional must perform an examination to determine the probable gestational age of the unborn child. If the gestational age is after fetal viability—which is defined at 21 weeks and one day, or earlier with medical advancements—an abortion could not be performed unless it was medically necessary for the mother. The exact language is that the abortion shall not be performed unless medically indicated to protect the life or physical health or mental health of the pregnant individual, which mirrors the language in the State Constitution.

In addition to regulating abortion post-fetal viability, it is critical we define other terms like extraordinary medical measures, attending health care professional, medical emergency, mental health, and physical health. If these terms are left undefined, then they are subjective and they lead to differing applications of the law throughout our state. This amendment is necessary to truly regulate abortions post-fetal viability in our state.

The bill as written, based on the laws it repeals and its lack of important definitions, results in Michigan not having any laws on the books to regulate late-term abortions. The bill as written says the state may regulate the provision of abortion care after fetal viability, but does not take any meaningful steps to actually regulate it, and that is what my amendment is looking to rectify.

I will ask the necessary question related to this bill: Are the Democrats truly going to elect to regulate abortion post-fetal viability as our Constitution allows, or will they take the extreme position that abortion will be permissible up to the moment a child leaves the womb? Please take this opportunity to tell the state of Michigan what limitations on abortion you do support so we can ensure those limitations go into state law. A step in that direction would be supporting this amendment. We should not be allowing abortion of babies that have reached the age when they could survive outside the womb.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4520, entitled**

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by amending sections 81 and 81a (MCL 750.81 and 750.81a), section 81 as amended by 2016 PA 87 and section 81a as amended by 2012 PA 366.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The President pro tempore, Senator Moss, assumed the Chair.

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 596**

**Yeas—22**

Anthony	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Bayer	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Brinks	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Camilleri	Irwin	Moss	Webber
Cavanagh	Johnson	Polehanki	Wojno
Chang	Klinefelt		

**Nays—16**

Albert	Damoose	Lauwers	Outman
Bellino	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bumstead	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Daley	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory

**Excused—0****Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Pursuant to Joint Rule 20, the full title of the act shall be inserted to read as follows:

“An act to revise, consolidate, codify, and add to the statutes relating to crimes; to define crimes and prescribe the penalties and remedies; to provide for restitution under certain circumstances; to provide for the competency of evidence at the trial of persons accused of crime; to provide immunity from prosecution for certain witnesses appearing at criminal trials; to provide for liability for damages; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts inconsistent with or contravening any of the provisions of this act,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

**Protests**

Senators McBroom, Lindsey, Bellino and Daley, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 4520.

Senators McBroom and Lindsey moved that the statements they made during the discussion of the bill be printed as their reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator McBroom’s statement is as follows:

When I was in the House, I was appointed to the Criminal Justice Committee during one of the terms I served there and these bills came forward at that time as well. They’ve reappeared multiple times over the years, and always there is the best of intentions. We care, I care, about the health and safety of our health care workers, particularly our nurses, it’s why I’ve supported the Safe Patient Care Act and numerous other bills to help our nurses and health care workers. However, through the committee process and hearing this discussion multiple times, what is very clear is that we already have laws to help people when they are assaulted to obtain justice and compensation for them when they’re assaulted, and we’re not using those. Prosecutors and hospitals continually resist the opportunity to bring charges against those who assault our nurses and other health care workers. They don’t want to do it. It’s bad business practice, they feel. The hospital doesn’t want to start prosecuting people who commit assaults on its employees. The prosecutors don’t go forward with these things; they’re either too complex because the patient has medical issues that impair their judgement or they’re on medications that impair their judgement, or the ability to claim stress of the moment as a defense, all these reasons are possibly why hospitals don’t do this. It could just be for selfish and monetary greed that they don’t do it. I don’t know for sure every single case why they don’t do it, but the fact of the matter is the hospitals are extremely resistant toward prosecution, and the prosecutors in our counties are resistant in prosecution, and as long as your workplace, as long as your employer, does not want you to sue—the nurses themselves don’t choose to endanger their careers by attempting to bring those charges on their own behalf. How will increasing penalties change any of that? It won’t.

This is not the right course of action to take to truly bring a safer work environment and to bring justice to those who are assaulted. Raising the level of penalties is not somehow going to make hospitals want to bring charges or prosecutors want to bring charges. It only disincentivizes them. It is going to create the exact opposite impact that we desire to see.

If we really want to do something about these issues, another bill package has been introduced—one that I’m a co-sponsor of and am proud to sponsor with my colleague from Ann Arbor—that’s Senate Bill No. 589. I think we should dismiss this bill and take that one up and really do something that will incentivize helping our health care workers and bring protection to them. This bill disincentivizes that. When will we understand that if the prosecution and the hospital aren’t going to do it at this level, why would they do it at a higher level? They’re not going to. What we ought to be considering too is to guarantee to our nurses that the hospital must prosecute in some situations. That’s something we could do that would make an effective difference. Protect them in the workplace from repercussions from being penalized for going after justice when they’ve been hurt. That could make a real difference if we protect our workers and give them those rights, but this is simply disincentivizing those who are already letting us down. I ask for a “no” vote.

Senator Lindsey’s statement, in which Senators Bellino and Daley concurred, is as follows:

My colleagues have made very compelling arguments against this legislation so I won’t repeat those, but I will just add one additional point. When I first saw the legislation, I thought we really should take steps to do a better job of protecting those people in the nursing community or working in these hospitals, so I tried to find a redeeming quality in this bill. When I saw there’s language in here about posting signs that might play a role in helping disincentivize people from doing violence, I thought maybe that’ll be the part that justifies this type of legislation. Then I looked at it and realized the signs themselves are going to tell people that if you’re a patient, you’re basically exempt from this increased criminal penalty. It’s so perverse. We’re going to put signs up if we pass this that tell that patient population, which is where most of these assaults are coming from, that they’re exempt from this penalty. I think this is so terrible it could actually incentivize more violence against people working in those hospitals. I urge a “no” vote.

Senator Runestad asked and was granted unanimous consent to make a statement and moved that the statement be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Runestad’s statement is as follows:

This issue is personal to me because I have a sister and daughter-in-law who both were nurses. They have left the profession. In both cases, they didn’t want to leave. It was things they saw while they were in the profession. In one case, the understaffing that required her to work enormous numbers of hours beyond her capacity she felt to do the job properly, along with being attacked—physically attacked—by patients. In the other case, it was, again, understaffing issues that she felt as a supervisor of nurses that she couldn’t in good conscience continue doing the job.

These bills I don’t believe at all solve the problem. The bill is applying only to individuals with the patients. So, family members, visitors, but not to the patient, and every case my sister-in-law outlined, it was the patient. Ostensibly, the rationale why they didn’t want to include the patient could be high, drunk, schizophrenic, or a number of issues. That certainly could apply to the person there with them, yet they would still pay that penalty but not the patient. The patient oftentimes might just be a nasty drunk. Should the nasty drunk be allowed to abuse the patient and not have these additional penalties? To me none of that makes any sense. Eighty percent of the assaults from what we saw in committee are by the patient. Only 10 to 12 percent are by the family members, and who knows if they are in their right mind. To me, this does not at all help the situation, posting that you can be charged with an extra assault. If you’re going to be charged with assault, most people know that. I don’t think this is going to make a dime’s worth of difference.

Where does all this end? We just increased penalties for insulting a DHHS employee. I saw a video of a teacher in Flint get a chair bashed over her head, breaking the chair. This kind of stuff happens in schools. Are we going to increase it in the schools? It happens to firefighters, poll workers, waitresses, legislators, when are we going to end all these carveouts? The root of the problem as I see it is understaffing. If there were individuals in the room when this was occurring who could help the nurses, that they can get help in these situations, wouldn’t help. Very often when talking to these individuals, the hospitals rarely ever report these. They don’t want the bad news of, Oh geez, we’ve had the assaults. A lot of prosecutors don’t want to deal with these. I don’t think this is going to help at all with what the real needs are—increasing staffing, making these hospitals report these cases would make a big difference. I will be voting “no” on these two bills.

Senator Singh moved that rule 3.902 be suspended to allow the guest of Senator Chang admittance to the Senate floor.

The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4521, entitled**

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by amending section 82 (MCL 750.82), as amended by 1994 PA 158.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 597**

**Yeas—22**

Anthony  
Bayer

Cherry  
Geiss

McCann  
McDonald Rivet

Santana  
Shink

Brinks	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Camilleri	Irwin	Moss	Webber
Cavanagh	Johnson	Polehanki	Wojno
Chang	Klinefelt		

**Nays—16**

Albert	Damoose	Lauwers	Outman
Bellino	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bumstead	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Daley	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory

**Excused—0****Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Pursuant to Joint Rule 20, the full title of the act shall be inserted to read as follows:

“An act to revise, consolidate, codify, and add to the statutes relating to crimes; to define crimes and prescribe the penalties and remedies; to provide for restitution under certain circumstances; to provide for the competency of evidence at the trial of persons accused of crime; to provide immunity from prosecution for certain witnesses appearing at criminal trials; to provide for liability for damages; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts inconsistent with or contravening any of the provisions of this act.”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 350, entitled**

A bill to amend 2008 PA 549, entitled “Michigan promise zone authority act,” by amending section 3 (MCL 390.1663), as amended by 2020 PA 330.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 598****Yeas—32**

Anthony	Daley	Klinefelt	Outman
Bayer	Damoose	Lauwers	Polehanki
Brinks	Geiss	McBroom	Santana
Bumstead	Hauck	McCann	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McDonald Rivet	Singh
Cavanagh	Huizenga	McMorrow	Victory
Chang	Irwin	Moss	Webber
Cherry	Johnson	Nesbitt	Wojno

**Nays—6**

Albert	Hoitenga	Runestad	Theis
Bellino	Lindsey		

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Senator Bayer asked and was granted unanimous consent to make a statement and moved that the statement be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Bayer’s statement is as follows:

Senate Bill No. 350 updates the Michigan Promise Zone Authority Act in a way that does not add any additional cost but does help more students actually graduate with higher education degrees and certificates. Michigan promise zones provide scholarships and, actually, they make higher education and certification programs available to students in low income communities. Promise zones are managed by local boards who make the decisions on how the scholarship funds are allocated to the recipients. At this time, the funds can only be used for tuition, fees, books, things like that. It is an amazing program and has helped many people over the years across our state.

The problem is, even with this scholarship, many students in promise zones really struggle to get that graduation—to complete the certification program—because of basic needs that are not met for them such as housing, transportation, child care, health care, and just the cost of paying for a licensure certification—they can’t even do that. So the federal government has helped us, they’ve identified requirements—what it actually does cost to go to college, to get a higher degree of some sort. They call it cost of attendance.

We used that model, that’s used all over the country, all over schools, universities, community colleges, and certification programs in Michigan that do scholarships, use these new categories that we’re trying to add to the promise zones. It’s very appropriate for us to align this scholarship program with all the other scholarship programs. This one serves low income families. The other one serves higher income families. It is very appropriate for us to serve all the families, all the students, with help to get those degrees.

Senate Bill No. 350 identifies those costs. We can do this without increasing any of our costs as a state, and it does boost those students from low income communities to the same categories, the same ability to get that enhanced degree, enhanced certificate certification programs. I thank you for the time listening.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 555, entitled**

A bill to amend 2008 PA 549, entitled “Michigan promise zone authority act,” by amending sections 5, 7, and 11 (MCL 390.1665, 390.1667, and 390.1671), as amended by 2016 PA 9.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 599**

**Yeas—32**

Anthony	Daley	Klinefelt	Outman
Bayer	Damoose	Lauwers	Polehanki
Brinks	Geiss	McBroom	Santana
Bumstead	Hauck	McCann	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McDonald Rivet	Singh
Cavanagh	Huizenga	McMorrow	Victory
Chang	Irwin	Moss	Webber
Cherry	Johnson	Nesbitt	Wojno

**Nays—6**

Albert  
Bellino

Hoitenga  
Lindsey

Runestad

Theis

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Senator Anthony asked and was granted unanimous consent to make a statement and moved that the statement be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Anthony’s statement is as follows:

I stand before you today to rise in support of Senate Bill No. 555, and similar to the bill we just passed, it is a bill to modernize the promise zones here in the state of Michigan. Now as a reminder, in 2019 Michigan enacted bipartisan legislation to become the first state in the nation to promote the creation of place-based scholarship initiatives. Each existing promise zone is a public-private partnership committed to ensuring every child in a community has a tuition-free path to at least an associate’s degree. Now when we talk about promise zones, I think it’s important to highlight where we have promise zones here in the state of Michigan. These are zones in Baldwin, Battle Creek, Benton Harbor, the city of Detroit, Flint, Hazel Park, Grand Rapids, the lovely city of Lansing, Mason County, Muskegon, Newaygo, Pontiac, and Saginaw.

We know that higher education is extremely important, and since 2019 the landscape has evolved. So to meet the needs of students today, these bills bring us one step closer to having a nimble, place-based scholarship program in these communities and hopefully more. I ask for a “yes” vote. Again, thank you Mr. President for the opportunity.

**Recess**

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion prevailed, the time being 12:14 p.m.

3:44 p.m.

The Senate was called to order by the President pro tempore, Senator Moss.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

**General Orders**

Senator Singh moved that the Senate resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of the General Orders calendar.

The motion prevailed, and the President pro tempore, Senator Moss, designated Senator McMorrow as Chairperson.

After some time spent therein, the Committee arose; and the President pro tempore, Senator Moss, having resumed the Chair, the Committee reported back to the Senate, favorably and without amendment, the following bill:

**House Bill No. 4021, entitled**

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” by amending sections 81101, 81132, 81145, 81146, and 81150 (MCL 324.81101, 324.81132, 324.81145, 324.81146, and 324.81150), section 81101 as amended by 2020 PA 385 and sections 81132, 81145, 81146, and 81150 as added by 1995 PA 58.

The bill was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The Committee of the Whole reported back to the Senate, favorably and with a substitute therefor, the following bill:

**Senate Bill No. 273, entitled**

A bill to amend 2008 PA 295, entitled “Clean and renewable energy and energy waste reduction act,” by amending sections 73, 75, 77, and 78 (MCL 460.1073, 460.1075, 460.1077, and 460.1078), sections 73, 75, and 77 as amended and section 78 as added by 2016 PA 342.

Substitute (S-3).

The Senate agreed to the substitute recommended by the Committee of the Whole, and the bill as substituted was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The Committee of the Whole reported back to the Senate, favorably and with a substitute therefor, the following bill:

**Senate Bill No. 519, entitled**

A bill to provide for the transition of transition-impacted industries into new industries; to create the community and worker economic transition office in the department of labor and economic opportunity; to create certain advisory committees; and to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities.

Substitute (S-4).

The following is the amendment to the substitute recommended by the Committee of the Whole:

1. Amend page 5, following line 20, by inserting:

- “(5) Beginning 1 year after the effective date of this act, the office director shall annually submit a written report to the legislature that includes all of the following:
  - (a) Information regarding the utilization of transition activities.
  - (b) A description of transition-impacted industries, transition communities, and transition workers.
  - (c) An evaluation of the transition plan, including, but not limited to, the outcomes of the transition plan.”.

The Senate agreed to the substitute as amended recommended by the Committee of the Whole, and the bill as substituted was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of  
**Motions and Communications**

Senator Singh moved that the rules be suspended and that the following bills, now on Third Reading of Bills, be placed on their immediate passage:

**Senate Bill No. 273**

**Senate Bill No. 519**

The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of  
**Third Reading of Bills**

Senator Singh moved that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following bills:

**Senate Bill No. 273**

**Senate Bill No. 519**

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 273, entitled**

A bill to amend 2008 PA 295, entitled “Clean and renewable energy and energy waste reduction act,” by amending sections 5, 7, 71, 73, 75, 77, 78, 91, and 93 (MCL 460.1005, 460.1007, 460.1071, 460.1073, 460.1075, 460.1077, 460.1078, 460.1091, and 460.1093), sections 5, 7, 71, 73, 75, 77, 91, and 93 as amended and section 78 as added by 2016 PA 342, and by adding sections 72, 80, and 80a; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Lauwers offered the following amendment:

- 1. Amend page 32, following line 12, by inserting:
  - “Enacting section 2. This amendatory act takes effect January 1, 2025.”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,  
Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 600**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Nesbitt offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 32, following line 12, by inserting:

“Enacting section 2. This amendatory act takes effect 90 days after the date it is enacted into law.

However, this amendatory act does not take effect until the Midcontinent Independent System Operator issues a report concluding that this amendatory act will increase or maintain grid reliability.”

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 601**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana

Brinks  
Camilleri  
Cavanagh

Geiss  
Hertel  
Irwin

McDonald Rivet  
McMorrow  
Moss

Shink  
Singh  
Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The question being on the passage of the bill,  
The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 602**

**Yeas—20**

Anthony  
Bayer  
Brinks  
Camilleri  
Cavanagh

Chang  
Cherry  
Geiss  
Hertel  
Irwin

Klinefelt  
McCann  
McDonald Rivet  
McMorrow  
Moss

Polehanki  
Santana  
Shink  
Singh  
Wojno

**Nays—18**

Albert  
Bellino  
Bumstead  
Daley  
Damoose

Hauck  
Hoitenga  
Huizenga  
Johnson  
Lauwers

Lindsey  
McBroom  
Nesbitt  
Outman

Runestad  
Theis  
Victory  
Webber

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

**Protests**

Senators McBroom, Bellino, Hoitenga, Theis, Nesbitt and Daley, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 273.

Senator McBroom moved that the statement he made during the discussion of the bill be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator McBroom's statement, in which Senators Bellino, Hoytenga, Theis, Nesbitt and Daley concurred, is as follows:

Mr. President, I don't deny the good intentions that many have when it comes to these things and the sincere desire to see—I don't deny the sincere desire people have when it comes to the motivations of these bills or the goals, but I think we miss some significant understanding of how economics works. We miss true understanding of what incentivizes people into actions and the incredible amount of influence that is being peddled in this town to get a package like this passed.

It reminds me very much of what goes on in agriculture and what some of us who are in farming are dealing with when it comes to the prices you all pay for food. If you recognize and do any sort of history about how much money you pay for food, you'd be shocked how little you're actually paying because the world right now thinks, Oh my goodness food is so expensive. That gallon of milk is \$4. But those of us who make milk recognize it's not \$4. It's way more than that, so why is it that the consumer only pays \$4? Because the consumer's also paying for that milk and all the other taxes that he's charged and all the other costs that then the government funnels back down through many, many filters enriching many, many powerful people to drop a few more pennies in the farmer's pocket so they can just limp along.

Why are we having to do so many programs to help poor people pay for electricity? Why are we having to do so many programs to help people pay to put insulation in their house? Well, because electricity is expensive; insulation is expensive. Why is it so expensive? Because the government creates a whole bunch of ridiculous programs that drive the prices up, that let all those businesses and industries charge more and show up at our building construction code meetings and then demand we put more stuff in our buildings so then the people can't afford it so we take more tax dollars from them and then give them a few pennies so they can pay for it. That's all we're doing.

We're not saving the people money. We're only making it look like it. These are hoaxes; it's a sham. We're not really doing the people any favors. I ask for a "no" vote.

Senators Lauwers, Nesbitt and Singh asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Lauwers' statement is as follows:

Mr. President, just over 24 hours ago we were provided the final version of these bills. But, for the last several hours, we've sat here waiting because there is still yet another final version to emerge—we do have it for this one now; I have not had a chance to read it—a final version of these bills after months of no negotiations and hiding the work product from the public at large, as far as I can see. Mr. President, I guess we will have to vote to see what's really in these bills.

It doesn't really make sense to me because the last two times the Legislature revisited and updated our energy policy, the approach included both parties with several months of hearings containing hours of testimony and dozens of publicly debated amendments. I remember it well. That's because energy policy is complicated, Mr. President. The terms and processes are foreign to most, and the consequences of actions and decisions regarding our electrical grid can be impactful and long-lasting and in the case of these bills, potentially irreversible. Unfortunately, this majority is more in a hurry to pass something rather than really enact energy reforms that keep Michigan families warm and the lights on.

That's why I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting my amendment to delay the implementation of this bill until January 1, 2025. That way everyone, including the people sitting in this chamber, can get a better handle on these bills rather than rushing through and rather than relying on the talking points of Green New Deal activists and hope for the best.

Senator Nesbitt's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, the backers of this Green New Deal scheme that'll raise prices and decrease reliability insist our state can produce enough of this renewable energy to meet this government mandate and that Michiganders' lights and heat will turn on when they need to. My amendment's very simple. It will help make sure they actually do. MISO, which manages the flow of energy across 15 states and some provinces including Michigan—my amendment simply requires that the new mandates in this bill will not take effect until MISO has done a proper determination that will in fact—these bills will produce enough energy to maintain a healthy grid in our state. Michiganders have experienced more than enough power outages in recent years and our prices continue to go up. I ask for support of my amendment that will ensure they don't have to endure these power outages more frequently.

Senator Singh’s statement is as follows:

I’m pleased to rise today to support Senate Bill No. 273. When I joined the Legislature in the State House in 2013, one of the first bills I introduced was a bill to look at energy waste reduction—energy efficiency. Obviously the energy you do not use is the savings for everyone. It reduces the amount of need for electricity from our providers and electrification throughout the system. I was pleased that in 2016 we were able to create a standard of 1 percent toward energy efficiency. Now I’m proud to say that many years later, we are here increasing that percentage. We have shown working with our providers that we can provide energy efficiency that saves money for all of our residents. Today we’re going to be voting on a bill that increases the energy efficiency rate to 1.5 percent and provides a goal for our utilities to be at 2 percent. This is now an opportunity for us to help our citizens across the state save dollars and resources. I’m also proud that we now have been working with our co-ops as well as our municipal entities and now every citizen will have access to energy efficiency opportunities.

Also, within our negotiations we wanted to ensure that equity was at the cornerstone and we also now have for the first time in this state’s history a minimum spend of 25 percent going into low-income communities. This is now an opportunity for us to help those who are struggling the most to be able to save on their energy. We do that in a variety of ways—by allowing the energy efficiency program to grow but also to work with their homes through the building envelope as well as heat pumps and other types of technologies. This is a proven program that has worked.

We’re one of the top three states in the country for energy efficiency and this will only build on that. I am proud today to be presenting this bill and providing my “yes” vote. I encourage my colleagues to join me in voting to help our citizens save dollars and resources on their energy bills.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 519, entitled**

A bill to provide for the adjustment of transition-impacted workers into new industries; to create the community and worker economic transition office in the department of labor and economic opportunity; to allow the creation of certain advisory committees; to make certain appropriations; and to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 603**

**Yeas—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Nays—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

## Protests

Senators Albert, Bellino and McBroom, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 519 and moved that the statements they made during the discussion of the bill be printed as their reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

The bill before us today would establish a new state office with a goal as published by the nonpartisan Senate Fiscal Agency to “coordinate efforts related to its mission of assisting workers and communities during the State’s renewable energy transition.” The office would also be required to submit a transition plan to the Legislature by the end of 2025. Also, the bill defines a transition-impacted industry to be fossil fuel energy workers, internal combustion engine workers, workers in the building and construction trades, and anyone else the masters of the universe deem appropriate. We must ask ourselves what the purpose of this legislation is, why its advocates think it’s necessary?

To answer that question, we cannot look at this legislation today in isolation. It must be put into context with other missteps the majority of this Legislature is taking. For instance, the two crown jewels of their directed economy—the 100 percent mandate of carbon-neutral energy, and billions of taxpayer-funded incentives to force a shift to electric vehicles. This bill before us today is a recognition that these government-forced and coerced actions will have a negative impact on Michigan jobs. These new jobs may be fewer in number and pay less than the old ones. This is the value proposition of a benevolent centralized planner. Your livelihood and ability to support your family will need to be sacrificed, but don’t worry, it’s for the greater good. A good of course that is determined by the centralized planners own value judgement and will be crammed down upon everyone, whether the people want it or not. It would be more fitting to rename this so-called proposed Community and Worker Economic Transition Office to the Ministry of Forced Economic Transition and State-Mandated Unemployment.

I have heard supporters of this legislation say many times that this office is needed because market forces are moving us toward renewable energy and electric vehicles. I acknowledge there are some natural market movements in this direction, but these natural market-driven movements pale in comparison to the government actions and mandates, both at the state and federal levels. To an overwhelming extent this is a government-created market. The government is actively trying to force this transition through centralized planning and mandates, and what will the impact be on the economy? What’s going to happen to Michigan workers and families who are dependent on jobs in the automotive and energy industries? The answer lies in this very legislation. This bill before us today talks about replacing lost income and gaps in income and replacing lost tax base revenue as if they’re inevitable consequences of the forced transition state governments want to interject upon the people of the state of Michigan. The original version of this bill even called for something called a wage benefit differential and set up a specific fund for the so-called transition. The legislation before us may have gone from terrible to just bad with the changes, but it still puts our state on a very dangerous path with a very dangerous role for government. Why would we as a state intentionally force policies expected to result in lost jobs and lower wages for workers? It doesn’t make sense, but that’s what the Democratic-controlled Legislature has done time after time this year. Case in point is repealing our right-to-work law. At a minimum—and this is being charitable—this bill needlessly grows state government and endorses government interference with the economy and our livelihoods. It hints at centralized planning and forced market mandates that have failed so spectacularly in the past in virtually every nation that has attempted them.

Any movement toward electric vehicles and renewable energy should be allowed to take place more naturally and in sync with the broader economy. These changes should not be forced. It is one thing for natural market forces to dictate changes in employment trends, but it’s another thing entirely for government to mandate these transitions, particularly within tight timeframes. It would make the energy grid even more unreliable than it already is and make our utility bills even higher than they already are. It would eliminate jobs and raise costs at the same time. We are at great risk of relying on technologies that are not ready and the consequences might have significant impacts.

This bill symbolizes a monumental divergence of political philosophy between those who advocate for a planned economy and those who advocate for free markets. As Hayek argued in the *Road to Serfdom*, centralized planning may have nobly-stated ends such as social justice, equality, or security, but the means used to implement these ends which is of great concern. Hayek stated, “in this sense socialism means the abolition of private enterprise, of private ownership of the means of production, and the creation of a ‘planned economy’ in which the entrepreneur working for profit is replaced by a centralized planning body.” The danger proposed is that there is a correlation between how free markets work and the degree of freedom which is given in a society. In a planned economy, competition is substituted with coercion. This coercion does not limit itself to the economic side of life. For a centralized plan to be enacted, individual liberties need to be limited.

The link between planned economies which were driven by authoritarian governments is glaringly obvious from the early 20th century up to today. I would have thought the examples were self-evident, but this leaves me to think they are not, so I will list a few examples. The former Soviet Russia, any poor country behind the Iron Curtain, North Korea, China, Vietnam, Cambodia, Cuba, Venezuela, what do all these countries have in common? They relied on a supposedly benevolent planner to run their economy which resulted in poverty, loss of liberty, and untold suffering. Centralized planning is simply inefficient because markets are too complex. It is impossible for a planning board of a handful of members or even one person to fully understand what will actually work across a whole society. On the other hand, a free economy allows for individuals to determine production through competition which is moderated through market-driven pricing.

Most importantly, this type of free economic system not only generates prosperity but opportunity and it supports a free society as well. The divergence is stark and anyone who would be foolish enough to support servitude and poverty over freedom and prosperity is beyond me. To sum it up, this legislation goes beyond what the scope of government should be. It supports centralized planning and the road to serfdom, and I urge a “no” vote.

Senator Bellino’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, let’s all recap how this legislation arrived before us today. Lansing Democrats have passed bill after bill after bill that sends a clear message to businesses—you and your jobs are not welcome here. We gave you higher taxes, more regulations, we cow-towed to all our union bosses, extreme and expensive energy mandates as we are seeing today, and the list goes on.

The bill before us is an admission that these policies will cost Michiganders their jobs. An acknowledgement that businesses are being driven from our state. But, Mr. President, don’t just take my word for it, look around at my own county. Other states are targeting Michigan companies because they see these extreme policies as an opportunity to lure companies and good paying jobs. And what is your solution, Mr. President? More government of course.

If you liked the UIA, just wait until you see the Community and Worker Economic Transition Office. And we all in this room, we love the UIA. It’s like that soft toy your grandkids have, that the older boy beats up on the younger boy. When it was Snyder it was lawsuits, it was bad software, it was huge settlements. Now it’s billions and billions and billions of dollars of fraud. Mr. President, the only transition taking place, due to Lansing Democrats, is the transition from the employment to the unemployment line. The transition of jobs from Michigan to North Carolina, to Ohio, or from my own Monroe County across the border to Lucas County. The transition from Michigan residents to Florida, Tennessee, and Texas.

The existence of these bills today are an indictment of the policies of this majority. I’ve got to say one thing—I want to applaud the Democrats on their honesty. I want to applaud you because you are admitting your policies don’t work. I ask for a “no” vote.

Senator McBroom’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I’m glad that my colleague who just preceded me brought up horses and carriages, because I’ve been doing some historical research and I’m wondering how many of us have heard of the BERE program—the blacksmith and equine reeducation program. This was a really inspirational program about that time that served to help blacksmiths and those who raised horses transition over to the car economy, and we paid for it by putting taxes on cars. Then there’s the GAWD program—that was the program for gas workers development, to help all the people who are part of gasification—like we know this building was originally done—transition over to electricity. And of course, we put some taxes on copper and electric rates to pay for that reeducation. Now of course, that’s all nonsense—that never happened. Not true.

So who paid for all that retraining? Who paid for the displaced blacksmith and the livery stable worker? And who paid for the misplaced gasification worker? Who paid for the people who built carriages, and what did they get to do? Well, some of them adapted, learned that they could make carriages for other purposes, and that carriages transition into other vehicles. We know that’s how the Dodge brothers worked, and many others. But you know who mostly paid for training? The big businesses that we are constantly being told aren’t paying enough taxes. Ford paid for retraining those people because he needed the workers. That’s how it’s supposed to work. That’s what’s supposed to go on here.

So we always come to this moment when we think, Well it’s too complicated, we have to help, let’s get the government involved and run out there and we’ll straighten and smooth all of this out, nobody will be left without options. We just heard this a few years ago from our government when they’re like, You know what, there’s no more jobs that you can get without a four-year college degree, in fact, you might need more than that, let’s create the merit curriculum. Now all of a sudden we’re panicking because we don’t have enough people to work on our cars, put plumbing in the house, or put wires in the house.

We are not good at central planning. Governments don't do a good job with that. It was just a few years ago when we heard, Well the incandescent bulb has got to go, the future is curly-Q bulbs, let's spend a billion dollars and buy everybody in the state a curly-Q bulb just to make sure that they know that they're OK. People literally went around, door to door from our utilities, and passed out curly-Q light bulbs to people. Now where are they? A few years later we realized that's not great technology. In fact, it's dirty technology. If we had just let the market work, we wouldn't have wasted a billion dollars passing out junk bulbs to everybody that now nobody buys anyway because there's a better product. We don't do a good job with central planning. It doesn't work out for us.

We need to let the marketplace work. We need to let those who are seeing these transitions work. And certainly, there is not universal agreement that all of these plans and stuff—worldwide—that it's all going this way. We're already seeing countries walk some of these back. We see auto manufacturers who are going different routes and looking at hydrogen—recognizing this isn't a sure thing. Maybe our bet needs to be in a different direction. All one has to do is go back in history a little while and see those who were approached, Hey what's the car going to be? Just a passing fancy, it's never going to take over the market. Horses are here to stay. Well, they were wrong. But those were government people saying that—from the United States Patent Office. They are not right, and we could be dead wrong here again. And we're going to create a huge training program and take tax dollars from our citizens to do it, instead of letting the marketplace generate that demand and force the very people who will profit from this transition to do their own darn work, instead of taking money from us to do it.

Senators McMorro and Cherry asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator McMorro's statement is as follows:

It has been fascinating to sit here over the past few weeks and months to hear some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle decrying the fears of China and Chinese dominance and the threats that are heading toward our shores, and then to point at something like the EV transition as if it is optional. The reality is that more than a dozen countries around the world, including the population of most industrialized nations, have already determined that they will be phasing out internal combustion engine vehicles within the next few years, maybe within the next five years, ten years, 15 years, 20 years. If we do not position our state, our workers, and our signature industry to respond to this transition that we're living in, we will get left behind because if every country has determined that they will no longer be allowing the sale of internal combustion engine vehicles, what prosperity exists if there are no customers left to sell your products to?

Now the other reality is that transitions are hard. Henry Ford himself said, "If I had asked the people what they wanted, they would have said faster horses." Sometimes it is hard to see what you can't imagine yet, and I'm sure at the time when we transitioned from horses and carriages to motorized vehicles that were accessible and manufactured and made for everybody, I can only imagine the lobbying from the carriage industry saying, This is never going to happen, it's not possible, we can't see it in front of our eyes, this is just destroying our jobs. Guess what? None of us get to work in this building in a horse-drawn carriage. We don't. Transitions are challenging. It is going to take coordination; it is going to take investment. The reality from the White House, from our leadership in the new Democratic majority, in this office itself is that we believe in our workers, we believe in our state, and we believe that we should remain the automotive capital of the nation and the world. The only way we do that is looking at the reality of who the customers are and what they will be buying and preparing for that reality.

This bill is just one step to show that our state believes in this future, that we are aligning our government, our resources, to get it done, to ensure as we make this transition that no worker gets left behind, that no industry gets left behind, that no stakeholder gets left behind, so that we can show the rest of the country how to lean in to becoming the center of the automotive industry, the clean energy industry, and how we can bring everybody along with us and anybody who is trying to convince you that it is a mandated transition is lying.

Senator Cherry's statement is as follows:

I'm going to be brief in my remarks. Listening to what's been said so far, I'd like to put a few facts out there. We've heard a lot about, so far in the debate over this bill, Democrats raising taxes, and I just want to remind everybody the only thing that's happened with taxes in this chamber is cutting taxes this session and all the members on this side of the aisle voted to cut taxes and all the members on the opposite side of the aisle voted not to cut taxes. I just want to remind folks when we're talking about taxes, we've only cut them. Democrats that is. Second, we are doing a disservice to our constituents if we don't learn from the past, and

Michigan, time and again, has gone through technological changes that have hurt workers, that have hurt our citizens. Technological and other changes, we used to have a huge mining economy in parts of our state and it went away and we didn't do what we should have done to support those communities, to support those workers. We shouldn't repeat that mistake. When we went through the transition to a global economy, it devastated different communities in our state and we didn't do the things we should have done to help those communities and help those workers. We are going through a new transition today; let's not repeat the same mistakes of the past. I urge a "yes" vote on this bill.

### Recess

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.  
The motion prevailed, the time being 4:33 p.m.

4:49 p.m.

The Senate was called to order by the President pro tempore, Senator Moss.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of  
**General Orders**

Senator Irwin moved that the Senate resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of the General Orders calendar.

The motion prevailed, and the President pro tempore, Senator Moss, designated Senator McMorrow as Chairperson.

After some time spent therein, the Committee arose; and the President pro tempore, Senator Moss, having resumed the Chair, the Committee reported back to the Senate, favorably and with a substitute therefor, the following bill:

#### **Senate Bill No. 502, entitled**

A bill to amend 1939 PA 3, entitled "An act to provide for the regulation and control of public and certain private utilities and other services affected with a public interest within this state; to provide for alternative energy suppliers; to provide for licensing; to include municipally owned utilities and other providers of energy under certain provisions of this act; to create a public service commission and to prescribe and define its powers and duties; to abolish the Michigan public utilities commission and to confer the powers and duties vested by law on the public service commission; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to provide for the continuance, transfer, and completion of certain matters and proceedings; to abolish automatic adjustment clauses; to prohibit certain rate increases without notice and hearing; to qualify residential energy conservation programs permitted under state law for certain federal exemption; to create a fund; to encourage the utilization of resource recovery facilities; to prohibit certain acts and practices of providers of energy; to allow for the securitization of stranded costs; to reduce rates; to provide for appeals; to provide appropriations; to declare the effect and purpose of this act; to prescribe remedies and penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts," by amending sections 6, 6a, 6m, 6t, and 11 (MCL 460.6, 460.6a, 460.6m, 460.6t, and 460.11), section 6 as amended by 2005 PA 190 and sections 6a, 6m, and 11 as amended and section 6t as added by 2016 PA 341, and by adding section 6aa.

Substitute (S-6).

The following is the amendment to the substitute recommended by the Committee of the Whole:

1. Amend page 35, line 21, after "**Labor**" by inserting a comma and striking "**for construction mechanics**,".

The Senate agreed to the substitute as amended recommended by the Committee of the Whole, and the bill as substituted was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

### Recess

Senator Irwin moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.  
The motion prevailed, the time being 4:56 p.m.

5:04 p.m.

The Senate was called to order by the President pro tempore, Senator Moss.

Senator Singh moved that the Senate resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of the General Orders calendar.

The motion prevailed, and the President pro tempore, Senator Moss, designated Senator McMorrow as Chairperson.

After some time spent therein, the Committee arose; and the President pro tempore, Senator Moss, having resumed the Chair, the Committee reported back to the Senate, favorably and with a substitute therefor, the following bill:

**Senate Bill No. 271, entitled**

A bill to amend 2008 PA 295, entitled "Clean and renewable energy and energy waste reduction act," by amending sections 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 22, 28, 45, 47, and 49 (MCL 460.1003, 460.1005, 460.1007, 460.1009, 460.1011, 460.1022, 460.1028, 460.1045, 460.1047, and 460.1049), sections 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 45, 47, and 49 as amended and sections 22 and 28 as added by 2016 PA 342, and by adding sections 32 and 53.

Substitute (S-3).

The Senate agreed to the substitute recommended by the Committee of the Whole, and the bill as substituted was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

**Motions and Communications**

Senator Singh moved that the rules be suspended and that the following bills, now on Third Reading of Bills, be placed on their immediate passage:

**Senate Bill No. 502**

**Senate Bill No. 271**

The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Senator Singh moved that a respectful message be sent to the House of Representatives requesting the return of the following bill:

**House Bill No. 4926**

The motion prevailed.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

**Third Reading of Bills**

**Recess**

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion prevailed, the time being 5:09 p.m.

5:26 p.m.

The Senate was called to order by the President pro tempore, Senator Moss.

Senator Singh moved that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following bill:

**Senate Bill No. 502**

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 502, entitled**

A bill to amend 1939 PA 3, entitled "An act to provide for the regulation and control of public and certain private utilities and other services affected with a public interest within this state; to provide for alternative

energy suppliers; to provide for licensing; to include municipally owned utilities and other providers of energy under certain provisions of this act; to create a public service commission and to prescribe and define its powers and duties; to abolish the Michigan public utilities commission and to confer the powers and duties vested by law on the public service commission; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to provide for the continuance, transfer, and completion of certain matters and proceedings; to abolish automatic adjustment clauses; to prohibit certain rate increases without notice and hearing; to qualify residential energy conservation programs permitted under state law for certain federal exemption; to create a fund; to encourage the utilization of resource recovery facilities; to prohibit certain acts and practices of providers of energy; to allow for the securitization of stranded costs; to reduce rates; to provide for appeals; to provide appropriations; to declare the effect and purpose of this act; to prescribe remedies and penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” by amending sections 6a, 6m, and 6t (MCL 460.6a, 460.6m, and 460.6t), sections 6a and 6m as amended and section 6t as added by 2016 PA 341, and by adding section 6aa.

The question being on the passage of the bill,  
 Senator Runestad offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 44, line 1, by striking out all of enacting section 1 and inserting:  
 “Enacting section 1. This amendatory act does not take effect unless all of the following bills of the 102nd Legislature are enacted into law:
  - (a) Senate Bill No. 296.
  - (b) Senate Bill No. 297.
  - (c) Senate Bill No. 298.”.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Senator Runestad offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 44, line 1, by striking out all of enacting section 1 and inserting:  
 “Enacting section 1. This amendatory act does not take effect unless all of the following bills of the 102nd Legislature are enacted into law:
  - (a) Senate Bill No. 297.
  - (b) Senate Bill No. 298.”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,  
 Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 604**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Runestad offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 44, line 1, by striking out all of enacting section 1 and inserting:

“Enacting section 1. This amendatory act does not take effect unless Senate Bill No. 296 of the 102nd Legislature is enacted into law.”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 605**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Webber offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 11, following line 26, by inserting:

**“(15) Beginning on the effective date of the amendatory act that added section 6aa, the commission shall not increase electric rates for residential customers in this state until January 1, 2040.”** and renumbering the remaining subsections.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 606**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0****Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Huizenga offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 11, following line 26, by inserting:

**“(15) Beginning on the effective date of the amendatory act that added section 6aa, the commission shall not increase electric rates for nonprofit organizations in this state until January 1, 2040.”** and renumbering the remaining subsections.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 607****Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0****Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Huizenga offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 11, following line 26, by inserting:

“(15) **Beginning on the effective date of the amendatory act that added section 6aa, the commission shall not increase electric rates for public and private schools in this state until January 1, 2040.**” and renumbering the remaining subsections.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment, Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 608**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Webber offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 43, following line 29, by inserting:

“**Sec. 6bb. The commission shall require electric utilities to issue rebates to customers whose service is interrupted for more than 24 hours.**”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment, Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 609**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Lauwers offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 43, following line 29, by inserting:

“Enacting section 1. This amendatory act takes effect January 1, 2025.” and renumbering the remaining enacting section.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 610**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator McBroom offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 2, following “**THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN ENACT:**” by inserting:

“~~Sec. 1. (1) A commission to be known and designated as the “Michigan public service commission” is hereby created, which shall consist—~~**The Michigan public service commission is created in the department of licensing and regulatory affairs.**”

(2) ~~The commission consists of 3-6 members, not more than 2-3 of whom shall be~~ **are** members of the same political party, appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the senate. **At least 1 member of the commission must be a resident of the Upper Peninsula.**

(3) Each member ~~shall of the commission must~~ be a citizen of the United States ~~and of the~~ **this** state, of Michigan, ~~and no member of said~~ **A member of the** commission shall **not** be pecuniarily interested in any public utility or ~~public service~~ **person** subject to the jurisdiction and control of the commission. During ~~his~~ **a member's** term, ~~no a member of the commission shall not~~ serve as an officer or committee member of any political party organization, ~~or hold any office, or be employed by any other commission, board, department or institution in this state. No commission~~

(4) **A member of the commission shall not** be retained or employed by any public utility or ~~public service~~ **person** subject to the jurisdiction and control of the commission ~~during the time he~~ **while the member is** acting as such ~~commissioner, and a member of the commission or~~ for 6 months thereafter, ~~and no after that time.~~

(5) A member of the commission ~~who is a member of the bar of the state~~ **State Bar** of Michigan ~~shall not practice his profession law or act as counselor or attorney in any court of this state during the time he is while a member of said the commission. Provided, however, This shall~~

(6) ~~This section does not require any commissioner member of the commission to retire from, or dissolve any partnership of which he the individual is a member, but said the partnership while he is a member of the commission, shall not engage in public utility practice while the individual is a member of the commission. Immediately upon the taking effect of this act, the offices of the present members of the Michigan public service commission are hereby abolished, and the members of the Michigan public service commission as herein created shall be appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the senate, for terms of 6 years each: Provided, That of the members first appointed, 1 shall be appointed for a term of 2 years, 1 for a term of 4 years, and 1 for a term of 6 years. Upon the expiration of said terms successors shall be appointed with like qualifications and in like manner for terms of 6 years each, and until their successors are appointed and qualified. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as is provided for appointment in the first instance.~~

(7) **Members of the commission shall serve for terms of 6 years or until a successor is appointed, whichever is later. If a vacancy occurs on the commission, the governor shall make an appointment for the unexpired term in the same manner as the original appointment."**

The question being on the adoption of the amendment, Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 611**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator McBroom offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 2, following “THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN ENACT:” by inserting:

“Sec. 1. (1) ~~A commission to be known and designated as the “Michigan public service commission” is hereby created, which shall consist~~ **The Michigan public service commission is created in the department of licensing and regulatory affairs.**

(2) ~~The commission consists of 3-6 members, not more than 2-3 of whom shall be~~ **are** members of the same political party, appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the senate. **At least 1 member of the commission must be a resident of the Upper Peninsula. In addition to the 1 member who is a resident of the Upper Peninsula, at least 1 member of the commission must be a rate payer who has a residence or business with average yearly energy costs of less than \$100,000.00.**

(3) ~~Each member shall of the commission must be a citizen of the United States and of the this state. of Michigan, and no member of said~~ **A member of the commission shall not be pecuniarily interested in any public utility or public service person subject to the jurisdiction and control of the commission. During his a member’s term, no a member of the commission shall not serve as an officer or committee member of any political party organization, or hold any office, or be employed by any other commission, board, department, or institution in this state. No commission**

(4) ~~A member of the commission shall not be retained or employed by any public utility or public service person subject to the jurisdiction and control of the commission during the time he while the member is acting as such commissioner, and a member of the commission or for 6 months thereafter, and no after that time.~~

(5) ~~A member of the commission who is a member of the bar of the state State Bar of Michigan, shall not practice his profession law or act as counselor or attorney in any court of this state during the time he is while a member of said the commission. Provided, however, This shall~~

(6) ~~This section does not require any commissioner member of the commission to retire from, or dissolve any partnership of which he the individual is a member, but said the partnership while he is a member of the commission, shall not engage in public utility practice while the individual is a member of the commission. Immediately upon the taking effect of this act, the offices of the present members of the Michigan public service commission are hereby abolished, and the members of the Michigan public service commission as herein created shall be appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the senate, for terms of 6 years each: Provided, That of the members first appointed, 1 shall be appointed for a term of 2 years, 1 for a term of 4 years, and 1 for a term of 6 years. Upon the expiration of said terms successors shall be appointed with like qualifications and in like manner for terms of 6 years each, and until their successors are appointed and qualified. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as is provided for appointment in the first instance.~~

(7) ~~Members of the commission shall serve for terms of 6 years or until a successor is appointed, whichever is later. If a vacancy occurs on the commission, the governor shall make an appointment for the unexpired term in the same manner as the original appointment.”.~~

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 612**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana

Brinks  
Camilleri  
Cavanagh

Geiss  
Hertel  
Irwin

McDonald Rivet  
McMorrow  
Moss

Shink  
Singh  
Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The question being on the passage of the bill,  
The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 613**

**Yeas—20**

Anthony  
Bayer  
Brinks  
Camilleri  
Cavanagh

Chang  
Cherry  
Geiss  
Hertel  
Irwin

Klinefelt  
McCann  
McDonald Rivet  
McMorrow  
Moss

Polehanki  
Santana  
Shink  
Singh  
Wojno

**Nays—18**

Albert  
Bellino  
Bumstead  
Daley  
Damoose

Hauck  
Hoitenga  
Huizenga  
Johnson  
Lauwers

Lindsey  
McBroom  
Nesbitt  
Outman

Runestad  
Theis  
Victory  
Webber

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Senators Webber, Huizenga, McBroom and Shink asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Webber's first statement is as follows:

Mr. President, my amendment is simple and straightforward. It will protect the pocketbooks of every residential energy user in this state. Michiganders are still struggling with inflation not experienced in nearly half a century. They're paying more for groceries, more for gas, more for electricity, more to heat their homes, more for everything. My colleagues across the aisle insist Michiganders won't bear the financial burden of this expensive Green New Deal, but their bills don't actually guarantee that. My amendment fixes this oversight. I ask for a "yes" vote to make sure families, seniors on fixed incomes, and every other resident of our state are protected from rate increases associated with this legislation.

Senator Huizenga's first statement is as follows:

Mr. President, nonprofit organizations play a critical role in the lives of millions of Michiganders every single day, from supporting education and environmental protection to providing health care and healthy foods. Many of these organizations operate on a razor's edge financially and especially recently as they've been particularly hard-hit with record inflation and gas prices. The last thing they can afford is massive hikes in energy prices. Unfortunately it's indisputable that this new legislation will bring with it a massive price tag. When costs go up, services get shorted. So whether they're a small soup kitchen or a large hospital, no Michigan nonprofit should be forced to close their doors and abandon their mission because of these bills. Please protect vital work for Michigan nonprofits by holding them harmless from rate hikes associated with these bills. I ask for a "yes" vote.

Senator Huizenga's second statement is as follows:

My amendment ensures that tax dollars invested in the education of Michigan students stay where they belong—in the classroom. We should all be proud of the fact that regardless of who's been in the majority in this chamber in recent years, we've been able to work in a bipartisan fashion to provide record funding to our schools. This has been particularly important since the pandemic as many Michigan students have struggled to recover from learning losses during the forced school shutdowns. Now is certainly not the time to divert money from our classrooms, yet that could very well happen due to costly mandates included in these bills. Like all large organizations, energy is a tremendous cost driver for school systems. It's expensive to heat up all those big buildings during a Michigan winter. When energy costs go up, which we know they will, then important funds that should go to the classroom get sucked up in energy costs.

Mr. President, it's not disputable that the bill before us will be extremely costly. Millions of dollars of wind turbines and solar panels won't pay for themselves. Someone will get stuck with this new bill. I hope you agree with me that it shouldn't be our schools, and I ask for a "yes" vote to hold Michigan schools harmless from any rate increase associated with these bills.

Senator Webber's second statement is as follows:

Mr. President, Michiganders pay the highest energy rates in the Great Lakes region and some of the highest in the nation, yet we also experience power outages at twice the national average. The bills before us today are modeled after California's Green New Deal. Now I tend to believe that there's not much California has done that Michigan should model itself after, but that's especially true for energy policy. California's legislation didn't deliver carbon-neutral energy. What it did deliver was much-higher rates and more-frequent power outages. Mr. President, Michiganders have experienced more than their fair share of winter nights without heat and summer days without air conditioning in recent years. If Lansing Democrats insist on passing their own Green New Deal, the least it should do is make sure Michigan residents are reimbursed when the power doesn't turn on because the wind hasn't blown or the sun hasn't shined. My amendment will require power outage rebates for Michiganders. I ask for a "yes" vote.

Senator McBroom's first statement is as follows:

In 2016 when we were debating energy policy, I introduced similar amendments to expand the Public Service Commission. This one is to expand it to six and to guarantee that one member of that panel be from the Upper Peninsula. This is not an unprecedented or unusual request as many of our state's boards and commissions have this requirement that somebody be on them from the Upper Peninsula. When we consider what we have before us today, and the incredible volume of land that we're proposing to take up, along with the very peculiar circumstances for energy that the Upper Peninsula has struggled with—and some of you are well-aware of—dealing with our connection with Wisconsin and lack of connection with the Lower Peninsula, it is of paramount importance to have somebody from the Upper Peninsula serving on the Public Service Commission, especially as this legislation looks to move forward.

Our issues in the Upper Peninsula are distinctive and unique when it comes to power generation, particularly with the Wisconsin connections but also because of our needs and having one ratepayer who is taking up over 65 percent of the electricity. This very distinctive issue puts our consumers, the users of energy, in an unfortunate predicament under the current structure of the Public Service Commission where we're poorly represented and unable to have someone who has voting power speak for our interests and watch out for the policy implementation that would adversely impact our peninsula. We've just seen recently the proposal to take land in the Upper Peninsula and dedicate it to a purpose that those in the U.P. do not wish to have, and that's been proposed by somebody who doesn't live in the U.P. We have seen many times over the years people who have proposed various proposals to dictate to us what animals we can hunt or raise, what energy sources we can even use—most particularly and recently, propane—where the Governor's staff literally told me that we would not need propane after 2050 because there would be as-of-yet undiscovered technology to use. Mr. President, I look at this and say the necessity of having somebody from the Upper Peninsula serve on the Public Service Commission could not be more apparent and more acute than it is at this moment during this particular debate. I ask for support of my amendment.

Senator McBroom's second statement is as follows:

I'd like to offer to the members an alternative since they don't think an Upper Peninsula resident should be guaranteed a spot on the Public Service Commission, perhaps they may—a more broad approach would be to your liking. Right now our Public Service Commission is made up of three members and the work they have to do is incredibly difficult and technical in nature. The landscape of energy generation and rate-setting is a very complex enterprise and so it's understandable that those we appoint to the commission over its 100-year life are often those who have a high degree of expertise and experience in the energy sector. That means though that those three individuals are almost always coming to us from either the utility sector or from the manufacturing and industrial sector where they buy or sell or generate huge amounts of electricity.

The Public Service Commission does not just set rates for the large end-users, it doesn't just issue rules to the large producers, the Public Service Commission is charged to govern the rates and the rights of everyday citizen ratepayers. It's not really possible, I think, to just take one of those three and sub in somebody who would have a significant degree of less expertise in these issues, especially because if one person can't make a meeting and you're just left with two, it could become a very slow walk where nothing happens.

I am proposing in my amendment that we expand the commission to six but that we mandate that one member of those six be a regular ratepayer, somebody who just has a home and pays rates, somebody who might have a small business and whose utility bill annually is less than \$100,000, which might sound really big, but for my little dairy farm it's nearly \$50,000 per year to pay for utilities. To put someone on the commission who can be there for the people, who can speak for the interests of the people, and not be someone who's just been in the utility world or been in the manufacturing world, but just wants to make sure the people of this state are not being gouged, are being treated well, and in particular as we consider what has gone on in this state over the last several years with power outages and how impacted our citizens are by going days or weeks without power and we get so wound up about it here.

We're not going to let this happen anymore, we say. We're going to have big hearings on this. We're going to demand better of our utilities, but who on there is genuinely on the commission to speak for those people and to stand up for the little guy? Nobody. My amendment offers us the chance to change that going forward for the future. I encourage a "yes" vote.

Senator Shink's statement is as follows:

I rise in support of Senate Bill No. 502. Climate change is happening now. Its causing millions of dollars worth of damage each year in Michigan and I dealt with some of it firsthand as chair of the Washtenaw County Board of Commissioners. We have to address it now. Michigan must do its part, and the clean energy future package is Michigan's part. It will also bring in billions of dollars investment into this state.

Senate Bill No. 502 requires the Public Service Commission, in approving integrated resource planning, to weigh, along with other factors, equity in environmental justice for people too long neglected, affordability, compliance with the clean energy standards in Senate Bill Nos. 271 and 273, and public health. It creates a requirement that EGLE assess environmental justice and public health impacts of integrated resource plans. It increases the utility representation fund to provide financial support for interventions in cases, and encourages grant-making to nonprofits representing environmental justice communities and communities with the highest energy burdens. It contains prevailing wage standards and the construction and maintenance of new or existing capacity resources. It creates a process for residents to work with MPSC to improve its processes.

This is the moment to do our part. I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on Senate Bill No. 502.

Senator Singh moved that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following bill:

**Senate Bill No. 271**

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 271, entitled**

A bill to amend 2008 PA 295, entitled "Clean and renewable energy and energy waste reduction act," by amending sections 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 22, 28, 45, 47, and 49 (MCL 460.1003, 460.1005, 460.1007, 460.1009, 460.1011, 460.1022, 460.1028, 460.1045, 460.1047, and 460.1049), sections 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 45, 47, and 49 as amended and sections 22 and 28 as added by 2016 PA 342, and by adding sections 32 and 53.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator McBroom offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 6, following line 22, by inserting:

**“(iii) Is a reciprocating internal combustion engine placed in service to facilitate the retirement of coal-fired generation located in the Upper Peninsula before the effective date of the amendatory act that added this subparagraph. This subparagraph does not apply after the end of the Midcontinent Independent System Operator planning year ending in 2050.”** and renumbering the remaining subparagraph.

2. Amend page 16, line 1, after “that” by inserting a comma and **“except as provided in subparagraph (iii),”**.

3. Amend page 16, following line 14, by inserting:

**“(iii) A reciprocating internal combustion engine placed in service to facilitate the retirement of coal-fired generation located in the Upper Peninsula before the effective date of the amendatory act that added this subparagraph. This subparagraph does not apply after the end of the Midcontinent Independent System Operator planning year ending in 2050.”**

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

### Roll Call No. 614

### Yeas—18

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

### Nays—20

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

### Excused—0

### Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Nesbitt offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 14, line 10, by striking out “nuclear.”
2. Amend page 14, line 11, after “coal.” by striking out “A renewable energy resource comes” and inserting **“Renewable energy resource includes nuclear fuel. Other renewable energy resources come”**.
3. Amend page 14, line 13, by striking out “minimizes” and inserting **“minimize”**.
4. Amend page 14, line 14, after “and” by striking out “includes, but is” and inserting **“include, but are”**.
5. Amend page 16, following line 14, by inserting:

**“(iii) A nuclear power plant.”**

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 615**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Hoytenga offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 59, following line 7, by inserting:

“Enacting section 2. This amendatory act does not take effect unless Senate Bill No. 61 of the 102nd Legislature is enacted into law.”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 616**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Bellino offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 59, following line 7, by inserting:

“Enacting section 2. This amendatory act does not take effect unless Senate Bill No. 10 of the 102nd Legislature is enacted into law.”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 617**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Damoose offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 59, following line 5, by inserting:

**“(3) If statewide average customer electric rate increases for 2025 or any subsequent calendar year exceed the increase in the Consumer Price Index for that year, the commission shall by order permanently suspend the application of the amendatory act that added section 51 and the amendatory act that added section 53.**

**(4) As used in this section, “Consumer Price Index” means the most comprehensive index of consumer prices available for this state from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor.”.**

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 618**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Lindsey offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 53, line 29, after “program” by inserting “**for eligible electric generators other than rooftop solar**”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 619**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Lindsey offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 16, line 2, by striking out “use” and inserting “uses”.
2. Amend page 16, line 3, after “steam” by inserting “**and that, if installed after the effective date of the amendatory act that added section 51, was manufactured in the United States**”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 620**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Nesbitt offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 59, line 7, after “law.” by inserting “However, this amendatory act does not take effect until the Midcontinent Independent System Operator issues a report concluding that this amendatory act will increase or maintain grid reliability.”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 621**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis

Bumstead  
Daley  
Damoose

Huizenga  
Johnson  
Lauwers

Nesbitt  
Outman

Victory  
Webber

**Nays—20**

Anthony  
Bayer  
Brinks  
Camilleri  
Cavanagh

Chang  
Cherry  
Geiss  
Hertel  
Irwin

Klinefelt  
McCann  
McDonald Rivet  
McMorrow  
Moss

Polehanki  
Santana  
Shink  
Singh  
Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Nesbitt offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 59, following line 7, by inserting:

“Enacting section 2. This amendatory act does not take effect unless House Bill No. 4002 of the 102nd Legislature is enacted into law.”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 622**

**Yeas—18**

Albert  
Bellino  
Bumstead  
Daley  
Damoose

Hauck  
Hoitenga  
Huizenga  
Johnson  
Lauwers

Lindsey  
McBroom  
Nesbitt  
Outman

Runestad  
Theis  
Victory  
Webber

**Nays—20**

Anthony  
Bayer  
Brinks  
Camilleri  
Cavanagh

Chang  
Cherry  
Geiss  
Hertel  
Irwin

Klinefelt  
McCann  
McDonald Rivet  
McMorrow  
Moss

Polehanki  
Santana  
Shink  
Singh  
Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Lauwers offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 59, line 6, after “effect” by striking out the balance of the bill and inserting “January 1, 2025.”. The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 623**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Lauwers offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 59, following line 5, by inserting:

**“(3) If statewide average customer electric rate increases after the effective date of the amendatory act that added this subsection exceed 10%, the commission shall by order permanently suspend the application of the amendatory act that added this subsection.”.**

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 624**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Lauwers offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 59, following line 5, by inserting:

**“(3) If statewide average customer electric rate increases exceed 20% after the effective date of the amendatory act that added this subsection, the commission shall, by order, permanently suspend the application of the amendatory act that added this subsection.”**

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 625**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Lauwers offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 59, following line 5, by inserting:

**“(3) If statewide average customer electric rate increases after the effective date of the amendatory act that added this subsection exceed 30%, the commission shall by order permanently suspend the application of the amendatory act that added this subsection.”.**

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 626**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Nesbitt offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 59, following line 5, by inserting:

**“(3) If the commission determines that the amendatory act that added this subsection fails to lower statewide average electric costs, the commission shall by order permanently suspend the application of the amendatory act that added this subsection.”.**

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 627**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Nesbitt offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 2, line 23, by striking out the balance of the line and inserting “**unreliable and unaffordable energy act**”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 628**

**Yeas—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Nays—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 629**

**Yeas—20**

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

**Nays—18**

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

**Protests**

Senators Runestad, Huizenga, Theis and McBroom, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 271 and moved that the statements they made during the discussion of the bill be printed as their reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Runestad’s statement is as follows:

Apparently the current majority of this Legislature has looked out at the fact that Michigan has the highest energy cost in the Midwest and has decided, You ain’t seen nothing yet, you’re going to be blown away. There is no question, this bill package is going to blow us all away with big spikes in energy and electrical costs for every citizen and business in the state of Michigan.

The Mackinac Center estimates that this plan will cost hundreds of billions of dollars, thousands more for every person, every year, and make the likelihood of winter blackouts almost inevitable. For what? As the non-partisan Citizens Research Council—non-partisan—recently noted in their reports, changes in Michigan’s energy laws will have no affect on global climate change. Wow. That’s right Michigander, the majority’s plan, in the face of being the nation’s 49th in population growth, is to spike our energy costs and destroy jobs, all for no reason.

We know our current energy costs are already uncompetitive. We pay 30 percent higher energy rates with some of the worst reliability in America. So how do the utilities currently deal with all this? Well, they enter special sweetheart agreements, where some of our last remaining industries get some special deals to help reduce rates. What will these companies do in 2040 when this disastrous plan is 100 percent implemented and Michigan can’t do special sweetheart deals for everyone? So from time to time, through the years, the state of Michigan has had major rewrites of its energy code, but it has never slapped it together this way, this plan which has almost completely been done behind the scenes with no significant input from the business community or from lawmakers across the aisle.

Our job as elected officials, on these huge re-writes that effect every citizen in this state, is to work collaboratively, work with the best experts, and work to find the best solutions. Then debate it openly and publicly and take a vote. For these bills, we skipped all those steps except for the rush to take a vote. The majority calls this package their Michigan Healthy Climate Plan. There is nothing healthy about skyrocketing energy costs and rolling winter blackouts.

This so called healthy plan—all this so called healthy plan is going to accomplish is the continuation of the exodus, the running of our state population and businesses out of Michigan. Both United Van Lines and U-Haul report in their annual surveys that Michigan is in the top five states for populations escaping one way, out of town to other states. The Democrats' solution to this loss of population is this ridiculously-named healthy plan, which is akin to having a healthy plan in place where if you discover you have a bad case of diarrhea the Democrats' healthy plan would recommend you go see a doctor who would prescribe you an enema. This package is a complete and utter disaster and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Senator Huizenga's statement is as follows:

I speak today as a clean energy proponent. I speak to you as someone who has consistently worked toward a cleaner, greener future for generations to come. I have personally chaired the Michigan Conservative Energy Forum, worked with local environmental efforts, and have owned and operated an environmental sustainability software company for years. I'm proud of my service and advocacy, and I've done it all without hurting families—families who are struggling paycheck to paycheck with rising costs on everything right now. Make no mistake, this bill will raise energy costs for those families in need. If this legislation was truly going to lower costs as some have professed, then the majority party would not have blocked our amendments requiring that costs be lowered. If they were confident that families, nonprofits, schools, and others were not going to bear the brunt of higher energy prices, then they would have voted "yes" on our amendments. But we all know that costs will go up. The simple reality is that forcing the end of reliable energy production for less-reliable and more-expensive energy at increasing rates will only increase costs. We should be doing more to lower costs, not raising them today, or any day.

Senator Theis' statement is as follows:

Astronomically high rates, scheduled rolling brownouts—or worse yet, blackouts in the middle of winter—an overloaded grid, this is the reality for Californians suffering under the crushing weight of green energy policies enacted by climate ideologues. This is not just a West Coast mindset. I'm sure we all remember the political fallout from our federal bureaucratic geniuses floating a ban on gas stoves. Rather than green energy purists taking an honest assessment of these failed policies as an example of what not to do, our counterparts across the aisle and across the street have embraced them with religious fervor. Never mind that Michigan residents already pay among the highest electricity rates in the country, or that Michigan already has power outages at double the national average, or frankly that you only have to live in Michigan for about ten minutes to realize that while our state is amazingly beautiful, almost every other state in the country has more abundant sunshine making solar inefficient at best. Forget working seriously and trying to solve energy problems and high costs that people are already facing at a time when families and businesses are struggling in this economy.

Instead, here we are voting on a completely partisan set of bills with no testimony in committee. Who needs to hear from the experts? We're busy mandating utopia. Make no mistake, this legislation would drastically change Michigan's energy policy that would make it even less affordable and less reliable. This extreme approach to energy policy will create burdensome mandates, drive up energy costs for residents across our state, harming the poorest among us the most, while further threatening the stability of our electric grid. This kind of wholesale change and policy with pie-in-the-sky unobtainable dictates is not something Michigan residents and businesses want, nor can they afford. More and bigger government further interfering with lives and business operations hasn't worked before and it won't work now.

I believe in this state. I believe in its people. But the types of policies that have been rushed through this chamber over the past ten months, including this green energy plan today, will do nothing—absolutely nothing—to reverse the avoidable trends of population decline and negative job growth Michigan is experiencing. I strongly urge your "no" vote.

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, this situation and this set of bills—just even this one bill—are so far ranging and so broad to consider that it becomes difficult to know where to even start poking this monster. How do you approach this situation and create a uniform story from beginning to end to define how awful it is when it's impossible to even see all of it in one glance. In the past, Michigan energy policy took years of discussion, and it was always bipartisan. But all of a sudden we are racing ahead with this policy, so afraid to have debate in committee, so afraid to have debate even here that we're jockeying for position on the board—wouldn't want to end the discussion with a "no" vote explanation.

Mr. President, there's an old saying about being so heavenly minded as to be no earthly good. What we're dealing with here has a nice parallel of being so future oriented as to be no present good. We've set our sights on some sort of ambitious vision of utopia and of perfecting the world situation that we're going to stop the weather, we're going to stop climate change—about two degrees—in 100 years. Even though the scientists who recommend that we need to do these things readily admit that the ability to determine a single action, taken even corporately by the world's ability to impact something 100 years from now, is exponentially diminishing every year that goes by. It's impossible. But more problematic than that and the reason I quip to you that we're so future oriented as to be no present good is because we do all of this in the name of the future and disregard the very present moment. The people that are here now. The ratepayers, the citizens, those who need food, and we cast that aside because we're saving the planet.

This that we are trying is not even untried. This isn't new. Other states have entered into these ambitious ideals, other countries have, and we're seeing the consequence of that, it's not new. Michigan has already stuck its toe in the water. A simple perspective of the historical story of the success of Michigan's energy plans just dating back to the '90s. What happened after we adopted a new plan in the '90s? Well, rapidly increasing rates and bigger and bigger profits for utilities. Ten years later or so, the Legislature came and redid our energy plan, created a renewable energy portfolio. What were the results? Higher rates, less production, big strain on transmission, bigger profits for utilities, less reliability.

Fast forward to 2016, the last time we did this. What have been the results since then? Well, low and behold, higher rates, bigger profitability for utilities, less reliability, more strain on transmission. We keep on repeating the same formula, and we are doing the same things. And why? Well, influence in Lansing is certainly a significant part of that. We don't have an honest, free debate about these policies. The influence that is placed within these chambers, particularly to drive the agenda from leadership positions and from caucus positions on both sides of the aisle for decades is preventing the voices of the people from being heard, from the members who come here with nothing in their minds except to represent the needs of their people.

Why do we care what DTE wants? Why do we care what Consumers wants? Why do we care whoever the group from Wisconsin is now? We don't serve them. They're supposed to serve us. That's why we have a Public Service Commission; that's why they have monopoly rights, because they're supposed to serve us, not us serving them. It's incredibly frustrating, and I know members on that side see it too, they fussed over it when we were in the majority. We have got to stop this crazy merry-go-round ride of letting the utilities take us to the cleaners, again and again. When will we enact a policy that forces them to be stingy with dollars, forces them to have a little bit of pain in the pocketbook instead of our ratepayers?

Do you know that my rates have more doubled? And it did it in one month last summer. How is a small dairy farm in the Upper Peninsula supposed to just see a 100 percent jump in rates—in one month time? And what are we doing about it? Oh, great, we're going to put up 260,000 acres of solar panels on farmland. That's brilliant. So when my farming neighbors decide they might as well take the \$3,000 an acre that the government subsidized to some solar company to build solar panels next there, and then the farm next to them is like, Well I don't want to deal with that so I'll take it too. Next thing you know, a farm is totally surrounded by all these solar panels and all the services they depend upon to keep their farm going. The maintenance guys, the dealerships, the other farmers that they need as neighbors—they're all gone. I might as well sell my place too and put solar panels up on it, move to Montana or something.

It's ridiculous to think that this is not going to change the entire landscape of this state and critically impact and cripple your food production, take away 260,000 acres. And you're not going to do it to trees, Can't cut them down, that's the carbon sequestration. We're going to stick it to the forestry industry that we just invested a billion dollars in. No more tree cutting. That's a wilderness area.

The false claims of cheaper energy? Solar is cheaper? Wind is cheaper? I was on the energy committees in the House, I sat through lots of nice dinners with the big utilities and they put their nice charts up there, Hey look, wind is so much cheaper now and it's getting cheaper. Not fair comparisons though. We don't talk about the incentive dollars that they're getting so they can buy the land out from underneath our feet. Hey, you want to complain about the subsidies the other ones get? I'm right there with you. It's not right either. That's why I mentioned it in my earlier speech today. We call it cheaper, because the rates don't go up as rapidly as they might have, meanwhile we take more money out of your pocketbook in taxes and give it back to the utilities some other way. Oh here, have some free lightbulbs. Where are we going to grow our food?

The people of this state need us to focus on three things when it comes to energy. Lower rates, reliability, and not having to compete against government mandates and funding for things like land, work, profitability, access, and freedom in general. This bill does nothing to address those three things. In fact, it works counter to them. Then we couldn't even get some consideration for the Upper Peninsula situation, where our weather—I know I heard one of my colleagues earlier, and he's on my side so I'll get him later, but to say, Hey we've got a beautiful peninsula here. Yeah, well thanks a lot for forgetting about the other one. You're all happy to say its beautiful when you like to come visit.

Meanwhile, one of the other colleagues mentions mining and oh just poof, it just disappeared. Well, it hasn't disappeared. It's still there. It's still the bedrock of what we do there. And this plan just takes the mining company, our big employer, our big ratepayer, our big stability in the whole energy market, and says, Yeah all that work you guys did before, let's see you do it again. No consideration.

The time has come to look seriously at why we're on this merry-go-round of energy. Why our state is such an incredible outlier in the energy picture. Why it is that our big utilities do choice in other states, but when we talk about choice here—oh my goodness, that would be the end of ends. It will never work. And we let them tell us that. We let them spin us again.

We have to try and look at this, not from the perspective of 100 years from now. It's not that I don't care about 100 years from now, I want my grandchildren to have a great place or my great-grandchildren I suppose because I'm old now, but I've got to think about the people who are here right now. My young son, 15 years old, comes to me and says, Dad I want to grow this farm, I want to expand the amount of cows that we have. First thing my dad tells him, How are you going to feed them? Where are we going to get more land? Now here we are, making that even harder. Tell my son, Well sorry son, Well sorry son, that dream is going to have to be out the window unless we move to Canada, eh—which we don't say in the U.P. the way they do in Canada, just so you're sure.

We have to do better if we really are serious about growing this state economically, population wise, industry wise. I mean, after all, all this green energy and EV cars are going to take mining. We've got the copper; we've got the iron, but yet poof, mining is gone apparently. Well yeah, I wonder why. All these policies; all these ideas, regulations, and higher energy costs. Energy costs are the number one reason why a business does or doesn't come. The number one reason. We talk about talent; we talk about education; they can get that, they can build that, but if there's not energy they can't be there. We have to do better than this bill—this group of bills today. I ask for a “no” vote.

Senators Bellino, Lauwers and Nesbitt, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill Nos. 271, 273, and 502 and moved that the statements they made during the discussion of Senate Bill No. 271 be printed as their reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Bellino's statement is as follows:

I rise to oppose these irresponsible bills before us which would radically change this beautiful peninsula's energy policy. As families and communities continue to pay more for virtually everything, we need to give them realistic and effective solutions that will increase energy reliability and reduce costs. This plan doesn't achieve either of these goals. It's more about government mandates and more government control of people's lives and people's property that's going to result in less reliable energy and less money in people's pockets. This plan will allow companies to buy clean energy credits from another state and claim they are saving the planet while passing along these costs to consumers and giving Democrats the illusion that they actually did something good. It's new math, right out of Wall Street's playbook.

The 10 million people who live in Michigan deserve an affordable and reliable energy plan that uses a wide variety of sustainable sources. I urge you to put the people first and reject this irresponsible endeavor that prioritizes Washington and coastal elites and doesn't put the lives and livelihood of Michigan families first.

Senator Lauwers' statement is as follows:

Here we are again, again we are about to vote on significant legislation rushed through this chamber at lightning speed. Again we are about to vote on legislation that will impact the people of Michigan for years and years to come, but was thrown together for a vote in a matter of weeks without considering if they are even feasible. Again we are about to vote on legislation that was pushed forward in a showcase of partisan power with no regard for bipartisan scrutiny or collaboration, and, quite frankly, legislation that was crafted with what seems like no real concern for the effects it will have on the state beyond immediate headlines.

Mr. President, let's be honest, we simply are not there yet. The Michigan Green New Deal presented before us today is a bad deal for the people of this great state. Michigan residents need to—need and deserve reliable and affordable energy, but that is not what they are going to get here today. Instead Democrats have unapologetically put forward a plan to drive up costs and make our energy grid even less reliable.

Many Michiganders are still struggling to pay for groceries and other essentials on the heels of record inflation not experienced in four decades. They simply can't afford the cost of this type of severe and short-sighted policy shift forced down on them from Lansing. Let's not pretend, these over-burdensome mandates will both threaten the stability of our electric grid and drive up the cost that will ultimately be passed down to the consumers. That means higher monthly bills for Michigan families, seniors, and businesses.

And speaking of business, I am concerned this is the reason the Ford Marshall Plant has been paused. Capital is a coward; it doesn't run toward risks rather it runs far from it. This legislation creates uncertainty for Michigan manufacturing about manufacturing being competitive with neighboring states. This is no way to grow our population.

Senator Nesbitt's statement is as follows:

The extreme changes proposed to our state's energy policy in the proposal before us today are the result of a rushed, short-sighted process that valued achieving a partisan talking point, rather than producing an energy policy that can work for the people of Michigan. This pie-in-the-sky notion of being a 100 percent carbon-free energy user has been shown to be untenable, expensive, and dangerous. Imposing such a mandate will only cause the bills of Michigan families to increase and the reliability of our energy grid to falter.

Don't believe me? A sponsor of one of these bills admitted in one of the few, limited hearings that this would, in fact, be more expensive for Michigan's families, seniors, and businesses. The monumental shifts mandated in these bills will require significant infrastructure upgrades, combined with the prohibition on utilizing cheaper, more reliable energy sources.

Who pays for this? Michigan families do. Michigan businesses do. And who do you think are going to bear those costs? That's right, the working families of Michigan who have, under this administration, watched every single bill, fee, and rate increase. Piling on with more expensive utility bills is a recipe for disaster in this state.

You may hear the sponsors or those supporting these bills say, Well sure costs may go up, but think of what we are all receiving in return. We don't have to think about what we'll be receiving in return. We know. We all know because we've seen what has happened to the reliability of the energy grid where politicians attempted these failed green-energy policies, these failed mandates. States like California and Illinois, they begrudgingly brought nuclear plants back online to avoid blackouts and brownouts. Countries like Germany shuttered nuclear power plants over a decade ago so they could rely on wind generation, only to become reliant on Russian natural gas. As we know, this in turn became a major problem when Vladimir Putin decided to invade Ukraine. Now, more than a third of Germany's electricity comes from what? Wait for it, coal-fired power plants. Not the clean coal plants like we see in Monroe, that have spent billions of dollars to invest in and upgrade their plants, and the Wyoming Powder River Basin.

This is what happens when you take an extreme, purely ideologically-based approach to energy policy. One based upon activist instead of reality; one based upon talking points instead of helping Michigan families and small businesses. The environmental activist class, these coastal billionaires that are supporting these elected officials who are pushing this are inevitably forced to correct course and revert back to traditional fuels and nuclear power that will make sure the lights actually come on when you flip the switch.

While taking an all of the above energy approach has proven to be the most affordable, reliable option, it also allows sovereign nations like the United States to control their own destiny by becoming energy independent, without being held hostage by enemies or hostile nations. We are at a point in our history where bridge fuels like natural gas, as well as nuclear, wind, solar, hydro and geothermal can allow our country to keep running without being held hostage by strained global supply chains, political upheavals, or military conflicts.

What do we see from this administration? Trying to close Line 5, a reliable source of energy for Michigan. What do we see from this administration in Washington D.C.? The first decision was to cancel the Keystone XL Pipeline. We've got to the point of being energy independent and these decisions mean something. We saw today that we could have been building this up for American technology, American energy, but there has been rejections of these ideas. Why, then, we would give up that ability by forcing ourselves to adopt an energy policy that is expensive, unworkable, and has a record of failure? It goes against every notion of common sense.

Effective energy policies should transcend political lines, as they have far-reaching consequences on our environment, economy, and the wellbeing of our citizens. They require a comprehensive understanding of diverse perspectives and a willingness to find common ground. And without an open committee process, transparency in drafting bill language, and a failure to include all parties in negotiations, you create a recipe for disaster. We've seen here in Michigan how it can and should be done.

Previous legislatures and governors have provided ample evidence of how to adopt adaptable, reliable state energy policy. Eight years ago, the Republican-led legislature and a Republican Governor put forward and eventually adopted an energy policy that received broad bipartisan support from across business, industry, labor, and political affiliations. That was achieved with month after month of workgroups, more than a dozen committee hearings, and over 100 individuals or organizations providing their input through verbal or written testimony.

The House Committee on Energy and Technology, which I chaired at the time, saw over 30 amendments offered by Republicans and Democrats, with some amendments being adopted from Republicans, some being rejected by Republicans, some amendments being adopted from Democrats, and some from Democrats

being rejected. We did our homework and had everyone at the table, including my friend from the 28th District. Several months later we saw bipartisan approval—two-thirds of Republicans and two-thirds Democrats supporting in both the House and Senate, with the Governor signing them after an almost three and a half year long working product into law.

Unfortunately, this was not the approach of the bill sponsors and the majority this time around. The process has been shrouded in secrecy and has regrettably succumbed to political expediency, rather than being focused on providing affordable, reliable energy to Michigan's families, our manufacturers, and our seniors.

I know that this energy proposal isn't worth the paper it's written on because we all know why it is being done. On the national stage, there is an apparent and confusing rush among far-left politicians with presidential ambitions to try and see who can ruin their state the fastest.

Well, advancing this legislation will certainly give our Governor a boost as she tries to keep up with that smooth-talking socialist with the good hair from California. I just wish it wasn't at the expense of struggling Michigan families and our state's long-term energy future.

Senators McBroom, Nesbitt, Singh, Hoytenga, Bellino, Damoose, Lindsey, Lauwers, Irwin, Geiss and Brinks asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, my amendment seeks to address a significant issue that comes to the Upper Peninsula's energy situation. It's one that I referenced earlier today, where one of our ratepayers is over 65 percent of the energy usage in the Upper Peninsula. This particular issue leaves us in a precarious position when it comes to rate setting and stability in the grid, and was felt so acutely just a few years ago when, through government intervention, our coal-fired plants in the Upper Peninsula were forced out of operation. Until, that is, Midcontinent Independent System Operator determined they can't survive without those operating.

So the users of the Upper Peninsula then were forced to pay extra payments in order to keep those plants operating, even though the government said they needed to be shut down. Those incredible resource payments and costs were felt acutely by all ratepayers in the U.P. and many of us spent a lot of time trying to figure out a solution to the Upper Peninsula's energy situation—which, if you're not aware, represents some of the most, if not the most, expensive energy rates anywhere in the country.

The situation can be very dire for us. This legislation, due to some of the structure it has, puts us in a precarious position again. Most specifically, because due to the situation we had with the closure and the forced payments from MISO, eventually a deal was struck with Cliffs Natural Resources—the iron mining—to build new generation, natural-gas-fired generation, and two different turbine units were set up in the Upper Peninsula that we now depend on. This dropped emissions related to Cliffs Natural Resources by over 86 percent. Yet, if they're not given credit for that significant reduction and instead treated as if that never happened, and that they now have to go forward with additional CO2 reductions in the future, it threatens the very stability of what's been set up in the Upper Peninsula and put us in this precarious position again.

So my amendment seeks to simply allow the consideration of this reduction that Cliffs has already successfully accomplished by building the natural-gas-fired plants to be put in place until the end of the current MISO contract in 2050. I ask for adoption of my amendment.

Senator Nesbitt's first statement is as follows:

Mr. President, nuclear energy provides reliable and affordable energy 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year, day or night, and through all types of weather. Last year, nuclear power accounted for nearly 22 percent of all utility electricity generated in Michigan. That is more than double all the utility generated by wind, solar, biomass, and hydroelectric dams combined. But, this plan before us would require all nuclear power generation to end by 2040. That means closing the Enrico Fermi Nuclear Generating Station in Monroe, the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant in Bridgman, and replacing the over 3,200 megawatts they generate. My amendment would allow nuclear energy to count as renewable under this mandate, recognize that nuclear energy is safe, reliable, and produces no carbon—which is supposedly the whole point of going to a 100 percent clean energy standard. I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

Senator Singh's statement is as follows:

I just wanted to tell my good colleague from Senate District No. 20 that nuclear energy is considered a clean energy source, is in there, it goes past 2040, so perhaps if he needs a little explanation I can go over there and explain how it continues on past 2040.

Senator Hoitenga's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, the people of my district and all of our districts are struggling, struggling to pay for gas, for food, and for housing. The last thing they should be struggling to do is heat their homes this winter. If Democrats insist on passing this huge climate change tax, the very least we can do for struggling families is remove the cost of home heating from our state sales tax. My amendment tie-bars these proposals to Senate Bill No. 61, which does exactly that. I ask for your "yes" vote.

Senator Bellino's statement is as follows:

In the earliest days of this term, I made one of my priorities known when I dropped Senate Bill No. 10. The bill is simple, it prevents municipalities from adopting or enforcing a ban on the use of natural gas or the installation of natural gas infrastructure. Today, this is still one of my priorities. This is why I am offering an amendment to tie-bar my bill—Senate Bill No. 10—to Senate Bill No. 271. Natural gas is a vital part of our electric generation and home heating mix in Michigan, and our citizens should not be deprived of it by their municipalities. As we head into the winter months, it is vital that Michigan residents aren't left out in the cold by these energy policies pushed by coastal elitists. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Senator Damoose's statement is as follows:

In our committee meetings on this bill, not one person could answer one question about what we actually get from this bill. Not one person was able to point to any tangible outcome we could expect by Michigan singlehandedly implementing this bill. Not one person could answer the question about how the global climate would be impacted, even if we took the entire state of Michigan out of the worldwide energy equation entirely by not producing or consuming any energy. Even then, nobody could point to any specific positive outcomes. But one thing we do know is that this package will be very costly for our economy, for our businesses, and mostly for our families.

The bill before us makes a lot of lofty promises, but the only thing Michigan residents can be sure of is that they will deliver higher rates. Michigan already pays some of the highest energy rates in the nation, and the rates without question will go even higher if these bills become law. We should at least be honest with our citizens on what they can expect, especially since this comes at a time when they have already been battered by record inflation. Gas prices remain high and they could spike even further due to world events; food prices continue to make it difficult for many people to feed their families; interest rates are the highest we've seen in decades, buying a home or a car right now is just plain off the table for most Michigan families. How hard do we want to make things for the people we represent?

Mr. President, my amendment is simple. If energy rates in our state exceed the rate of inflation, the mandates in these bills would be halted. In these trying times, I ask for support of my amendment to make sure these bills aren't just another gigantic tax hike on the hard-working, weary Michiganders we represent.

Senator Lindsey's first statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I can't recall finding myself on the same page as the Michigan Environmental Council, the League of Conservation Voters, and my colleague from Washtenaw County, but there's a first time for everything. If the goal of this Green New Deal clean energy mandate is really to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, there is a glaring emission in these bills that must be corrected. This legislation continues to artificially limit the use of rooftop solar as an energy source. Some of my Democratic colleagues have advocated for exactly what this amendment does, eliminate the arbitrary cap on distributed generation from rooftop solar. My amendment would allow private property owners to reduce their dependence on nonrenewable energy sources by producing their own clean energy through rooftop solar. I ask for a "yes" vote on this amendment and support of personal property rights.

Senator Lindsey's second statement is as follows:

Mr. President, there is a lot not to like with this Green New Deal, like much higher rates and an even less reliable grid. But one thing that can't be denied, the renewable energy mandate in these bills will create jobs. The catch is that they will be created in China. Worldwide, China makes 97 percent of the silicon wafers that go into solar panels, and more than three-quarters of the solar panels themselves. A state law mandating the use of millions more solar panels will mean billions of dollars going from Michigan ratepayers to corporations in China. Just imagine what those in power in China must think watching this. They're laughing all the way to the bank. Billions more will pour into their coffers while they continue to pollute at a rate that dwarfs the minuscule impact Michigan has on the climate.

Mr. President, our Governor claims she is focused on Making it in Michigan. One of my colleagues across the aisle recently introduced economic development bills she is calling the Make it in Michigan plan. But, right now, these energy bills read like the Build it in Beijing plan. I ask for a "yes" vote on my amendment to require that all the renewable infrastructure mandated by these bills be made right here in America.

Senator Nesbitt's second statement is as follows:

Mr. President, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle appear to be in a rush to pass this energy proposal. Some believe their rushed attempt is so Democratic majorities can adjourn sine die historically early and start their holiday break. However, the majority will claim it is so the bipartisan earned income tax credit legislation that passed earlier this year can be implemented quicker. In fact, one of our colleagues just now brought up this tax relief for working poor. Well, good news. Here is his opportunity to ensure this gets implemented quickly. In fact as I've said before, we on this side are ready to support giving the earned income tax credit bill—currently in our chamber, House Bill No. 4002—immediate effect tonight, today, let's do it. By doing this, the Democratic-controlled Legislature won't have to adjourn sine die historically early and it will give us and our colleagues in the House more time this year to vet these energy bills rather than ramming them through without the opportunity to read them. It's a win-win for everyone. I look forward to my colleagues' support on this amendment.

Senator Lauwers' first statement is as follows:

Mr. President, Michigan families have seen grocery bills and gas prices increase with no relief. They've seen inflation and mortgage rates become unpredictable. The last thing they need is to watch their utility bills skyrocket as a result of rushed attempts to California our state's energy policy. While we've been told that rates will remain largely unchanged or possibly even go down, I'd simply ask the majority put their money where their mouth is on this one. My amendment would suspend this act should the rates of utility customers increase ten percent upon implementation of the new policies contained in this package. Michigan families are already struggling. Let's not have this half-baked proposal punish them more.

Senator Lauwers' second statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I respectfully request my colleagues to refer to my previous commentary on the amendment to stall these disastrous policies once they increase utility rates of Michigan families by ten percent. While ten percent may not seem to be much to some, to the families of Michigan struggling under Bidenomics it can be the difference between making ends meet or making tough decisions. That's why I'm hoping my colleagues can support this amendment which would suspend the new untested energy policies if utility rates increase by 20 percent. I hate to assume, Mr. President, but I think we all can agree that a 20 percent increase in our energy bills would warrant rethinking these devastating policies. That's why I'm asking my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on this amendment.

Senator Lauwers' third statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I know when it comes to certain topics the members of my caucus and those who make up the caucus of my colleagues across the aisle can disagree, but when it comes to the energy bills of Michigan families trying to keep their lights on and homes warm, I think I found an amendment on which we surely all can agree. My amendment would simply suspend these new policies should rates increase by 30 percent upon implementation. Mr. President, it appears to me that my colleagues disagreed with me when I said a rate increase of ten percent or 20 percent as a result of this far-left leaning Green New Deal is too much. I shudder to think that they would hold that same opinion if rates on Michigan families increased by 30 percent. I ask for a "yes" vote on my amendment.

Senator Nesbitt's third statement is as follows:

Mr. President, we have heard time and time again, this Governor and members of the majority support providing relief to the hardworking taxpayers and families and seniors of the state of Michigan. Unfortunately, their track record tells a different story. Vetoing the suspension of the gas tax; scheming with the Attorney General to raise income taxes next year on all working families and working seniors; proposing a billion and a half dollar tax increase on small businesses, workers, and nonprofits, all while doling out hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayer money to multinational corporations. They've even voted time and time again against providing income tax exemptions to all seniors as well as opposing a \$500 per child tax credit to help struggling Michigan families.

That's why I feel it's necessary to offer this amendment which will suspend this act should the Michigan Public Service Commission determine that the average utility rate across the state is not reduced. By adopting this amendment, the ratepayers of this state will not be financially punished simply because the talking points of those pushing this California-style energy policy fail to come to fruition.

Senator Nesbitt's fourth statement is as follows:

Mr. President, we just need to be honest with the people of the state of Michigan regarding what is going on in these bills. I know we don't even have time to read them because they're so rushed to get them through.

They had a 60-minute committee meeting, the ink was still wet on the actual substitutes, and unfortunately members of the Senate Energy Committee and members of this body as a whole have had almost no time to digest these expensive, ill-advised changes being pushed through via legislation. Therefore at the very least, we should give the act a proper name in order to alert the public of what is to come. My amendment is very simple. It will simply rename this legislation as the Michigan Unreliable and Unaffordable Energy Act. I hope I can count on my colleagues' support for this truth-revealing amendment.

Senator Irwin's statement is as follows:

I just want to take a moment to note the irony that a member who was just pushing for more expensive power is now complaining about how cheap solar energy has become. I want to let my colleagues know it's not the 1990s anymore. Look up the levelized cost of energy. Nuclear energy is very, very expensive; solar energy is cheap. This would be a very poor name for this bill because it would be incredibly inaccurate and stuck in the 1990s. I'll be voting to oppose.

Senator Geiss' statement is as follows:

I rise in support of Senate Bill No. 271, as it puts us on a path toward a clean energy future, even better than what was done on December 15, 2016; in fact, some of us in here were here then, which is the last time the Michigan Legislature opened our energy policy, a bill authored by a currently-serving member. But it's time for a significant update.

By establishing a clean energy standard, removing or reducing reliance on fossil fuels, creating a renewable energy credit portfolio standard, a clean energy portfolio standard providing for alternative electric providers, co-ops, municipally-owned clean energy portfolios, raising the distributed generation cap, creating off ramps as inevitable changes in technology occur, and more, all while ensuring that labor is part of our clean energy future and that by centering and protecting historically marginalized and negatively impacted communities is also central to our clean energy future. There seems to be a lot of confusion between climate change and weather, but we don't have time to go into that today. All the scientific evidence that we must do something now, that we must embark on these changes now, is before us.

This legislation marks the beginning of taking bold action to address this urgent crisis, one that is a clear and present danger, and failure to tackle it meaningfully cannot be an option. In fact, the cost of doing nothing is dire and detrimental to the health and welfare of our state and her people. Clean energy legislation is crucial in combating the climate crisis, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and transition to renewable energy sources. Folks, there is no planet B and we must do what we must to stem the damage we have inflicted upon Mother Earth, our only home, and repair her for the next generation and the ones after that and as we secure for them the tools to continue moving forward toward a better, cleaner, greener, safer, healthier tomorrow.

I offer deep gratitude to Senators Singh and Shink for their tireless work on this package and the other clean energy bills we've heard today, and for the input of the stakeholders who know that it is incumbent upon us to secure a clean energy future that ensures marginalized communities are not continually disproportionately affected by environmental hazards, and that they have equal access to clean resources. This isn't just about the business community or about utilities, this is about our planet that we live on together. For our planet, our state, our communities, our people, I urge that we embark upon this clean energy future by voting "yes" on Senate Bill No. 271.

Senator Brinks' statement is as follows:

Clean energy, affordable and reliable energy, bold action on climate change—our constituents have been demanding this for years and the urgency has only grown. Today we are taking the first key steps to deliver on this promise. Despite all the doom and gloom from the other party, this is a good day, an optimistic day, and I am proud of the work we have done. The best legislation reflects a range of voices and I am extremely proud of how many people were at the table to put together these bills that will set Michigan on a path to a more sustainable future. I am grateful to everyone who provided valuable perspectives on how to increase energy affordability, reliability, and sustainability. Despite the folks across the aisle asserting they have only had mere minutes to consider this policy—hundreds of hours of work, deliberation, debate, and good-faith negotiations have brought us to this point.

Specifically, I would like to thank the Senators from the 28th, 14th, and the 1st districts. I would also like to thank the chairman from the 19th District and everyone who participated in this lengthy and thorough process. We must have the courage to face the challenges of today and to do our best to prepare for the challenges of tomorrow. The bottom line is that these bills aim to make energy more affordable, our grid more reliable, and our state cleaner and a more sustainable place to live while improving equity and health. Thank you, Mr. President, and I urge my colleagues to join me and vote "yes" on these bills.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of  
**Introduction and Referral of Bills**

Senators Hoitenga, Hauck, McBroom and Cherry introduced

**Senate Bill No. 619, entitled**

A bill to amend 2000 PA 146, entitled “Obsolete property rehabilitation act,” by amending sections 2 and 16 (MCL 125.2782 and 125.2796), section 2 as amended by 2006 PA 70 and section 16 as amended by 2016 PA 222.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Economic and Community Development.

Senators McBroom, Hoitenga, Bellino and Lindsey introduced

**Senate Bill No. 620, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” (MCL 333.1101 to 333.25211) by adding section 2670.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Senators McBroom, Hoitenga, Bellino and Lindsey introduced

**Senate Bill No. 621, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 13k (MCL 777.13k), as amended by 2018 PA 587.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Senators Lindsey, Lauwers and Bellino introduced

**Senate Bill No. 622, entitled**

A bill to make, supplement, and adjust appropriations for various state departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024; to provide for certain conditions on appropriations; and to provide for the expenditure of the appropriations.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Senators Hoitenga and Bellino introduced

**Senate Bill No. 623, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” (MCL 333.1101 to 333.25211) by adding section 17773.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Senators Bellino, Hoitenga, Lindsey, Runestad and Theis introduced

**Senate Bill No. 624, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 9206 and 9227 (MCL 333.9206 and 333.9227), section 9206 as amended by 2023 PA 145 and section 9227 as amended by 2006 PA 91.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

### **Statements**

Senators Bellino, Irwin, McBroom and Runestad asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Bellino’s statement is as follows:

Channeling a former State Senator, I’d like to start with a quote: “The lack of transparency results in distrust and a deep sense of insecurity.” The Dalai Lama.

While House Democrats haven't held a hearing on a financial transparency plan yet, we've recently read about two—not one, but two—Democratic State Representatives who have, at the very least, an appearance of conflicts of interest regarding their so-called clean energy bills. It turns out the wife of a House Democrat lobbies for an Illinois-based solar company. That member sponsored legislation to strip away local control on permitting wind and solar facilities and green energy storage projects from local governments and give it to the Michigan Public Service Commission.

Let's see—let's strip away local control and let's give everybody a larger chance to make a lot of money on this project. I'd say it's nice work if you can get it, and you can get it if you vote the correct way. This is the second House lobbyist to be connected to clean energy scandals. Previously, the majority vice chair of the House Energy Committee confirmed that his sister, and more importantly, his campaign manager works for a multi-client lobbying firm focusing on clean energy. That member was also found to have maintained ownership of a now-dormant solar installation company.

As we discuss our green energy future, we owe it to the people of Michigan to be upfront and honest about possible conflicts of interest. And I would say that these are conflicts of interest.

Senator Irwin's statement is as follows:

I've heard a lot of passionate speeches this evening. I just want to remind my colleagues that here in Michigan, we have some of the most-dirty, most-unreliable, and most-expensive power in the country. That's because today we're sitting here after 40 years of continuous conservative leadership in this chamber. Forty years of catering to the fossil fuel industry. Forty years of catering to the utilities that have raised residential rates in the last ten years based on bills that some of the people in this room voted for back when they were in the House. All this high-minded talk and rhetoric about concern for low-income people falls a little short when we're sitting here looking at the dirtiest, least-reliable and most-expensive power in the region, and there are people who care about making this state better for businesses and better for our residents.

We have a chance to invest in homegrown clean energy that is cheaper, and we've got folks who want to hold us back. I didn't want to let this day pass without pointing out that there's one thing I agree with respect to the passion I heard from the other side of the aisle, and that's that our power is dirty, unreliable, and expensive, and it's because this place has been too beholden to the fossil fuel industry for too long. We finally have a chance to make a break, ditch those shackles, and give our citizens the freedom and opportunity to have homegrown energy that doesn't cause asthma, that doesn't cause cancer, that doesn't cause climate change, and that we control right here in Michigan. Continuing to rely on these fossil fuel companies, continuing to shackle our citizens to those companies' corporate profits on Wall Street is what got us to this point.

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I guess I could take some of that criticism a little more seriously if something in the legislation actually did something about those big companies that we've been so beholden to. I mentioned that in my "no" vote explanation and I particularly just want to bring to the floor again. Why do we care what they think? Why didn't the majority bring these bills up until they had cards that said the utilities were no longer in opposition? They're doing the same thing and they expect a different result now that it's suddenly going to get better? Cleaner? Cheaper? I don't think so.

Senator Runestad's statement is as follows:

I appreciate my colleague's comments from the other side of the aisle about the ongoing problems with the cost of energy and the collusion, I think, that has happened oftentimes with the Legislature and the utilities. So, we had an opportunity today to rectify that. I had amendments that would have made the Public Service Commission be appointed on a staggered six-year term.

When I go and talk to people in my district about how things operate, I ask them, How many of you know any of the three board members of the Public Service Commission? I have never talked to a person, out of thousands, that know who that is. They know what they do and they don't like what they are doing. When I say we have an opportunity to elect these members so they would have to come in front of you instead of hiding out in an office somewhere, appointed by a Governor with absolutely no relationship to you and your problems; they say, So we can make this so we can vote and these people can come in and talk to us? Absolutely. But that was killed today by the members on the other side.

That transparency, that ability of the people here in the state of Michigan to have a voice with the Public Service Commission was killed today. They also had an opportunity, when I talked to people, about the absolute lack of transparency of the boatload of \$58 million the utilities have in a slush fund to corrupt this entire chamber and the other chamber. When I talk to them about that and say, Oh, the utilities say that money comes from a few of our ratepayers; you're hell right it does. It comes from the ratepayers because

those ratepayers are getting a special deal, a sweetheart deal that nobody else gets and that money can come funneling right back into that slush fund and the other side had an opportunity today to do the right thing and to vote so we get transparency on that money, and it was killed today. Then we get lectured about doing the right thing? It is outrageous. We had an opportunity today to do the right things and the Democrats destroyed the opportunity.

**Announcements of Printing and Enrollment**

The Secretary announced that the following House bills were received in the Senate and filed on Wednesday, October 25:

**House Bill Nos. 4085 4086 4276 4346 4416 4417 4418 4419 4865**

The Secretary announced that the following bills were printed and filed on Wednesday, October 25, and are available on the Michigan Legislature website:

**Senate Bill Nos. 617 618**

**House Bill Nos. 5223 5224 5225 5226 5227 5228 5229 5230 5231 5232 5233 5234 5235  
5236 5237 5238 5239 5240 5241 5242 5243 5244 5245 5246 5247 5248  
5249 5250 5251 5252 5253 5254 5255 5256 5257 5258**

**Committee Reports**

The Committee on Oversight reported

**Senate Bill No. 493, entitled**

A bill to amend 1975 PA 46, entitled “An act to create the office of the legislative corrections ombudsman; to prescribe the powers and duties of the office, the ombudsman, the legislative council, and the department of corrections; and to provide remedies from administrative acts,” by amending the title and sections 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 (MCL 4.351, 4.352, 4.354, 4.355, 4.356, 4.357, 4.358, 4.359, 4.360, 4.361, 4.362, 4.363, and 4.364), sections 1, 6, 7, and 10 as amended by 1998 PA 318, sections 4, 5, 8, 9, and 13 as amended by 2018 PA 571, section 11 as amended by 1995 PA 197, and section 12 as amended by 1982 PA 170.

With the recommendation that the substitute (S-1) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

Sam Singh  
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Singh, McMorrow, Geiss, Polehanki and McBroom

Nays: None

The bill and the substitute recommended by the committee were referred to the Committee of the Whole.

**COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT**

The Committee on Oversight submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, October 25, 2023, at 8:30 a.m., Room 1200, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators Singh (C), McMorrow, Geiss, Polehanki, McBroom and Lindsey

The Committee on Economic and Community Development reported

**Senate Bill No. 559, entitled**

A bill to amend 1984 PA 270, entitled “Michigan strategic fund act,” by amending sections 5, 9, 88s, and 88t (MCL 125.2005, 125.2009, 125.2088s, and 125.2088t), section 5 as amended by 2023 PA 24, section 9 as amended and section 88s as added by 2021 PA 136, and section 88t as added by 2021 PA 134, and by adding sections 88u and 88v.

With the recommendation that the substitute (S-2) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

Mallory McMorrow  
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators McMorrow, Cavanagh, Polehanki, Cherry, McDonald Rivet, Moss and Geiss

Nays: Senator Lindsey

The bill and the substitute recommended by the committee were referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Economic and Community Development reported

**Senate Bill No. 560, entitled**

A bill to amend 1921 PA 2, entitled “An act to promote the efficiency of the government of the state, to create a state administrative board, to define the powers and duties thereof, to provide for the transfer to said board of powers and duties now vested by law in other boards, commissions, departments and officers of the state, and for the abolishing of certain of the boards, commissions, departments and offices, whose powers and duties are hereby transferred,” by amending section 3 (MCL 17.3), as amended by 2021 PA 143.

With the recommendation that the bill pass.

Mallory McMorrow  
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators McMorrow, Cavanagh, Polehanki, Cherry, McDonald Rivet, Moss and Geiss

Nays: Senator Lindsey

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Economic and Community Development reported

**Senate Bill No. 561, entitled**

A bill to amend 2018 PA 540, entitled “Economic development incentive evaluation act,” by amending section 3 (MCL 18.1753).

With the recommendation that the bill pass.

Mallory McMorrow  
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators McMorrow, Cavanagh, Polehanki, Cherry, McDonald Rivet, Moss and Geiss

Nays: Senator Lindsey

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Economic and Community Development reported

**Senate Bill No. 562, entitled**

A bill to amend 2000 PA 489, entitled “Michigan trust fund act,” by amending sections 2 and 4 (MCL 12.252 and 12.254), section 2 as amended by 2022 PA 83 and section 4 as added by 2021 PA 137.

With the recommendation that the substitute (S-1) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

Mallory McMorrow  
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators McMorrow, Cavanagh, Polehanki, Cherry, McDonald Rivet, Moss and Geiss

Nays: Senator Lindsey

The bill and the substitute recommended by the committee were referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Economic and Community Development reported

**Senate Bill No. 569, entitled**

A bill to amend 1967 PA 281, entitled “Income tax act of 1967,” by amending section 695 (MCL 206.695), as amended by 2023 PA 4.

With the recommendation that the bill pass.

Mallory McMorrow  
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators McMorrow, Cavanagh, Polehanki, Cherry, McDonald Rivet, Moss and Geiss

Nays: Senator Lindsey

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Economic and Community Development reported

**Senate Bill No. 579, entitled**

A bill to amend 1984 PA 270, entitled “Michigan strategic fund act,” by amending sections 9, 90g, and 90h (MCL 125.2009, 125.2090g, and 125.2090h), section 9 as amended by 2021 PA 136 and sections 90g and 90h as added by 2017 PA 109.

With the recommendation that the substitute (S-1) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

Mallory McMorrow  
Chairperson

## To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators McMorrow, Cavanagh, Polehanki, Cherry, McDonald Rivet, Moss and Geiss

Nays: Senators Victory, Lindsey and Webber

The bill and the substitute recommended by the committee were referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Economic and Community Development reported

**Senate Bill No. 580, entitled**

A bill to amend 1984 PA 270, entitled "Michigan strategic fund act," by amending sections 90i and 90j (MCL 125.2090i and 125.2090j), as added by 2017 PA 109.

With the recommendation that the substitute (S-1) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

Mallory McMorrow

Chairperson

## To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators McMorrow, Cavanagh, Polehanki, Cherry, McDonald Rivet, Moss and Geiss

Nays: Senators Victory, Lindsey and Webber

The bill and the substitute recommended by the committee were referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Economic and Community Development reported

**Senate Bill No. 581, entitled**

A bill to amend 1967 PA 281, entitled "Income tax act of 1967," by amending sections 51f and 711 (MCL 206.51f and 206.711), section 51f as added by 2017 PA 110 and section 711 as amended by 2018 PA 118.

With the recommendation that the substitute (S-1) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

Mallory McMorrow

Chairperson

## To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators McMorrow, Cavanagh, Polehanki, Cherry, McDonald Rivet, Moss and Geiss

Nays: Senators Victory, Lindsey and Webber

The bill and the substitute recommended by the committee were referred to the Committee of the Whole.

## COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Economic and Community Development submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, October 25, 2023, at 12:00 noon, Room 1100, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators McMorrow (C), Cavanagh, Polehanki, Cherry, McDonald Rivet, Moss, Geiss, Victory, Lindsey and Webber

The Committee on Energy and Environment reported

**Senate Bill No. 271, entitled**

A bill to amend 2008 PA 295, entitled "Clean and renewable energy and energy waste reduction act," by amending sections 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 22, 28, 45, 47, and 49 (MCL 460.1003, 460.1005, 460.1007, 460.1009, 460.1011, 460.1022, 460.1028, 460.1045, 460.1047, and 460.1049), sections 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 45, 47, and 49 as amended and sections 22 and 28 as added by 2016 PA 342, and by adding sections 32 and 53.

With the recommendation that the substitute (S-2) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

Sean McCann

Chairperson

## To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators McCann, McDonald Rivet, Singh, Bayer, Shink, Hertel, Camilleri, Chang and Polehanki

Nays: Senators Lauwers, Damoose, Outman, Hauck and Bellino

The bill and the substitute recommended by the committee were referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Energy and Environment reported

**Senate Bill No. 273, entitled**

A bill to amend 2008 PA 295, entitled "Clean and renewable energy and energy waste reduction act," by amending sections 73, 75, 77, and 78 (MCL 460.1073, 460.1075, 460.1077, and 460.1078), sections 73, 75, and 77 as amended and section 78 as added by 2016 PA 342.

With the recommendation that the substitute (S-2) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

Sean McCann

Chairperson

**To Report Out:**

Yeas: Senators McCann, McDonald Rivet, Singh, Bayer, Shink, Hertel, Camilleri, Chang and Polehanki

Nays: Senators Lauwers, Damoose, Outman, Hauck and Bellino

The bill and the substitute recommended by the committee were referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Energy and Environment reported

**Senate Bill No. 502, entitled**

A bill to amend 1939 PA 3, entitled "An act to provide for the regulation and control of public and certain private utilities and other services affected with a public interest within this state; to provide for alternative energy suppliers; to provide for licensing; to include municipally owned utilities and other providers of energy under certain provisions of this act; to create a public service commission and to prescribe and define its powers and duties; to abolish the Michigan public utilities commission and to confer the powers and duties vested by law on the public service commission; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to provide for the continuance, transfer, and completion of certain matters and proceedings; to abolish automatic adjustment clauses; to prohibit certain rate increases without notice and hearing; to qualify residential energy conservation programs permitted under state law for certain federal exemption; to create a fund; to encourage the utilization of resource recovery facilities; to prohibit certain acts and practices of providers of energy; to allow for the securitization of stranded costs; to reduce rates; to provide for appeals; to provide appropriations; to declare the effect and purpose of this act; to prescribe remedies and penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts," by amending sections 6, 6a, 6m, 6t, and 11 (MCL 460.6, 460.6a, 460.6m, 460.6t, and 460.11), section 6 as amended by 2005 PA 190 and sections 6a, 6m, and 11 as amended and section 6t as added by 2016 PA 341, and by adding section 6aa.

With the recommendation that the substitute (S-4) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

Sean McCann

Chairperson

**To Report Out:**

Yeas: Senators McCann, McDonald Rivet, Bayer, Shink, Hertel, Camilleri, Chang and Polehanki

Nays: Senators Lauwers, Damoose, Outman, Hauck and Bellino

The bill and the substitute recommended by the committee were referred to the Committee of the Whole.

**COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT**

The Committee on Energy and Environment submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, October 25, 2023, at 1:00 p.m., Room 403, 4th Floor, Capitol Building

Present: Senators McCann (C), McDonald Rivet, Singh, Bayer, Shink, Hertel, Camilleri, Chang, Polehanki, Lauwers, Damoose, Outman, Hauck and Bellino

Senator Singh moved that the Senate adjourn.

The motion prevailed, the time being 7:32 p.m.

The President pro tempore, Senator Moss, declared the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, October 31, 2023, at 10:00 a.m.

DANIEL OBERLIN

Secretary of the Senate

