

**PA13-58**

SB0564

Environment	33-45, 61-62	15
House	4788-4791	4
Senate	1356-1360, 1509-1511	8
		<b>27</b>

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**ENVIRONMENT  
PART 1  
1 – 305**

**2013  
INDEX**

HENRY TALMAGE: I think, as in a lot of things, progress is made, materials change, procedures change, that's -- I think the key here is you need to engage and understand from the commissioner of Agriculture who's charged with managing this to listen to them as to what the challenges are.

Do I think that there should be a line in the sand that says nothing changes? No. That's not what we're saying, but what we are saying that you have to reflect and listen to those who are charged with managing this and understand the limitations that come in to play. So, you know, we're not saying we don't think that bamboo stakes should ever be transitioned away from, maybe there is a better way, but a ban of that without giving the commissioner the opportunity to choose that this is the right option in certain instances just seems like kind of a maybe too much without all of that information.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you, sir.

Any further questions?

Thank you. We appreciate your time.

Neil Brown.

Good morning.

NEIL BROWN: Good morning, Madam Chair, members, ranking members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of Raised Bill Number 564.

I am Neil Brown, manager of Public Affairs for PSG Power Connecticut, which owns and operates the Bridgeport Harbor Generating Station.

That unit is now the only coal-fired unit

in Connecticut and is, therefore, the only plant subject to mercury emissions requirements established by the Legislature in 2003.

This was the first legislation of its kind in the nation, and I'm proud to say the company worked with the committee and the Connecticut DEEP and environmental advocates to help draft the legislation, and we campaigned for its enactment.

Subsequent to the legislation we invested about \$150 million to install mercury emissions controls at the station. These controls have been operating since 2008, and they have been consistently reducing mercury and particulate emissions in the 90 to 95 percent range, which meets or exceeds requirements.

In addition to reducing mercury, we also have reduced nitrogen oxide emissions by 67 percent and sulfur dioxide emissions by 76 percent and an important component on how we do this is by using a low sulfur coal and use of this type of coal will continue going forward.

The bill would adjust the frequency of emissions fact testing from quarterly to annually once an affected unit demonstrates compliance after eight consecutive quarterly tests.

We view this as a common-sense measure that better reflects how we operate the station. It would avoid the probability of having to start up the unit and create emissions just for the purpose of performing a test. And annual stack testing is consistent with requirements for Connecticut's trash-to-energy facilities and the federal mercury emissions regulations for certain coal-fired power plants. We think it makes sense, and we support its enactment.

I'd be happy to answer any questions.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you, Neil.

Just to comment, just for clarification purposes, would you please elaborate on this bill, as its proposed, does not eliminate the testing? It merely adjusts the testing. Correct?

NEIL BROWN: That is absolutely correct. Right now, the requirement is for performing a test once a quarter and the reality is that the station -- the operating parameters have changed over time. An example, last year, I think it ran only on 31 days so this would adjust the testing schedule from quarterly to annually once that there's demonstration that the requirements are being met.

REP. GENTILE: And can you give us an idea as to how much it actually costs to do one of these tests?

NEIL BROWN: With me is Bob Silvestri. He's our chief environmental engineer. I think he can answer that question.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you, Bob.

BOB SILVESTRI: Good morning and sorry for musical chairs.

The test itself probably runs in the range of 15 to 20,000 dollars for the testing company to do the work.

The concern also, as Mr. Brown has mentioned, you have a start-up issue that is ISO New England doesn't want us, we have to force the

unit on. Start-up costs are probably in the range of \$200,000 to get the unit online.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you.

Any questions?

Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I was actually one of the legislators that worked on this when we cleaned up the Sooty Six and then went to the mercury emissions so I am, you know, very familiar with the mercury emissions and with the fact that they are a pernicious pollutant and that we are very concerned about them and children, growing children, et cetera.

I just want to be sure that this has come about -- I'm assuming it's coming about as an efficiency matter and that there has never been a time -- sorry -- there's never been a time that the number has been in a point where there is concern? There was -- every single test that we've ever done, since we passed this, has been in the acceptable range?

BOB SILVESTRI: That is correct. We have 17 quarters under our belt. Just completed this past quarter's testing last week. All of the numbers have been consistently below the 0.6 standard that we established back in 2002.

REP. URBAN: I appreciate the feedback, and I will be listening to be sure because mercury is a very big worry for children as well as where this particular plant is located. We want to be sure.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you.

Any further questions?

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Is there testing required now under the federal standards, the Clean Air Act or otherwise?

BOB SILVESTRI: We've actually been ahead of the curve in Connecticut with the law we passed a number of years ago that we came into compliance of the law in 2008.

The federal Mercury and Toxic Standard, or what I like to refer to as MATS, does not come into effect until 2015. The provisions associated with that, that if you're a low-emitting unit, meaning that you're a certain number of degrees, if you will, below the standard the EPA proposes, you have to do testing once a year. And we're at that number.

The federal standard is, actually, twice what Connecticut established so even though it's going to take seven years for everybody to catch up to us, they're still at a higher number than we've been at since 2008. So it's a once-a-year testing, to answer your question.

REP. SHABAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

REP. GENTILE: Representative Miner.

REP. MINER: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

And so I think I understand from the prior speaker that this plant operated for 31 days last year?

BOB SILVESTRI: That is correct.

REP. MINER: And this legislation would not be tied to the days of operation in any way. It would be tied to a failure so presumably if it went to 38 days next year or this year, it would be a failure-to-comply test that would prompt us to go back to the, I guess, it's quarterly testing, not -- not more use?

BOB SILVESTRI: The failure would be if you're above the standard.

REP. MINER: Correct.

BOB SILVESTRI: Not related to days of operation. What is driving this, Representative, is in October, we were asked by ISO New England to come online just before Hurricane Sandy and we did. And we operated burning coal just for two days before the storm surge would come in and possibly take out the substation that we would feed to so we had to come offline. We had no call from ISO further during the quarter so we only had the two days of operation but because we burned coal, and you couldn't send people up on the stack to do testing with an impending hurricane, we were obligated to go ahead and do stack testing for the quarter. We forced the unit on -- I believe it was December 21st just to do the testing to comply with the law. And the scenario is, well, we're creating emissions just to do the test.

So that's why we're looking at, could we cut it back to an annual basis, having a consistently good track record; and then if there were any upsets or anything along the line, we can go back and revisit that and do more.

REP. SHABAN: Thank you.

REP. GENTILE: And just for my own purposes, I think we have some other questions here, as well, too.

This bill also includes a provision that should you not meet the standards or be in compliance, you can go back to the quarterly testing. Correct?

BOB SILVESTRI: Absolutely.

REP. GENTILE: So there is that protection in there?

BOB SILVESTRI: Absolutely.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you.

And with that, Representative Willis followed by Representative Shaban.

REP. WILLIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Actually, that was one part of my question was would there be a trigger. And so that's good to hear.

But I need to understand, when you say start-up cost of \$200,000. Could you tell me? I'm not clear what that is for, that investment.

BOB SILVESTRI: Turning the unit on is what I mean by startup.

ISO New England, of course, controls the generation in the region. And if electricity is needed, they'll call different units to come on.

In the situation we had back in December where we forced the unit on, ISO didn't want us. There was already a surplus of electricity so

it was at our expense rather than from reimbursement from ISO to start the unit to go online to do the testing. The start-up costs are really associated with fuel and personnel and getting the unit online for testing.

REP. WILLIS: So you wouldn't be called upon to do that other than -- so the \$200,000 has to take place every time you test quarterly?

BOB SILVESTRI: If we have to force the unit on, that is correct.

REP. WILLIS: And is that what has been happening thus far?

BOB SILVESTRI: Recently, yeah, with only 31 days involved with last year, for an example, you're looking at two days to get the unit just for testing. The first day you're really starting it up, you get it up to full load and you do your test. So you could easily say that eight of those days were associated with testing, and the other ones were making megawatts for ISO.

It's different from what we had when we originally worked with the committee back in 2002 with the bill, but we were a base-loaded unit. We ran 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. You go ahead and test it any time you want. Because the frequency of operations has reduced because of market conditions, we haven't run that much.

REP. WILLIS: Thank you. And the testing -- each time you test, there's an additional -- so right now you're paying between 15 and 20,000 dollars for that test to be analyzed?

BOB SILVESTRI: For the testers to come in and for personnel to go up onto the stacks, use their

equipment, take samples, and then have the samples analyzed, that's correct.

REP. WILLIS: So you'd only have to pay that if it was annual. You'd only pay the one-time expense, as opposed to three additional ones that you now do.

BOB SILVESTRI: That is correct, also, yes.

REP. WILLIS: Thank you.

I do want to was say, I also, like Representative Urban, was a part of the Sooty Six Initiative, and I want to thank you for way back then for standing up with us to see that that was done. So we appreciate that, and it's good to hear that you've had a good record all of these years. Thank you very much.

BOB SILVESTRI: Thank you.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you, Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I thought of a follow-up. If this bill were to pass and you were able to test once a year, as opposed to four times a year, would that have any impact on your rate structure or rates in general?

BOB SILVESTRI: Not that I can see.

REP. SHABAN: What are we looking at? I mean, you're saving, what, a million bucks, more or less?

BOB SILVESTRI: For -- again, if it's all based on us forcing the unit on. If you did it four times a year, you're \$800,000, roughly, plus you don't have an excess amount of emissions

going into the air that you really don't need at this point just for forcing the unit on for testing.

REP. SHABAN: Last question, more of a curiosity. How often does ISO have you guys fire up as backup? I know they have 30 minutes, 60 minutes, two-day backup guys in the queue. How often do they do that for your unit?

BOB SILVESTRI: If I understand your question correctly, if ISO called, how soon could we be online is that the question?

REP. SHABAN: No. I'm curious how often do you guys fire up to be a backup capacity?

BOB SILVESTRI: I don't have that data. I could mention that we were on right around the holidays running into January 3rd this year. We got the call from ISO January 17th for this cold spell that we're on. We're still operating right now, probably at a reduced load with the warmer temperatures for today projected into tomorrow. But I would think that once the temperatures start going back up again next week then ISO will bring us off. So I can tell this it's been in two times in the past month that they've called. I don't have the history to answer the rest of your question, though.

REP. SHABAN: Related to that, when ISO does, like before Sandy, when they said fire up the plant just to have it ready to go --

BOB SILVESTRI: Uh-huh.

REP. SHABAN: -- is that capacity getting on the grid, or are you just ready to flip a switch and get it on the grid?

BOB SILVESTRI: That's that minimum load. So there's a certain number of megawatts that are going out there. And if the need called it that we'd have to raise load and fulfill the issue, we would. But you are feeding megawatts to the grid at that point.

REP. SHABAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

REP. GENTILE: Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

And thank you for your testimony today. So when you say that you were only in operation 31 days last year. How many startups were involved in those 31 days of operation?

BOB SILVESTRI: I would probably cut it in two and say 15, but that's just an educated guess at this point.

REP. ALBIS: And would emissions testing be able to be done while you were already -- while you had been started up, or would you have to do a separate startup just for the testing?

BOB SILVESTRI: If we were running, the only thing we would have to do is go up to full load. The way Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection has, its regulations, we have to be at 90 percent or greater for full load. So if the unit were on and it was, say, at minimum load, we would have to raise that load for a period of time, get it up to 90 percent or greater and then go ahead and do the test. But the unit, again, would be on, and it's just a question of, okay, how do you adjust the load to go ahead and do that?

REP. ALBIS: Thank you very much.

BOB SILVESTRI: You're welcome.

REP. GENTILE: Representative Urban for the second time, and then Representative Vicino.

REP. URBAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Just to clarify, what I'm hearing now is you're actually -- you're an at-demand or peak-demand unit. You're not one that -- when we initially passed this legislation and worked with you on it -- I'd like to echo Rep. Willis because we did the Sooty Six and then you were wonderful in stepping up on the mercury part that we went with next -- so that gives us a different twist to this definitely because you are a peak unit. You are not a --

BOB SILVESTRI: That is correct.

REP. URBAN: Right. I think I just wanted to clarify that because I think that makes a big difference in what we're looking at here.

BOB SILVESTRI: We've gone from base-load unit, as I mentioned 24/7, to basically a peaking unit at this point. That is correct.

REP. URBAN: Thank you.

Thank you.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you.

Representative Vicino.

REP. VICINO: It sounds like it would be more cost effective to test the unit while it's on instead of turning it on; and the second part of my question is what kind of electricity or what kind of energy in dollar amounts is produced compared to -- you've mentioned some

costs of testing, but what is the final result of a 31-day use of your plant in two different sessions? What kind of energy costs are billed out to the consumer?

BOB SILVESTRI: Dollarwise, I really don't have, sir. I can mention megawatts that when we do the megawatt test, we're up about 390, 400 megawatts, but the dollar part I don't have.

REP. VICINO: So there's approximately 400 megawatts in proportion to the costs of the testing?

BOB SILVESTRI: It's a 400-megawatt unit and, again, being up at full load when we have to run the test, that's a good approximation.

REP. VICINO: Thank you.

REP. GENTILE: Representative Willis.

REP. WILLIS: I just have a follow-up question and that's on the savings. I don't know if you touched on this, but is that something that would get passed on to consumers or to shareholders?

BOB SILVESTRI: I will defer to Mr. Brown.

NEIL BROWN: Again, sorry for the musical chairs.

The simple answer is that those savings would accrue to shareholders, not ratepayers.

REP. WILLIS: Thank you.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you.

Any further questions?

Seeing none, thank you for your testimony this morning and your time.

Testimony of  
PSEG Power Connecticut  
Connecticut General Assembly  
Committee on the Environment  
January 30, 2013

Re: Raised Bill No. 564: An Act Concerning Mercury Emissions at Certain Power Plants

Chairs Meyer and Gentile, Ranking Members Chapin and Shaban, and members of the General Assembly's Environment Committee

PSEG Power Connecticut appreciates the opportunity to offer this testimony in support of Raised Bill No. 564.

PSEG Power Connecticut owns and operates the Bridgeport Harbor and New Haven Harbor generating stations. The Company is a subsidiary of PSEG Power LLC, one of the nation's largest independent power producers and is an indirect subsidiary of Public Service Enterprise Group Incorporated (PSEG), a diversified energy holding company headquartered in the neighboring State of New Jersey.

The coal-fired unit at Bridgeport is now the only coal-fired unit operating in Connecticut and, is therefore, the only power plant subject to the mercury emissions requirements established by the Legislature in Public Act-03-72. This ground-breaking legislation was the first of its kind in the nation when it was enacted in 2003. PSEG Power Connecticut worked with this Committee, the then CTDEP, and environmental advocates to draft the legislation and we vigorously campaigned for its enactment

PSEG Power Connecticut invested approximately \$150 million to install mercury emissions control technology at Bridgeport to comply with the legislation. The technology has been operating since 2008 and has consistently reduced mercury emissions at the station in the 90-95% range, meeting or exceeding requirements. The system also has been reducing particulate emissions by 90-95%. The collective success of our partnership with the State in establishing and meeting stringent mercury emissions requirements has been cited and used as a model by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in proposing federal mercury emissions regulations.

Raised Bill No. 564 would adjust the frequency of emissions stack testing from quarterly to annually once an affected unit demonstrates compliance after eight consecutive quarterly tests. The bill includes a provision to return to quarterly stack tests should an annual test not demonstrate compliance.

Annual stack testing would be consistent with existing requirements for Connecticut's trash-to-energy facilities and the final federal mercury emissions regulations for qualifying low-emitting coal-fired electric generating units. In addition, annual stack testing is included in regulations in New Jersey, where we also have installed state-of-the-art mercury emissions reduction technology on two coal-fired plants.

Raised Bill No. 564 better reflects how our Bridgeport coal unit now operates. It would avoid the probability of having to start up the unit – and create emissions – just for the purpose of performing a stack test. This bill is a common sense measure that we are pleased to support and we urge its enactment.

**H – 1163**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2013**

**VOL.56  
PART 14  
4512 – 4855**

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

The bill passes.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar number 547.

THE CLERK:

On page 28, Calendar 547, Favorable Report of the  
Joint Standing Committee on the Environment,  
Substitute Senate Bill 564, AN ACT CONCERNING MERCURY  
EMISSIONS TESTING AT CERTAIN POWER PLANTS.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (105th):

Good afternoon, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Good afternoon.

REP. GENTILE (105th):

Madam Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint  
Committee's Report -- Favorable Report, and passage of  
the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance  
of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage  
of the bill.

Representative Gentile, you have the floor,  
madam.

REP. GENTILE (105th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, this bill is intended to alleviate the start-up cost for the Bridgeport Coal-Fired Generator Plant that is currently operated by PSEG. Under current statute, the unit's mercury emission levels must be tested quarterly. This will would change that testing quarterly to annually. By doing so it would alleviate some very expensive costs and the intent is obviously to lower the operating costs, preserve jobs, and it's only -- only provided that the plant has been in compliance for a long period of time, namely eight consecutive quarters. There is a provision within the bill that if the consecutive quarters are not met, then they would have to go back to quarterly testing. Madam Speaker, I urge passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?

Representative Shaban of the 135th.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise in support of the bill. It's yet again a good example of an environmental bill that makes both common sense, business sense, and actually environmental sense. We heard some testimony at the public hearings where in order to meet the quarterly testing, you'd actually have to fire up the coal plant at times to conduct a test and then shut it back down, which doesn't make a whole lot of sense for actually trying to reduce these kinds of emissions. So the Chair -- the Chairwoman made good note of the important issue that if -- if they fail a test, then it goes back to quarterly. But while they are in compliance, annual testing is a smart idea so I urge support and adoption. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further on the bill?

If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House, will the members of the -- please take your seats, the machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives if voting by roll.  
The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Will members please return to the Chamber immediately.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted?  
Will the members please check the board to determine  
if your vote is properly cast. If all members have  
voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will  
take a tally.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Will the Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

S.B. 564 in concurrence with the Senate.

Total number voting	140
---------------------	-----

Necessary for passage	71
-----------------------	----

Those voting Yea	140
------------------	-----

Those voting Nay	0
------------------	---

Those absent and not voting	10
-----------------------------	----

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

The bill passes in concurrence with the Senate.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar number 341.

THE CLERK:

On page 17, Calendar 341, Report of the Joint  
Standing Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding,  
Substitute House Bill 6576, AN ACT CONCERNING THE  
APPLICABILITY OF THE SALE AND USE TAX TO WINTER  
STORAGE OF BOATS.

**S - 656**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2013**

**VOL. 56  
PART 5  
1213 - 1511**

mhr/gbr  
SENATE

56  
May 8, 2013

The amendment is adopted.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you. Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, would move that the bill as amendment  
be referred to the Committee on Finance, Revenue, and  
Bonding.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

If the Clerk would call, as the next item, from  
Calendar Page 4, Calendar 119, Substitute for Senate  
Bill 564.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On Page 4, Calendar 119, Substitute for Senate Bill  
Number 564, AN ACT CONCERNING MERCURY EMISSIONS  
TESTING AT CERTAIN POWER PLANTS, Favorable Report of  
the Committee on Environment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer, good afternoon, sir.

SENATOR MEYER:

Good afternoon.

Madam, I move acceptance of the committee's joint and  
Favorable Report and move passage of the bill.

mhr/gbr  
SENATE

57  
May 8, 2013

THE CHAIR:

The motion is on passage. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR MEYER:

I will, briefly.

Colleagues, right now the law in Connecticut is that if you have a coal-fired power plant, you have to have a mercury emissions test by DEEP, four times a year. There is actually only one coal-fired power plant left in Connecticut; it's the PSE and -- PSE&G plant, in Bridgeport. That company came to the Environment Committee, in January, and pointed out that they have regularly passed the current law that requires testing for mercury emissions four times a year, and they asked us if we would soften the burden on them in that regard because of the considerable expense to do a mercury emission.

And so what the Environment Committee did, in a bill that passed unanimously, is we said that if a coal-fired power plant complied with the test, passed the test in eight consecutive quarters, the -- the requirement of four-times-a-year tests would be reduced to one time a year. That will save this company millions of dollars, hopefully passed back on to the consumers. So that is the, that is the essence of the bill, and I urge its passage.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, I also rise in support of the bill before us today. I think the Chairman of the Environment Committee gave a very -- very good description as to why it's before us today.

mhr/gbr  
SENATE

58  
May 8, 2013

I'd also like to add that these plants, this particular plant isn't a plant that runs all the time, and it may seem like a testing requirement isn't that onerous. But, in fact, in this particular case, just to test they have to fire the plant up, which adds -- adds to certainly the problems we have with air pollution in the State of Connecticut, so we're actually, I believe, helping air pollution by eliminating the test.

It seems a little counterintuitive, but I believe the safety provision is in there, if there is a bad test, to enhance the testing schedule again.

I think it's clear that this bill deserves our support, and I encourage my colleagues to do so.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Chapin.

Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

And I rise in support of the bill. I appreciate Senator Chapin's description, because it did seem counterintuitive.

However, there -- there was a question I had, through you, Madam President, to the proponent, just for my clarification.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

And, Madam President, through you, Senator Meyer, the question is: If the coal plant is able to demonstrate

mhr/gbr  
SENATE

59  
May 8, 2013

that it's complied with the testing for eight straight quarters so that it has to only test annually, if there's a bad test, do they then revert back to testing quarterly?

Through You, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Madam President.

It's a good question, and the bill expressly provides that in the event that the annual test is failed, it goes back to the current requirement of a test four times a year.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Thank you, Senator.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark? Will you remark?

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Yes, Madam Chairman.

I'd, if there's no objection, I'd ask that this go on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

mhr/gbr  
SENATE

60  
May 8, 2013

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes; thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, if the Clerk would call, as the next item, Calendar Page 4, Calendar 132, Senate Bill 79.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Page 4, Calendar 132, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 79, AN ACT CONCERNING A STUDY OF EMERGENCY POWER NEEDS IN HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY, Favorable Report of the Committee on Aging.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon, Senator Ayala.

SENATOR AYALA:

Good afternoon, Madam President.

The Clerk is in position of amendment LCO 6 --

THE CHAIR:

Sir, do you want to adopt the bill first; move for adoption of the bill first?

SENATOR AYALA:

I'm -- I'm sorry, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

No problem.

SENATOR AYALA:

ed/cd/gbr  
SENATE

209  
May 8, 2013

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Calendar page 48, Calendar 309, Senate Bill Number 899, Madam President, move to place this item on the foot of the Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

And Madam President, on Calendar page 50, Calendar 405, Senate Bill Number 848, Madam President, move to refer this item to the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, if the Clerk would now read the items on the first Consent Calendar and then if we might proceed to a vote on that first Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 1, Calendar 496, House Joint Resolution Number 98; Calendar 497, House Joint Resolution Number 99.

On page 2, Calendar 498, House Joint Resolution Number 100; Calendar 499, House Joint Resolution Number 101;

ed/cd/gbr  
SENATE

210  
May 8, 2013

also on page 2, Calendar 500, House Joint Resolution  
Number 102.

On page 4, Calendar 119, Senate Bill 564.

On page 5, Calendar 155, Senate Bill 231.

On page 6, Calendar 169, Senate Bill 881; and Calendar  
188, Senate Bill 1029.

On page 7, Calendar 192, Senate Bill 835.

On page 12, Calendar 284, Senate Bill 964.

Page 16, Calendar 353, House Bill 6481.

On page 18, Calendar 376, Senate Bill 878; Calendar  
372, Senate Bill 977.

On page 19, Calendar 387, Senate Bill 386; and  
Calendar 392, Senate Bill 366.

On page 20, Calendar 396, Senate Bill 991; and  
Calendar 413, Senate Bill 1049.

On page 21, Calendar for 424, House Bill 6212.

And on page 25, Calendar 463, House Bill 6405.

THE CHAIR:

Those are all the bills on the Calendar.

At this point, Mr. Clerk, will you call for a roll  
call vote of the first Consent Calendar of the day and  
the machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

~~Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.~~  
Voting the first Consent Calendar of the day.  
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.  
Senators please return to the chamber.

(Senator Coleman of the 2nd in the Chair.)

THE CHAIR:

ed/cd/gbr  
SENATE

211  
May 8, 2013

Would members please check the board to see that your vote has been properly recorded? If all members have voted and all votes have been properly recorded, the machine will be closed.

And would the Clerk please take and announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

On the first Consent Calendar of the day.

Total Number Voting	36
Those voting Yea	36
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar has passed.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President.

If we might stand at ease for -- for just a moment.  
Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

The Chamber please stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

SENATOR LOONEY:

Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY: