

PA13-6

SB0946

Energy & Tech.	535-536, 539-541, 545-549, 721-722, 763, 765-766	15
House	1718-1724	7
Senate	802, 890-895	7
		29

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**ENERGY AND
TECHNOLOGY
PART 2
351 - 678**

2013

SENATOR DUFF: Thank you. Representative.

Any other questions from members of the committee?

-- Thank you very much, Sir.

Bryan Garcia followed by Representative Rutigliano.

BRYAN GARCIA: Good afternoon Chairman Duff, Chairwoman Reed, Vice Chairs LeBeau and Steinberg, ranking members Chapin and Hoydick and all the distinguished members of the Energy and Technology Committee.

I am joined today by my staff David Goldberg, our Director of Government and External Relations and Brian Farnen, our General Counsel. Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to be here today to provide comments on proposed legislation. I'll be providing comment on three bills being heard today: Senate Bill 946, Senate Bill 949 and House Bill 6472.

SB203

I'd like to now briefly summarize our testimony which we have submitted electronically. With regards to Senate Bill 946, I'd like to first provide a brief update on the actions that we have taken specific to Project 150 contracts including previously dispersed funds.

A particular note CEFIA has removed the cash grant commitments that had previously been reserved for the remaining Project 150 developments. Project 150 contractual operation dates have either passed, project developers have indicated they will be unable

to meet milestones or developers did not respond to our request for information.

We have included a table in our comments summarizing the status of the projects in our written testimony. CEFIA would be interested in supporting projects if the Legislature decides to proceed with this effort of extending the dates. CEFIA would like the ability to maintain consistency with our new focus and thus not seek to provide grants other than previously dispersed grants.

CEFIA would be willing to consider a financing opportunity through appropriate board approval processes to projects that are granted an extension.

For example, we recently provided a 5 million dollar loan to provide the necessary working capital to fuel -- to support fuel cell energy's construction of a 15 megawatt fuel cell park in Bridgeport, Connecticut. After the legislature extended the deadline on the project in last year's special session.

We are supportive of the proposed changes to extend the deadlines for Project 150 projects and we look forward to identifying appropriate financing vehicles with the project developers.

With regards to Senate Bill 949 CEFIA supports SB 949 and also acknowledges SP 203 which appears to have the same general intent as SP 949 except through a mandate as opposed to enabling legislation.

CEFIA believes authorizing or requiring municipalities to exempt property tax associated with the value of the clean energy project in commercial and industrial buildings

energy savings or clean energy production in order to be consistent with the C-pays financing model.

We thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments and we look forward to answering your questions.

SENATOR DUFF: Thank you Bryan. We appreciate that and we certainly appreciate last week's presentation as well. I think we got a good flavor of what you're doing over there. Also, have you submitted your testimony to the committee electronically?

BRYAN GARCIA: We have. We did that probably about an hour ago.

SENATOR DUFF: Okay. We don't have it yet but we look forward to it, to receiving it. Okay. Any? Representative Reed.

REP. REED: Yes, I just wanted to follow up on the Project 150 testimony again. Do you have any feelings or sort of professional observations as to why so many of these are not responding or not happening as in (inaudible)?

SB946

BRYAN GARCIA: Well, I think I -- in talking about this with our staff a large reason why most of the projects seemed to move forward was we entered the financial crunch at the end of, you know, the last decade. So that significantly opiated the large number of projects. I know that that was a big burrier but let me ask Brian who specifically referred over some of the projects.

BRIAN FARNEN: So what we did is we reached out via letter to the projects we had significant grant commitments to and basically asked are you

going to move forward with those projects in that time line? Because there were commitment dates and we didn't want a hold on our books those dollars for an additional year -- so almost \$10 million, and one of -- one of the entities did respond back and said there was no way they were going to make their commitment date and two of them; Stamford Hospital, Waterbury Hospital, they did not respond and I think the reason was because they weren't able to provide any adequate assurances that they were going to be able to meet the current commitment dates.

So if there was an extension I think that those projects could potentially get back on track but as of now with the current legislation none of them in my opinion that we have commitments set aside for would be able to meet their contractual obligations.

REP. REED: So I guess I'm just trying to discern, are you agnostic on this subject or do you have feeling about whether they should go forward or would you like to put your energy in something else?

BRYAN GARCIA: So we would be supportive of an extension but I would say that our board is very adamant in wanting the see the projects move.

You know, there's been a history of projects not moving forward and sitting, you know, as Brian has expressed that we had \$10 million sitting on our books in commitments. Our board is very action oriented so in terms of thinking about those extension timelines that may be something that we'll want to work with you on because we want to make sure that those

projects are moving forward and not just sitting on a, you know, an approval.

REP. REED: And just one more quick thing. So we keep circling back to this conversation issue of the municipalities having a sense of really what's in it for them? And I'm wondering if that's something -- I know you're doing -- creating financial products and putting deals together but is that something that you're working with DEEP on, you know, making those connections in terms of the education component of it?

BRYAN GARCIA: Yeah, we're working very closely with DEEP with their leading by example effort. So one of the bit -- major sections of Public Act 1180 was not only state facilities saving energy by ten percent through 2013 and twenty percent by 2018, but also establishing a standardized performance contracting program to support municipalities to engage in energy saving programs.

So we're working closely with the DEEP team on leading by example because the two entry points into the commercial and industrial market and the residential market are through the municipalities. So we're working closely with DEEP on that.

REP. REED: Thank you, thank you for your testimony, thank you Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR DUFF: Thank you. Representative -- Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. You mentioned district heating -- what happens -- some of the users that are on the lines if they don't pay their bills? Does

HB 6472

REP. STEINBERG: I have great confidence in you and I look forward to that solution.

BRYAN GARCIA: Thank you.

SENATOR DUFF: Thank you Representative.
Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER: Thank you very much. I don't have the benefit of your testimony in front of me and so I don't have the benefit of viewing the list of projects so I have a specific question about inclusion of a project and I just want to make it sure it's on the record that I am particularly concerned about the project -- the biomass project at the town of Montville and the applicability of that project under this recommended change.

SB 946

BRYAN GARCIA: So I see -- I'll provide you this list. Forgive me for us getting that -- that in late. I see four biomass projects on our list.

The Watertown renewable project, a 50 megawatt biomass project. Plainfield renewable energy we've got Dan Donovan behind us and Scottfield Martin. That project is moving forward. I've seen that project, it's up and running creating a lot of jobs for Connecticut.

Clearview Renewable, a 30 megawatt biomass project is not moving forward and the Clearview East Canaan digester cow manure biomass project is not moving forward but I'll leave you with my list.

REP. RITTER: Thank you for that and perhaps we'll be having some future discussion. Thank you.

SENATOR DUFF: Representative Piscopo.

REP. PISCOPO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman good afternoon. I am -- I was just wondering -- I -- I thought you said in your testimony that you were -- that you're unable to compete and -- and that's kind of why you're looking for more incentives. I think, you know, we provide the rebates and the tax -- the tax credits and now we're going after this property tax, really. I was just, I don't know, I'm just curious -- we spent a -- a number of us spent a -- a day yesterday and finance with the car tax -- property tax -- relief bill and I'm just wondering -- and we just -- and were visited by CCM this morning and they vehemently were opposed to this concept because it puts the town leaders at odds. I'm just wondering when -- when the market is going -- you know, year after year of these incentives when's the market going to be competitive with regular energy producers? I mean, they pray -- they pay their property tax so I'm wondering when -- when is this going to be -- I tried to get at this last time you were in front of me but yes -- how many years are we on?

BRYAN GARCIA: Fair question Representative Piscopo. I -- I would say that there are several cities and towns obviously that are looking forward to offering property tax exemptions so the views on CCM broadly don't necessarily apply to all cities and towns so the discussion of, you know, Senate Bill 946 is -- is an important one.

We -- we also have a number of project developers who will be testifying specifically I assume to -- to this benefit and how that affects the economics of their project. You know the area of providing incentives to support clean energy and energy efficiency

deployment is an important one to dive into. You know the tradeoffs between property tax and the energy savings that come from each of these projects is one that we need to look at in light of other ways of subsidizing these projects, either directly through rebates and subsidies or performance based incentives or federal investment tax credits. You know we need to take a look at that but I would offer that we have a discussion with the developers who are in the field in those towns looking to deploy capital to get projects going.

SENATOR DUFF: Thank you Representative.

Representative Hoydick.

REP. HOYDICK: Thank you Mr. Chair and thank you Bryan, it's nice to see you again. So currently municipalities cannot exempt projects from their tax roles for renewable energy?

(SB 203)

(SB 949)

BRYAN GARCIA: That's correct. That's correct, commercial and industrial. The residential properties can for Class 1 resources I believe.

REP. HOYDICK: Oh, for Class 1 resources --

BRYAN GARCIA: For class 1.

REP. HOYDICK: -- but combined heat and power they can or anything else?

BRYAN GARCIA: Let me ask David to clarify the definition.

DAVID GOLDBERG: Representative Hoydick. We believe there's a mandatory exemption currently in statute that applies to Class 1 resources for residential customers regarding commercial -- commercial and industrial customers currently

there is not an exemption or enabling authorization to allow that municipality to exempt the collection.

REP. HOYDICK: Thank you and from your information session last week, you said you had 14 communities on C pays and you're looking forward to 169 which I -- I do understand and support and I asked your briefly that day: do you think you're working a cross purposes by supporting a mandatory exemption for Class 1 renewables and then working and asking the municipal legislative bodies to enact C Pays?

BRYAN GARCIA: So we're up to 15 towns which is great and I -- I believe we're up to another five this week or next week that will come on board and I actually just want to report too that we did receive our first consent. I know the banking committee last year -- as we were taking up the C Pays Bill working very closely with the banker's association was focused on -- on consent and we got our first project in Senator Duff's territory in Norwalk was a consent deal so we're very excited about that. In terms of whether or not C Pays and property tax exemptions are working at odds with each other, several of the C Pays communities that have come on board have expressed a willingness and a desire to offer property tax exemptions to support economic development for C Pays projects but they -- they currently don't have the option.

So as we're talking about 946 or 203 the ability to at least have the option should be, you know, our baseline discussion in terms of - of what we want those municipalities to be able to offer in terms of C Pays project financing. Anything else?

REP. HOYDICK: And do you think that that allows a little more economic viability or competition between communities if they -- if you have enabling legislation?

BRYAN GARCIA: We do. I -- I would suggest that we ask some of the developers but I know in having discussions with current C Pays cities and towns that being able to offer that is going to -- they believe that that's not going -- not only going to support their economic development interest but it's also going to put them at a competitive advantage positions against others to attract developers to do projects in their towns.

REP. HOYDICK: Thank you very much.

SENATOR DUFF: Thank you Representative, any other questions? Okay, thank you very much Bryan. We have passed the one hour deadline for public officials and for officials and members of the public so we're now going to rotate back and forth.

We have Representative Rutigliano, just hang on one second we're going to allow Bill Burkas -- Barkas -- I'm sorry - from Dominion Retail come up and then after that Representative, you're on deck. Okay I don't see Mr. Barkas here so Representative why don't you come on up? Oh Bill, you are here okay, thanks.

BILL BARKAS: Good afternoon. Senator Duff -- Chairman Duff, Chairwoman Reed, members of the committee. My name is Bill Barkas. I am manager of State Government Relations for Dominion Retail. I would like to comment on House Bill 6470 and House Bill 6473. Dominion Retail is an affiliate of Dominion Resources as I mentioned.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**ENERGY AND
TECHNOLOGY
PART 3
679 - 997**

2013



CLEAN ENERGY
FINANCE AND INVESTMENT AUTHORITY

865 Brook Street
Rocky Hill, Connecticut 06067-3444
T. 860 563 0015
F. 860 563 4877
www.ctcleanenergy.com

**Statement of the Connecticut Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority
Regarding Raised S.B 946**

AN ACT CONCERNING CONTRACT EXTENSIONS FOR PROJECT 150 PROJECTS

The Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority (CEFIA) appreciates the opportunity to comment on S.B. 946, AAC Contract Extensions For Project 150 Projects. CEFIA would like to provide an update on the actions we have taken specific to Project 150 contracts, including previously disbursed funds. Attached below is information regarding our recent action under the direction of our Board of Directors.

Of particular note:

- CEFIA has removed the cash grant commitments that had previously been reserved for the remaining Project 150 developments; and
- Project 150 contractual operation dates have either passed, project developers have indicated they will be unable to meet contractual milestones, and/or developers did not respond to our requests for information

CEFIA would be interested in supporting projects if the legislature decides to proceed with this effort. However, CEFIA would like the ability to maintain consistency with our new focus and thus not seek to provide grants other than previously disbursed grants. CEFIA would be willing to consider a financing opportunity, through appropriate Board approval processes, to projects that are granted an extension, such as the \$5,000,000 financing recently arranged for FuelCell Energy of Danbury in support of the Project 150 15 MW fuel cell project in Bridgeport.

It's worth noting that any grants provided by the state to these projects will reduce the value of the Federal Investment Tax Credits (ITC). The ITC is currently set at thirty percent. CEFIA or State support in the form of a grant reduces the level of federal support for the project through the ITC and other mechanisms (i.e. accelerated depreciation) and believes financing or credit enhancement mechanisms are more effective in assisting the development of these projects and could bring about more clean energy per ratepayer dollar invested

CEFIA is pleased to be a part of the new energy, environmental and economic development landscape in Connecticut and looks forward to supporting the legislature's and Governor's vision to deliver cleaner, cheaper and more reliable sources of energy

We thank you again for the opportunity to provide these comments and we look forward to working with the committee throughout the session.

Attachment 1

**Project 100/150 Projects Still Proceeding With Their Project
Development Under The Terms Of Their EPA**

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)
Project	MW	Technology	CEFIA Additional Grant	Projects Still Proceeding With Development
Watertown Renewable	15.0	Biomass		No
Plainfield Renewable	30.0	Biomass		Yes
Clearview Renewable	30.0	Biomass	\$4,000,000	No*
SNEW Station	30.0	Pipeline Quality Landfill Gas		No
Clearview East Canaan	10.0	Digester – Cow Manure		No
Bridgeport Fuel Cell Park	15.0	Fuel Cell	\$1,500,000	Yes
Cube Fuel Cell Project	3.4	Fuel Cell	\$2,950,000	No*
DFC-ERG Milford	9.0	Fuel Cell		?
DFC-ERG Glastonbury	3.3	Fuel Cell		?
DFC- ERG Trumbull	3.3	Fuel Cell		?
DFC-ERG Bloomfield	3.6	Fuel Cell		?
Waterbury Hospital Project	2.4	Fuel Cell	\$965,499	No*
Stamford Hospital Project	4.8	Fuel Cell	\$508,942	No*
Total	159.8		\$9,924,441	

* CEFIA has terminated contractual commitment to provide additional funding as fund recipient could not provide assurances that the project is moving forward according to the schedule set forth in the agreement or confirm that all other representations and warranties set forth in agreement are still accurate.

#11



Connecticut Light & Power

The Northeast Utilities System



The Northeast Utilities System

TESTIMONY OF JAY FLETCHER
THE CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY
and YANKEE GAS SERVICES COMPANY

SB 109 SB 250
SB 315 SB 946
HB 5591

Energy and Technology Committee
March 5, 2013

Good afternoon. My name is Jay Fletcher, Director of Regulatory Policy for Northeast Utilities Service Company. I am appearing on behalf of The Connecticut Light and Power Company and Yankee Gas Services Company. With me today is David Goodson, Manager of Vegetation Management for NUSCO.

We are providing written testimony on a number of bills on the agenda for today's public hearing.

RE: HOUSE BILL NO. 6471, AN ACT CONCERNING TREE TRIMMING BY UTILITIES

We support this proposed legislation, with some minor revisions that we have attached on the final page of this testimony. The storms that we have experienced over the last two years have proven that trees are the major cause of outages. We recently received approval from the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority ("PURA") for our five year infrastructure hardening plan, which includes \$191 million for maintenance and enhanced tree trimming over the next five years. As part of our vegetation management planning, we have embarked on a more rigorous program to trim trees every four years, and to remove trees that present a hazard to our distribution and transmission systems. However, current legislation in some instances impedes our ability to trim and remove trees. This legislation would improve that process significantly, and would allow utilities to trim and remove trees more efficiently. The bill also contains protections for landowners, in the form of an appeal process to the town tree warden and to PURA. These changes to the legislation provide greater specificity as to which facilities this bill would apply and, more specifically, state that this bill applies to distribution lines that are less than 35 kilovolts. Tree trimming for higher voltage facilities is regulated at the federal level. The remaining changes clean up the language of Section (c) of the bill to ensure that our existing rights to trim trees within our easements are maintained.

#11

Page 3 of 6

facilities are not energy sources, as those sources do not generate energy. If the words "energy required to harvest an energy source" were deemed to include the energy required to build new electric power delivery systems, then a proponent of a new generator under this bill would have to estimate how much energy is used to obtain raw materials, to then make the component materials for new lines and substations, and to then install them using energy-powered vehicles. This would be an enormously speculative and time-consuming exercise, and would most likely yield a result that is very small by comparison with the cost of building and providing fuel to the generator. We would suggest that, should this bill move forward, it be amended to remove the reference to transmission and distribution facilities.

RE: SENATE BILL NO. 315, AN ACT CONCERNING COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANIES AND CUSTOMERS

As written, we cannot fully comment on this bill. There is insufficient detail contained in the language to provide commentary. However, as it is written we would not be in favor of this bill, as it is duplicative of existing processes. Each electric and gas distribution company is required to file with PURA an emergency response plan. These plans and, in some cases associated procedures, contain sections that deal specifically with customer communication. CL&P and Yankee have implemented a town liaison program that provides each town in our service territories with a single point of contact. We have also been proactive about reaching out to customers before, during and after an event to provide useful information on planning for an event and recovering from an event. We are concerned that this legislation is unnecessary and has already been implemented through previous legislative and regulatory action.

RE: SENATE BILL NO. 946, AN ACT CONCERNING CONTRACT EXTENSIONS FOR PROJECT 150 PROJECTS

This legislation allows certain projects that have been approved as part of the Project 150 initiative to extend their contractual in-service date for an additional 24 months. We are concerned that this legislation provides further relief to projects that have had PURA-approved contracts for many years, yet have not been constructed. The contracts approved by PURA allowed an extra two years beyond the originally scheduled in-service date to give each project adequate time to absorb reasonable financing or construction delays. Two of the projects have already received an additional two year extension (beyond the two years allowed in the original contract). Without the

Page 4 of 6

extension proposed by this bill, all of the contracts affected by this legislation will automatically terminate this year. The payment rates under these contracts are significantly over market, and include a payment structure that minimizes the risk to the projects by including a payment for a proxy of their fuel costs. We believe that these projects have had adequate time to get constructed and move forward. The fact that they have been unable to get financed to date is particularly noteworthy given the high payment rate and low risk provisions of the contracts. Providing additional time will extend the administrative burden associated with these contracts and will extend the over market risks for our customers.

RE: HOUSE BILL NO. 5591, AN ACT CONCERNING ON-BILL FINANCING FOR ENERGY-RELATED TECHNOLOGY UPGRADES

Our concern with this legislation is the reference to customers using on-bill financing for smart meters. We wish to point out that CL&P owns the meters that serve its customers, and it would be problematic to allow customers to own their own smart meters, which may not be compatible with our systems. We have a number of current programs that provide an on-bill option for customers, and the Comprehensive Energy Strategy outlines other areas in which the State would like to advance the on-bill financing concept. We would suggest that the State focus on the priorities outlined in the CES prior to implementing any new on-bill financing programs.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony on these bills.

H – 1155

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL.56
PART 6
1695 – 2023**

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

44
April 24, 2013

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, sir. And thank you young ladies and gentlemen for coming up here today. We look forward to seeing you entertaining us later. Maybe I'll get a chance to get out and see you. But thank you again for coming.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 384.

THE CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. On Page 34, Calendar Number 384, Senate Bill 946 AN ACT CONCERNING CONTRACT EXTENSIONS FOR PROJECT 150 PROJECTS.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Lonnie Reed, distinguished Chairman of the Energy and Technology Committee. You have the floor, ma'am.

REP. REED (102nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good noon. I'd say we're noon straight up.

I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report in concurrence with the Senate and for passage of this bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

45
April 24, 2013

The question before the Chamber is the acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative Reed, you have the floor.
REP. REED 102nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill extends for at least 24 months, a very innovative program called Project 150. Project 150 has a goal of creating of up to at least 150 megawatts of new, cleaner, greener, more affordable and more reliable electric generation and actually was the brain child of our own Terry Backer several years ago.

During the economic downturn the program sort of flat lined and we were sort of going to let it die but when we gave it a brief extension we got very excited that Bridgeport came through with a program. We're about to celebrate that, and it's going to be able to deliver energy to 15,000 homes.

Several others are also in the pipeline now. We think the time is right to keep it from dying a natural death and so we want to extend it for 24 months.

I urge passage. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

46
April 24, 2013

Thank you, ma'am. Will you remark further on the bill? Representative Hoydick of the 120th.

REP. HOYDICK (120th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions to my esteemed colleague, the Chairman, the Co-Chairman of the Energy and Technology Committee.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Reed, please prepare yourself.

Representative Hoydick.

REP. HOYDICK (120th):

Thank you, sir. Representative Reed, though this passed out of Committee unanimously and passed the Senate, I know that there were some, some opposition during the testimony period of the public forum. Could you share what the opposition to extending this program is?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Reed.

REP. REED (102nd):

Well, I think some of the concern was, how much money is in the grant program and also, what else is competing for the same funding and I think we sort of realized the greater good was to allow Project 150 to exist. We also have, I can annoy you with

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

47
April 24, 2013

excruciating details about energy policy, but we have a Z-Rec program that's being very successful and an L-Rec program that's being very successful and the Project 150 seems to deliver clean energy to a larger number of houses, which as my esteemed colleague from Stratford knows, is one of the goals we've had since the big storms when we lost so much generation capacity to create essentially micro grids.

So we thought for the greater good, this was a good program to promote.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Hoydick.

REP. HOYDICK (120th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you for that answer, Representative Reed.

I tend to agree that one of the benefits of extending the program is what we're going to visualize in Bridgeport happening very shortly, and I think the benefits far outweigh the risks of extending the program.

If we do, if this bill passes, and we do extend, what other projects, or approximately how many, do you have an idea of how many will be advanced in the

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

48
April 24, 2013

pipeline within that two-year period. Through you,
Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Reed.

REP. REED (102nd):

I believe that there are at least five and new
life seems to be occurring in at least three of those
five. Some of them proprietary information. Not
everybody wants to publicize it yet, but there is some
exciting potential partnerships that are happening.
That's the other thing.

It's public/private money so really getting some
partners excited about helping to make this happen has
been a very important aspect of it and there are big
signs of that happening now and could pick up speed in
the very near future.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Representative
Hoydick.

REP. HOYDICK (120th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support this
bill and I would encourage my colleagues to also
support it.

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

49
April 24, 2013

The advantages of Project 150, this short-term extension for some of the projects in the pipeline are the benefits that we're going to see in Bridgeport, which as Representative Reed mentioned as the public/private partnership with our local utility companies as well as Dominion Energy and Fuel Cell Energy and I would encourage everyone to vote yes on this bill. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Would you care to remark further on the bill before us? Would you care to remark further on the bill before us?

If not, will staff and guests please come to the Well of the House. Will Members please take your seats. The machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by Roll.

The House of Representatives is voting by Roll.

Will Members please return to the Chamber immediately.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Have all Members voted? Have all Members voted? Will the Members please check the board to determine if their vote is properly cast.

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

50
April 24, 2013

If all Members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. Will the Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 946.

Total Number Voting	143
Necessary for Passage	72
Those voting Yea	143
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	7

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

The bill passes.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 385.

THE CLERK:

On Page 35, Calendar Number 385, Substitute for Senate Bill 950 AN ACT CONCERNING TECHNICAL AND MINOR REVISIONS TO AND REPEAL OF OBSOLETE PROVISIONS OF ENERGY AND TECHNOLOGY STATUTES, Report of Committee on Energy and Technology.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Reed of the 102nd.

REP. REED (102nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report on the

S - 654

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL. 56
PART 3
614 - 910**

cd/gbr
SENATE

57
April 18, 2013

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Moving to Calendar page 24, the last two items on that page, Calendar 220, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 1001 that item is marked go; and the last item on that page, Madam President, Calendar 221, Senate Bill Number 946, Madam President, move to place that item on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Moving to Calendar page 25, Calendar 225, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 1031, Madam President, that item is marked go.

Moving to Calendar page 26, the second item on that page, Calendar 230, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 235, Madam President, move to place that item on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

The last item on that page, on Calendar page 26, Calendar 235, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 188, is marked go.

On the next page, Madam President, Calendar page 27, Calendar 237, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 910 is marked go.

Moving to Calendar page 28, the fourth item on that page, Calendar 250, Substitute for Senate Bill Number

cd/gbr
SENATE

145
April 18, 2013

Mr. Clerk, call for a roll call vote, but will you do the proceedings and go through and read the vote on the -- on that Consent Calendar. Read the bills on the Consent Calendar and the machine then will be opened.

THE CLERK:

On page 1, Calendar 96, Senate Resolution Number 19,
RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF JASON E.
BOWSA OF BROAD BROOK TO BE A MEMBER OF THE
CONNECTICUT RIVER VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL COMMISSION,
favorable report of the Senate Committee on Executive
and Legislative Nominations.

Also on page 1 --

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, if you'd like you can just read the
Calendar Number --

THE CLERK:

Okay.

THE CHAIR:

-- and the Resolution Number. Okay.

THE CLERK:

Great.

Page 1, Calendar 97, Senate Resolution Number 20.

On page 2, Calendar 98, Senate Joint Resolution Number
46; also on page 2, Calendar 99, Senate Joint
Resolution Number 47; page 2, Calendar 130, Senate
Joint Resolution Number 21; page 2, Calendar 131,
Senate Joint Resolution Number 48; page 2, Calendar
136, Senate Joint Resolution 49.

SR 21

On page 3, Calendar 197, Senate Joint Resolution
Number 50; also on page 3, Calendar 198, Senate Joint
Resolution Number 51; page 3, Calendar 245, Senate
Resolution Number 22; page 3, Calendar 246, Senate

cd/gbr
SENATE

146
April 18, 2013

Joint Resolution Number 23; page 3, Calendar 247,
Senate Joint Resolution Number 52.

And on page 4, Calendar 316, House Joint Resolution
Number 72; page 4, Calendar 317, House Joint
Resolution Number 73; also on page 4, Calendar 318,
House Joint Resolution Number 74; page 4, Calendar
319, House Joint Resolution Number 75.

On page 5, Calendar 320, House Joint Resolution Number
76; also on page 5, Calendar 321, House Joint
Resolution Number 77; page 5, Calendar 322, House
Joint Resolution Number 78; on page 5, 323 is the
Calendar, House Joint Resolution Number 79.

And on page 6, Calendar 324, House Joint Resolution
Number 80; also on page 6, Calendar 325, House Joint
Resolution 81; page 6, Calendar 326, House Joint
Resolution Number 82; page 6, Calendar 327, House
Joint Resolution Number 84.

HJR 83
Calendar 328-HJR 84

On page 7, Calendar 329, House Joint Resolution Number
85; page 7, Calendar 330, House Joint Resolution
Number 86; page 7, Calendar 331, House Joint
Resolution Number 87; and on page 7, Calendar 332,
House Joint Resolution Number 88.

On page 13, Calendar 128 --

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, would you also check page 11, Calendar
Number 1 -- 0111.

THE CLERK:

I think that was referred to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

It is the Consent Calendar, sir.

THE CLERK:

Oh, yes, yes, yes, you're right. Sorry about that.

On page 11, Calendar 111, Senate Bill Number 825.

cd/gbr
SENATE

147
April 18, 2013

And on page 13, now, Calendar 128, Senate Bill --

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, would you look at 127, also, please, 127,
Calendar 127.

THE CLERK:

Okay.

Calendar 127, Senate Bill Number 927; also on page 13,
Calendar 128, Senate Bill 1032; and on page 13,
Calendar 137, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 837.

On page 8 --

THE CHAIR:

-- 15.

THE CLERK:

-- 15, Calendar 151 --

THE CHAIR:

Senator, would you look at Calendar 147, please.

THE CLERK:

-- Calendar 147 --

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

THE CLERK:

-- Senate Bill Number 1061; also on page 15, Calendar
1 --

THE CHAIR:

-- 49.

cd/gbr
SENATE

148
April 18, 2013

THE CLERK:

-- 49, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 909; on page 15, Calendar 151, Senate Bill Number 63.

And, now, on page 16, Calendar 156, Senate Bill Number 1004; also Calendar 157, Senate Bill Number 1006.

And on page 18, Calendar 173, Substitute --

THE CHAIR:

-- Mr. Clerk, can you look at 168 first, please.

THE CLERK:

I'm sorry.

Calendar 168, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 880, and Calendar 173, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 874.

On page 19; Calendar 183, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 853.

And on page 20, Calendar 187, Senate Bill Number 953; also on page 20, Calendar 191, Senate Bill Number 704.

On page 22, Calendar 206, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 950.

On page 23, Calendar 213, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 826.

On page 24, Calendar 221, Senate Bill Number 946.

And on page 29, Calendar 25 --

THE CHAIR:

Sir, on page 28, first.

THE CLERK:

I'm sorry.

cd/gbr
SENATE

149
April 18, 2013

Page 28, Calendar 250, Substitute for Senate Bill
Number 1010.

And on page 29, Calendar 258, Substitute for Senate
Bill Number 1073.

On page 37, Calendar 306, Senate Bill Number 111.

And I think that's it.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, I think so.

This time I'll ask everybody to please vote. The machine is open, and we're voting on the Consent Calendar.

Do you -- would you please announce it again, Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate,
voting today's Consent Calendar. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted, all members have voted, the machine will be closed.

Mr. Clerk, will you please call the tally.

THE CLERK:

On today's Consent Calendar.

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

THE CHAIR:

cd/gbr
SENATE

150
April 18, 2013

The Consent Calendar passes.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, a couple of additional items. First of all, on a matter adopted earlier today, Calendar 344, Substitute for House Bill Number 6648, would ask for a suspension for immediate transmittal of that item to the Governor.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, for a couple of -- of items for recommittals on the last -- near the end of the Calendar, Calendar page 52, under "Favorable Reports and Resolutions," Calendar 34, Senate Resolution Number 8, I would move to recommit that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

And also, Madam President, Calendar 212, Senate Resolution Number 14, I move to recommit that item to the Education Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.