

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, LABOR AND ENERGY**

**Seventy-sixth Session  
May 30, 2011**

The Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy was called to order by Chair Michael A. Schneider at 3:05 p.m. on Monday, May 30, 2011, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Michael A. Schneider, Chair  
Senator Shirley A. Breeden, Vice Chair  
Senator David R. Parks  
Senator Allison Copeny  
Senator James A. Settelmeyer  
Senator Elizabeth Halseth  
Senator Michael Roberson

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Assembly District No. 14  
Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea, Assembly District No. 35

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Scott Young, Policy Analyst  
Matt Nichols, Counsel  
Linda Hiller, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Jason Geddes, City of Reno  
Judy Stokey, NV Energy  
Rett Jesse, Nevada Controls, LLC  
Luke Busby, Clean Energy Center, LLC  
Richard Hamilton, Clean Energy Center, LLC

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy  
May 30, 2011  
Page 2

Joe Johnson, Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter  
Doug Busselman, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation  
Rose McKinney-James, The Solar Alliance  
Chad Dickason, Hamilton Solar  
Rebecca D. Wagner, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada  
Donald E. Jayne, Administrator, Division of Industrial Relations, Department of  
Business and Industry  
Jack Mallory, International Union of Painters and Allied Trades, District  
Council 15; Southern Nevada Building and Construction Trades Council  
Debra Gallo, Southwest Gas Corporation  
Tom Clark, Quick Space  
James V. deProsse, Administrator, Manufactured Housing Division, Department  
of Business and Industry

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 359.

[ASSEMBLY BILL 359 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions governing energy.  
(BDR 58-1064)

JASON GEDDES (City of Reno):

The language in section 1 through section 6 of A.B. 359 mirrors the language in Senate Bill (S.B.) 288. Assembly Bill 359 would make the Waterpower Energy Systems Demonstration Program permanent. It also addresses issues of contiguous property, waterpower and waterpower generation. We met with the sponsors and interested parties on this bill and worked on the language presented today.

[SENATE BILL 288 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions governing renewable energy.  
(BDR 58-1026)

Section 6, subsection 2 of this bill would fix problems that surface with peak demand. When we were planning to install a megawatt photovoltaic system at our Stead wastewater treatment plant, we encountered a demand-size issue. We had trouble applying solar energy power generated during summer on-peak periods to off-peak positions. The attempt to arrive at 100 percent of annual requirements is a way to address the demand issue when the intent is to generate and consume everything on the site but not to build a bigger system than needed on the site.

Section 7 of A.B. 359 would address the cap issue of 2 percent. We are trying to create a mechanism to move that forward and allow the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN) to review it when the cap is being approached. The 1 percent statewide cap is approximately 72 megawatts (MWs). The SolarGenerations and renewable programs have approved 73 MWs, with approximately 43 MWs installed. We want to ensure the cap goes up, and this section provides the mechanism. Senate Bill 59, passed on May 29, 2011, raised the cap to 2 percent.

SENATE BILL 59 (1st Reprint): Increases the cumulative capacity of net metering systems operating in this State. (BDR 58-408)

Section 7, subsection 4 of A.B. 359 addresses hydroelectric systems located on contiguous properties. If the customer-generator sells the contiguous property, the net metering system would no longer be available.

JUDY STOKEY (NV Energy):

We support A.B. 359 and have worked with the sponsor and other interested parties. We also support the Governor's bill, S.B. 59, regarding the 2 percent cap, as long as we stay within the \$255 million cap. There would be a conflict with the net metering portion of this bill versus S.B. 59, however.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Is the conflict with S.B. 59 in section 7 of A.B. 359?

MR. GEDDES:

Yes, it is in section 7, subsection 1.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

What would be necessary to make the two bills comply with each other? The previous bill you referenced, S.B. 288, had no fiscal impact to the State, but A.B. 359 does.

MR. GEDDES:

The fiscal impact attached to this bill is the cost of rule-making from the PUCN. They testified in the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means they could work the rule-making into their regular schedule. The language regarding the cap on page 4, line 19, of A.B. 359 which states "equal to 1 percent," would mirror language in S.B. 59 which states "equal to 2 percent." I would delete the

language from line 20 to line 27 from A.B. 359 and change the 1 percent to 2 percent which would be consistent with S.B. 59.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Since these bills conflict, I would like to ask Counsel how we would address this.

MATT NICHOLS (Counsel):

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think Mr. Geddes is largely correct that it is essentially changing... , on page 4, section 7, line 19, changing 1 percent to 2 percent. And then, you would pick up the line 27, essentially, ... "the total peak capacity of all utilities in this State." And then, to make this entirely consistent with S.B. 59, the changes in line 30 and line 43, changing 100 kilowatts (kW) to 25 kW, would also come out. The provisions in subsection 4 on the next page, page 5, that's not in conflict with the bill that was passed out of this Committee and that passed out of the Assembly yesterday. So you wouldn't need to really do anything in section 4. If this bill were enrolled, if S.B. 59 were enrolled, that sort of conflict, I mean it's technically a conflict, but the sections are not inconsistent so they can both be codified without any problem.

MS. STOKEY:

We changed 100 kW to 25 kW because we were concerned about distribution upgrades. We want to make sure the customer using the system actually pays for upgrades. I am not sure if S.B. 59 deals with that, but we want to keep it at 25 kW. I spoke with the sponsor of the bill, and he wanted me tell this Committee he has not agreed to any amendments that will probably be coming forward today.

RETT JESSE (Nevada Controls, LLC):

I support A.B. 359. I am an engineering contractor with Nevada Controls, LLC. We install small hydroelectric systems. Section 2, subsection 2 of this bill states "The regulations must provide that the amount of any rebate provided pursuant to the Program must not exceed 50 percent ... ."

I do not disagree with that wording; however, the agreement was that the wording for solar and wind programs would be the same. It is not certain this wording will occur in the solar and wind programs. I would like to see that

language deleted, allowing the PUCN to handle the rebates as they have in the past. We had an agreement with Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea that the 50 percent rebate would be applied to all the renewable-energy programs, not just hydroelectric.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Are you saying you would like to see that applied to the wind program?

MR. JESSE:

Yes, wind and solar programs, or delete the language and let the PUCN handle it as they have in the past. My recommendation is to delete the additional language in section 2, subsection 2, of A.B. 359.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Is Assemblyman Goicoechea amenable to that?

MR. JESSE:

I am not sure. The agreement was that programs would be treated uniformly in other legislation which may or may not pass. It will not be uniform if this passes and the other bills do not. I would like to leave it in the hands of the PUCN.

LUKE BUSBY (Clean Energy Center, LLC):

I represent a small renewable-energy developer in Reno. We oppose the current version of A.B. 359 and have proposed an amendment ([Exhibit C](#)). The problem addressed by the proposed amendment is ambiguity in chapter 704 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* regarding the definition of "premises." The amendment provides a clear definition of "premises." We petitioned the PUCN for clarification on this issue for a wind project we propose to build. The PUCN will not rule on the issue until after the end of this Session.

This bill provides an exception for waterpower projects and states that those projects can be built on contiguous property. The same rationale for waterpower projects owned by the same person applies to other renewable technologies. If the Legislature moves forward and adopts an exception for one particular technology, the PUCN may rule that energy projects using other technologies cannot be built on contiguous land owned by the same person. It is difficult for us to understand why allowing someone to build a renewable-energy system in accordance with the existing net metering rules on contiguous property that person owns would be harmful to anyone else.

The other proposed amendments to A.B. 359 would bring the net metering provisions in compliance with the overall cap proposed in the Governor's bill, S.B. 59. The proposed amendments would also delete other changes we believe harmful to renewable energy, including lowering the net metering cap.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I am concerned the definition of "premises" means all the contiguous real property owned and/or leased by a customer of the utility. For example, I have 800 acres, and if I rent or lease property to my neighbor to provide power to reduce his bill for sprinkler irrigation, that would be a long distance, maybe two to three miles. If the cost to distribute power over that distance is placed on the utility, and ultimately the ratepayers, then it seems as if the power company should get something back for their investment.

MR. BUSBY:

In a case like that, the premises issue would not solve the big economic problem. Assembly Bill 359 does not change the rule that people must put all their equipment behind their meters. According to net metering rules, if someone were to build a distant project, a line would have to be installed all the way to the load, and the equipment would have to be placed behind the utility's meter. There is an exception in A.B. 359 that states waterpower energy systems can be hooked up to the transmission or distribution system. This exception would not apply to any other technologies. The problem you are pointing out would not exist for any other renewable-energy project.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Would it still exist for hydroelectric power?

MR. BUSBY:

Yes, it would, but that would be a consequence of the existing language of the bill, not our amendment, [Exhibit C](#).

RICHARD HAMILTON (Clean Energy Center, LLC):

We are a technology-agnostic, renewable-energy development company. We employ a dozen people and provide benefits to them. We have been able to grow our company slowly, even as the economy has been shrinking.

I am here to describe the practical implications of the premises issue on one of our projects. We are negotiating with Truckee Meadows Community

College (TMCC) and Desert Research Institute (DRI) for a community program to provide workforce training, resource assessment and research. The program includes two wind turbines located on their property. This program is good for these institutions. It will provide an education platform on which to build an indigenous renewable-energy workforce and attract students from out of state. It also will provide lower cost energy to the higher education system which will help with their budget crisis.

During construction, we can provide up to 50 jobs. During operation and maintenance, we can provide approximately six jobs. There will be a large, positive impact from this project, but without the change provided through this legislation, the project is potentially dead.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Do you depend on grants and other financial sources for this project?

MR. HAMILTON:

This project would receive no money from the educational institutions, from TMCC or DRI. We have tax grant issues, and we are mired in regulatory issues impairing our ability to build this project. The clock is ticking with the tax laws, and we only have until the end of 2011.

MR. BUSBY:

We would appreciate the opportunity to work with the bill's sponsor and NV Energy to develop language that would allow this project to move forward.

JOE JOHNSON (Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter):

We support A.B. 359 but, we have two issues. The cap should conform to S.B. 59. Secondly, the change from the 100 kW limit for real net metering to 25 kW is a significant retreat and potentially could affect many school installations that are already authorized at 50 kW or 100 kW. I spoke with the bill's sponsor who is not necessarily in agreement with this and who did not address the issue directly, as it was not part of the original proposal.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Are the exemptions for schools' 100 kW projects?

MR. JOHNSON:

The statutory limitations and authorizations are for 50 kW. The PUCN is able to authorize another 50 kW. Renewable-energy systems are about 100 kW for public buildings and schools, which is the highest percentage of what has been installed in the latest authorizations.

DOUG BUSSELMAN (Nevada Farm Bureau Federation):

We support A.B. 359. Nevada Farm Bureau Federation members are involved in various hydroelectric projects. This bill would help them move forward and launch their projects.

ASSEMBLYMAN PETE GOICOECHEA (Assembly District No. 35):

I have seen only one of the proposed amendments to this bill, [Exhibit C](#). I will leave it to the discretion of the Committee.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

There is a proposed amendment from Luke Busby, [Exhibit C](#).

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA:

I saw that proposed amendment, and I did not support it.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I realize this proposed amendment has the potential to open this up. There may be a way to craft the proposed amendment to limit it to a specific project.

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA:

My concern was if it is opened up to everyone and we start discussing the ability to lease property, once a system is built, control of the property may be lost. This could be an issue.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Senator Settlemeyer brought that up.

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA:

That is my concern, so if there is a way we can craft the language to tighten it up on a particular project, I would not have a problem with it.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Mr. Nichols was looking for a way to craft the proposed amendment.



MR. NICHOLS:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have heard the testimony and the bill sponsors sound amenable to something I think we can probably confer after the Committee is over, with Judy [Stokey] and Jason Geddes and Mr. Busby, and see if there is something that works for everyone. We could put something together and get it back to you quickly.

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA:

I do not want to jeopardize the bill.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

On page 4, line 30, the bill proposes to reduce net metering capacity from 100 kW to 25 kW. Joe Johnson from the Sierra Club testified that most of the schools being rehabbed have authorization for 50 kW. They then have to go to the PUCN for authorization for an additional 50 kW to reach the 100 kW level.

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA:

Unless there are some concerns from Judy Stokey and NV Energy, I see no reason not to go back to 100 kW.

ROSE MCKINNEY-JAMES (The Solar Alliance):

Given the comments of Mr. Geddes and others with respect to S.B. 59 and conformance, which was not discussed with the sponsor of the bill, I want to make sure that Assemblyman Goicoechea is aware of the inconsistency. If he has a position, we would appreciate having that addressed

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Do you want the discrepancies with S.B. 59 addressed?

MS. MCKINNEY-JAMES:

Yes, that would be section 7 of A.B. 359.

MS. STOKEY:

The bill is meant to handle distribution upgrades, not the school issue. The PUCN accepts and grants petitions for waivers to schools on the limit. We would like to keep it at 25 kW because of upgrades that would be needed. We do not think other customers should have to pay for that. We would like to

speak later with Mr. Busby about higher education and wind power systems. There is a petition in front of the PUCN on that issue.

CHAD DICKASON (Hamilton Solar):

We have had challenges working with the utility regarding the issue of 25 kW versus 100 kW as proposed in section 7, subsection 2 of A.B. 359. Any upgrades to a system should be paid for by the customer. Our concern is making sure there is a method of arbitration. We have encountered situations in which our systems have met the National Electrical Code, but have not met the utility's standards. We want to ensure there is a method of arbitration so the cost of a system could not unreasonably increase.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

There are a number of things to work out on this bill. We will process this bill this week, because it has an exemption. Any conflicts with S.B. 59 need to be addressed.

Ms. Wagner, is there a mechanism in the PUCN whereby some of these concerns can be addressed?

REBECCA D. WAGNER (Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada):

Do you mean a mechanism to address arbitration on issues related to the 25 kW versus 100 kW? We do not have anything specific, but we could probably work something out.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 359 and open the hearing on A.B. 255.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 255 (1st Reprint)**: Revises procedures relating to certain accidents occurring in the course of employment. (BDR 53-102)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MAGGIE CARLTON (Assembly District No. 14):

This is the third and last bill that came out of the Legislative Commission's Subcommittee to Review the U.S. Department of Labor's Report on the Nevada Occupational Safety and Health Program. This is what I call "The family bill." We heard heart-wrenching testimony in front of the Subcommittee and during Nevada OSHA hearings on work-related accidents in southern Nevada and how the families of deceased workers felt left out. This bill attempts to

keep grieving families current with investigations involving their deceased loved ones.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:  
Is this bill exempt?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:  
Yes, it is.

DONALD E. JAYNE (Administrator, Division of Industrial Relations, Department of Business and Industry):

This bill is exempt from recall. Assemblywoman Carlton addressed the highlights of A.B. 255. Section 1 of the bill outlines some of the duties we have in the Occupational Safety and Health Administration Review Board (Nevada OSHA), Division of Industrial Relations (DIR), Department of Business and Industry (DBI), regarding information given to families. In addition to fatalities, this bill also describes what Nevada OSHA defines as a "catastrophe." A catastrophe is an accident resulting in the hospitalization of three or more employees.

Section 3 is an important part of this bill. It directs us to make our best efforts to contact and interview family members. In the past, these people were left out of the process because Nevada OSHA did not interview them. Some of the families wanted to be interviewed and some did not.

JACK MALLORY (International Union of Painters and Allied Trades, District Council 15; Nevada State AFL-CIO):

We supported A.B. 255 in its original version. In discussions with other interested parties and the DIR, some of the things in the original bill could not be facilitated by the DIR, but we support this bill.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:  
We will close the hearing on A.B. 255 and open the hearing on A.B. 390.

ASSEMBLY BILL 390: Revises provisions relating to energy assistance.  
(BDR 58-801)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MAGGIE CARLTON (Assembly District No. 14):

The idea for an energy assistance bill was brought to me by a constituent who lives in a mobile home park in Las Vegas. Residents of the park have meters on

their individual homes, but the community itself is master-metered. Residents who have meters on their homes get an itemized bill based on electricity usage. There is a universal energy charge (UEC) on their electric bills, but because they are not recognized as customers of the utility and because the park is master-metered, they cannot apply for energy assistance. This constituent had been trying to help an elderly neighbor apply for energy assistance, but because she was not recognized as a customer, she could not go through the application process. This bill would not guarantee an applicant will get assistance, but it would allow a person to apply for assistance and be recognized as a customer.

Ms. STOKEY:  
We understand the issues and support this bill.

DEBRA GALLO (Southwest Gas Corporation):  
We also support A.B. 390.

Ms. WAGNER:  
We are neutral on this bill, but there is no fiscal impact.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:  
Who determines if a person qualifies for assistance?

Ms. WAGNER:  
That is a technical issue for the utilities.

Ms. GALLO:  
The Division of Welfare and Supportive Services (DWSS), Department of Health and Human Services, would take the applications. We assess the UEC to our customers who are the master-meter operators. They probably split the charge and prorate the bills to the residents. We do this in Arizona, a state that allows the master-metered customers access to the assistance program.

Ms. STOKEY:  
We need to find a way to do this, but since they are not our customers, we do not know how much power they are using. We would have to work through the landlord to get that information.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

The DWSS put a fiscal note on this bill. They had to determine how they would handle this and how many people might be able to apply for assistance. That fiscal note was removed because it became de minimis. People will apply through the DWSS as they are already doing.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

How difficult is it for a person who needs assistance to go through the system?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON:

It is not that onerous. The DWSS will help people through the process as much as possible. The stumbling block my constituents encountered was they were not recognized as utility customers, and therefore they were not allowed to receive the application.

Ms. STOKEY:

We do not have many mass-metered units remaining. We are trying not to install them anymore, so over time, this issue should diminish.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 390 and open the work session on A.B. 358 with the work session documents ([Exhibit D](#)).

**[ASSEMBLY BILL 358 \(2nd Reprint\)](#)**: Revises provisions governing certain manufactured buildings. (BDR 43-1069)

TOM CLARK (Quick Space):

Following the hearing on A.B. 358 last week, we recognized that putting the definition of special purpose commercial coach in statute would be an arduous task. We have proposed a new amendment, page 5, [Exhibit D](#), that would compel the Manufactured Housing Division (MHD), DBI, to promulgate regulations on special purpose commercial coaches at the same time they are promulgating regulations on portable buildings. The amendment also places the definition of special purpose commercial coach in the definition of commercial coach, which already exists in statute.

SCOTT YOUNG (Policy Analyst):

The original proposed amendment with the new section 3 to A.B. 358 is in the work session packet, [Exhibit D](#), page 3. Mr. Clark's proposed amendment with the new section 4 is in the work session packet, [Exhibit D](#), page 5.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I understand the concept of the amendment, but why do we want to create a special standard? Are the safety standards the same, whether the building is public or nonpublic, or whether the building is rented or not?

MR. CLARK:

The distinction between public use and nonpublic use applies to commercial coaches used on construction sites. We hope to work with the MHD to pass regulations to define that these buildings are not open to the public. These buildings would not be seen at a golf tournament. A contractor such as Quick Space would be able to move those units around a construction site without having them reinspected and having new fees placed upon them each time they are used. Contractors are going to protect their assets. When the public is accessing these buildings, there is a need for a higher level of safety. On a jobsite, we are hoping to not have to have the buildings reinspected and new fees paid.

JAMES V. DEPROSSE (Administrator, Manufactured Housing Division, Department of Business and Industry):

The MHD is required by statute to develop regulations for the installation of these buildings. There is a section in the installation standards manual for commercial coach buildings which specifies the differentiation between nonpublic- and public-use buildings. There are higher standards for a public-use application, a portable classroom in a school or a sales office at a housing subdivision, than there are for a nonpublic-use application. We require stamped drawings from an engineer and the building's manufacturer's installation requirements for public-use applications. The safety installation requirements are well-defined. It is the same kind of building whether it is for nonpublic use on a construction site or on another site. It is already defined in regulation and in the installation manual we are expected to develop through regulation.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Are you saying you do not need this amendment?

MR. DEPROSSE:

Yes, the installation requirements for the public and nonpublic buildings are already defined in our regulations and in our installation manual which we are required to create through statute and regulations.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I recall that Mr. Clark's client had problems trying to get these buildings installed. People were going back and forth trying to get buildings inspected.

MR. DEPROSSE:

We get very few complaints about delayed inspections. Regardless of style, if a building is installed by a licensed installer, a reinspection is rarely needed.

MR. CLARK:

The concern my client has is whether each time a special purpose commercial coach is placed on a job site if this is allowable without having the coach reinspected by the MHD. This is why we are trying to open the regulations to clarify what is and is not going to be inspected and when the fee will be charged. In 2001, there have been commitments to get clarifying regulations about this, and it has not yet happened. Mr. deProsse has made a commitment that this will be dealt with in regulation. The amendment ensures it actually occurs this time.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I was told that until recently there was a different person in charge of MHD and the new individual would not be repeating the errors of his predecessor. Has your client had any problem with the current administration?

MR. CLARK:

There have been no concerns over implementation, but there have been concerns about the determination of what should be permitted and inspected. We are hoping to clear that up so we can work with the MHD to define exactly what will be inspected and when fees will be expected.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Is the amendment more important than the bill? I am willing to support the bill as written, but I do not support the amendment.

Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy  
May 30, 2011  
Page 16

MR. CLARK:

The bill is important and so is the amendment. We would like both. We would not want the bill to die because of the amendment. Maybe having this hearing will compel the MHD to make clear regulations.

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

I will close the work session hearing on A.B. 358.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 358.

SENATOR HALSETH SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR PARKS VOTED NO.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

We will return to A.B. 255 which was discussed earlier in the meeting.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I appreciate this bill and am supportive of notifying the families. This bill goes beyond that by including not only the families, but attorneys, union representatives and everyone else. Is this how it is done in other states?

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

We will hold this bill until Wednesday when we can have more experts testify and answer some of these questions. We will return to A.B. 390, the energy assistance bill.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 390.

SENATOR COPENING SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

\* \* \* \* \*



Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy  
May 30, 2011  
Page 17

CHAIR SCHNEIDER:

Seeing no more business, the Senate Committee on Commerce, Labor and Energy is adjourned at 4:03 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Linda Hiller,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Michael A. Schneider, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>EXHIBITS</u>			
Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 359	C	Luke Busby	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 358	D	Michael A. Schneider	Work Session Documents