

No. 73
STATE OF MICHIGAN
Journal of the Senate
103rd Legislature
REGULAR SESSION OF 2025

Senate Chamber, Lansing, Thursday, September 4, 2025.

10:00 a.m.

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

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

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

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

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

Senator Roger Victory of the 31st District offered the following invocation:

Our heavenly Father, we come to You in prayer on this beautiful September morning, a day of Your creation. We ask that Your hand of guidance be upon the Senate Chamber as we do the work on behalf of the people of this wonderful state. As we start this day, let us be reminded of the words of Matthew 19:26: “With man this is impossible, but with God all things are possible.” This, we ask in Your name. Amen.

The President pro tempore, Senator Moss, led the members of the Senate in recital of the *Pledge of Allegiance*.

Motions and Communications

Senators Nesbitt and Chang entered the Senate Chamber.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Victory’s statement is as follows:

It’s probably not as earth-shaking as the good U.P. sweet corn that’s awaiting us here, but it is something important that I expect to bring to the Senate.

I rise today to share bittersweet news that my legislative director, David Chhum, has accepted a new position across the Capitol in the House of Representatives. I want to express my sincere gratitude for all of his hard work and service to my constituents. He has had a tremendous impact and I’d like to thank him for it. David has worked tirelessly to represent my office throughout the 31st Senate District—attending events and building relationships throughout our community. As he has grown in his career and moved into the legislative process, he has worked closely with key stakeholders and done excellent work to enhance my legislative portfolio. And now, as he goes forward to begin the next phase in his career, I want to share my excitement and wish him the best as he continues to make an impact for the people of Michigan.

Also—this is not on the script, but I think this is an example of a true Michigan story. David was raised here in West Michigan, saw opportunity, yet he decided to take on job opportunities in California, Arizona, and Florida—but his heart was truly in the state of Michigan. After all those opportunities, he has returned to the state of Michigan and continues to serve the state in this fashion.

With that, please join me in welcoming and encouraging him in his new journey.

Senator Brinks entered the Senate Chamber.

Senator Lauwers moved that Senator Runestad be temporarily excused from today’s session.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Singh moved that Senators Bayer, Geiss, Santana and Shink be temporarily excused from today’s session.

The motion prevailed.

Recess

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

The motion prevailed, the time being 10:06 a.m.

11:05 a.m.

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

During the recess, Senators Shink, Runestad, Geiss, Santana and Bayer entered the Senate Chamber.

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

Senators Irwin, McBroom, Shink, Polehanki, Chang, Bayer, Cavanagh, Daley and McMorro introduced
Senate Bill No. 518, entitled

A bill to amend 2008 PA 295, entitled “Clean and renewable energy and energy waste reduction act,” by amending section 5 (MCL 460.1005), as amended by 2023 PA 235, and by adding part 9.

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

Senators McBroom, Irwin, Shink, Polehanki, Cavanagh, Chang, Bayer, Daley and McMorro introduced
Senate Bill No. 519, entitled

A bill to amend 2008 PA 295, entitled “Clean and renewable energy and energy waste reduction act,” (MCL 460.1001 to 460.1232) by adding sections 245 and 247.

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

Senators Damoose, Bayer and Webber introduced

Senate Bill No. 520, entitled

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by amending section 462f (MCL 750.462f), as amended by 2016 PA 338.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety.

Senators Damoose, Bayer and Webber introduced

Senate Bill No. 521, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 16w of chapter XVII (MCL 777.16w), as amended by 2016 PA 486.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety.

Senators Bayer, Damoose, Chang, Webber and Cavanagh introduced

Senate Bill No. 522, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 288, entitled “Probate code of 1939,” by amending section 19b of chapter XIII (MCL 712A.19b), as amended by 2023 PA 295.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety.

Senators Chang, Damoose, Bayer, Webber and Cavanagh introduced

Senate Bill No. 523, entitled

A bill to amend 1975 PA 238, entitled “Child protection law,” by amending section 18 (MCL 722.638), as amended by 2022 PA 66.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety.

Senators Webber, Damoose and Bayer introduced

Senate Bill No. 524, entitled

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by amending sections 448, 449, 450, 451, 454, and 462 (MCL 750.448, 750.449, 750.450, 750.451, 750.454, and 750.462), section 448 as amended by 2002 PA 45, sections 449 and 462 as amended by 2002 PA 46, section 450 as amended by 2014 PA 326, section 451 as amended by 2016 PA 338, and section 454 as amended by 2002 PA 672.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety.

Senator Hertel introduced

Senate Bill No. 525, entitled

A bill to amend 2016 PA 436, entitled “Unmanned aircraft systems act,” by amending section 7 (MCL 259.307), as added by 2018 PA 442.

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

Senator Moss introduced

Senate Bill No. 526, entitled

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” by amending sections 80110 and 80112 (MCL 324.80110 and 324.80112), section 80110 as amended by 2020 PA 72 and section 80112 as amended by 2006 PA 237.

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

Senator McBroom introduced

Senate Bill No. 527, entitled

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending sections 3208 and 3212 (MCL 600.3208 and 600.3212), section 3212 as amended by 2019 PA 142.

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

Senator McBroom introduced

Senate Bill No. 528, entitled

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending sections 3216 and 3220 (MCL 600.3216 and 600.3220).

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

Senator Moss introduced

Senate Bill No. 529, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” (MCL 168.1 to 168.992) by adding sections 483b, 544g, 590i, and 957a.

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

Senator Moss introduced

Senate Bill No. 530, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” (MCL 168.1 to 168.992) by adding section 482g.

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

Senators Irwin and Moss introduced

Senate Bill No. 531, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending sections 482, 590h, 685, 957, and 958 (MCL 168.482, 168.590h, 168.685, 168.957, and 168.958), section 482 as amended by 2018 PA 608, sections 590h and 685 as amended by 2018 PA 650, and section 957 as amended by 2018 PA 120, and by adding sections 482f and 547.

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

House Bill No. 4706, entitled

A bill to make, supplement, adjust, and consolidate appropriations for various state departments and agencies, the judicial branch, and the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026; to provide for certain conditions on appropriations; and to provide for the expenditure of the appropriations.

The House of Representatives has passed the bill and ordered that it be given immediate effect.

The bill was read a first and second time by title.

Senator Singh moved that rule 3.203 be suspended and that the bill be referred to the Committee of the Whole and placed on the order of General Orders.

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

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

Motions and Communications

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

Senate Bill No. 501

House Bill No. 4101

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

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

General Orders

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

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

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

Senate Bill No. 501, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 16335, 17801, and 17821 (MCL 333.16335, 333.17801, and 333.17821), as amended by 2009 PA 55, and by adding sections 17820a and 17820b.

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

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

Senate Bill No. 398, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 6230 and 6234 (MCL 333.6230 and 333.6234), as added by 2012 PA 501.

Substitute (S-1).

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

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

House Bill No. 4101, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” (MCL 333.1101 to 333.25211) by adding section 16188.

Substitute (S-1).

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

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

Motions and Communications

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

Senate Bill No. 398

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

Third Reading of Bills

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

Senate Bill No. 394

Senate Bill No. 395

Senate Bill No. 396

Senate Bill No. 398

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:
Senate Bill No. 394, entitled
A bill to establish the ownership of and conveyance rights associated with subsurface pore space.
The question being on the passage of the bill,
The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 219

Yeas—29

Albert	Daley	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Anthony	Damoose	Lauwers	Santana
Bellino	Hauck	McCann	Singh
Brinks	Hertel	McMorrow	Theis
Bumstead	Hoitenga	Moss	Victory
Camilleri	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Webber
Cavanagh	Johnson	Outman	Wojno
Cherry			

Nays—7

Bayer	Geiss	Lindsey	Shink
Chang	Irwin	McBroom	

Excused—0

Not Voting—1

Runestad

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senators McBroom and Lindsey, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 394 and moved that the statements they made during the discussion of the bill be printed as their reasons for voting “no.”
The motion prevailed.
Senator McBroom’s statement is as follows:
Mr. President, I would echo some of the things that the previous speaker from the 18th District mentioned, but would also like to add that for those of us who represent the Upper Peninsula—who are particularly aggrieved by the energy policy that was passed, which relies so heavily upon this idea of carbon capture in order to be implemented, without the consideration that the geology of the Upper Peninsula does not allow for carbon capture to be done in this way at all. Therefore, we’re standing on the cusp of losing vital infrastructure and energy generation in the short future. There’s other legislation to rectify that situation that’s desperately needed and should be linked to this as quickly as possible. That’s why I’m voting “no.”

Senator Lindsey’s statement is as follows:
The Senator from the 15th District just asked a few questions that he probably meant as rhetorical, talking about the future and the potential consequences of this legislation—the potential negative consequences—why would we leave it to future generations? That’s not what I rose to speak about, and although it was

probably a rhetorical question, I would submit that there is a simple answer to that. We will all be out of office, likely many of us will be dead, and it will be our children, our grandchildren, and their grandchildren who will bear these consequences, not us. In the meantime, the people who fund this town and the people who fund Washington, D.C., will reap a huge benefit from passing this legislation, and that's what I actually rose to talk about.

It strikes me as so bizarre that we're moving this legislation when we know that, ideologically, the people who are on the left side of the spectrum believe that carbon capture is a smoke-and-mirrors thing. It's not a good way to go about achieving the political goals that they believe in. Then on the right, most of us believe that the whole environmental Green New Deal scam is a scam. I believe that. So, we both disagree with this, but we're going to show up in the Michigan Senate and pass legislation codifying a system for carbon sequestration in Michigan. Why? Is there more to it? I think there is.

I think the answer to why we're doing what we're doing today—this is a “no” vote explanation by the way—I think the reason we're doing what we're doing today is because of federal tax credits. It's because some people are going to get enormously wealthy from tapping into this scheme of carbon sequestration. I read a report last night that all of the applications that have been initiated to tap into the federal tax credit program for carbon sequestration amount to \$800 billion. Eight hundred billion dollars. Who pays for this? Well, there are generally two ways that we can pay for a tax advantage that we're going to give to companies that use this system. We could do it the honest way, and take money from the people of the United States, including, of course, the people from Michigan, and transfer it directly to them, or the federal government could just print more money and we could all pay for it through inflation. I don't think for a minute that we'd be standing here debating this legislation today if it weren't for the case that people who are very important, very influential, and have a lot of resources on both sides of the political aisle, know that if the state of Michigan passes our own version of carbon sequestration regulation, that that allows them a fast track to tap into federal tax credits to get this money, and the people will be paying the cost of this. I will not buy into, you know, the environmental alarmism of, How bad could carbon sequestration be? But I will point out it's a fair concern.

We in Michigan are sitting here talking about bipartisan efforts to tackle PFAS contamination. Do we want to have our children and their children have that conversation about what—and by the way, is it a real concern? How tight is the legislation on this? Let me just give you an example. It talks about carbon sequestration in terms of, “geologic storage of carbon dioxide streams,” and then goes on to define, “‘Carbon dioxide stream’ means carbon dioxide that has been captured from an emission source, incidental associated substances derived from the source materials and the capture process, and”—and—“any substances added to enable or improve the injection process.” I wonder what any substance used for injection could involve?

Again, I don't think we'll have to answer that question. Our children and our grandchildren and the future residents of Michigan will have to answer that question, and they may bear the cost because we wanted to pass legislation today to help a few powerful rich entities capture federal tax credits on the backs of the American people. I'll vote “no,” and I hope you do too.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert's first statement, in which Senator Theis concurred, is as follows:

I will be voting “yes” on this legislation, but I want to make it perfectly clear that it has nothing to do with the faulty arguments used by environmental alarmists who support carbon capture for very different reasons. I did not support the energy mandates approved by Michigan Democrats here a few years ago, but I support this legislation because it makes sense to authorize permitting for carbon capture at the state level, rather than the federal level.

Injection wells have been utilized in Michigan for many decades, and have been done safely. These wells are thousands of feet below the earth's surface, underneath many layers of impenetrable substrate formations. We do this for natural gas without issue, and carbon dioxide is a safer gas as it is not combustible. There are benefits to this legislation. Allowing carbon capture permitting at the state level may increase productivity in active oil and gas wells here in Michigan. This could help boost Michigan's oil and gas revenue, and also have a net result in lowering carbon emissions.

I am not against green energy in itself, but I am against government mandates, especially when they make energy more costly and unreliable for Michigan residents. These mandates are based on an ideology that carbon dioxide is inherently bad. When I ask some supporters of this legislation the basic question, “What should our target level of carbon be?” I don't get any answers. As far as I can tell, the goal is to reduce carbon in our atmosphere as much as possible. What would happen if we actually went all the way, and successfully

rid carbon from our planet’s atmosphere? Well, to start, the earth’s temperature would drop to an uninhabitable level, plant life would die, and we would run out of oxygen. The point being, carbon is essential to life.

If we really want to get serious about addressing greenhouse gases, we should maybe be addressing what amounts to half of the greenhouse effect. Dihydrogen monoxide. This substance causes many thousands to die annually, it is the cause of many natural disasters, and in the winter it causes many traffic accidents. Perhaps we should create a factory-sized dehumidifier and get this substance out of our atmosphere. Of course, this is commonly known as water, and we should get it out of the air? Well obviously, I’m joking here, but I exaggerate to illustrate a point that we need to accept that there is a natural order of things we cannot control. We need carbon dioxide to live. That does not mean we should eliminate all regulations. It was not that long ago when many of our urban centers suffered from unchecked hydro-carbon emissions, leading to severely unhealthy air pollution. I definitely think regulations controlling pollutions serve a common good, but we seem to be going too far on regulating carbon emissions in general.

The bottom line is that I support this legislation before us today because it’s a step toward improving our energy policy. This should be an easy win. However, the recent energy reforms passed by Michigan Democrats prohibited carbon capture as counting towards clean energy when it’s used to support oil production. As one can see, I have mixed feelings about this bill. On one hand, the support itself makes practical sense. On the other hand, looking at the bill in the context of our current energy policies in Michigan, the benefits become more convoluted. The mandates approved recently in Michigan are unworkable. To conclude, I support this bill based on its own merits. That being said, I look forward to seeing our unsustainable energy policies repealed next term.

Senator Albert’s second statement is as follows:

I wanted to respond to a couple of questions that my colleague from the 15th District mentioned.

The first one was a question of, Why are we—I presume he means us on the politically right side of the spectrum—why are we opposed to renewable resources? I didn’t want to speak for everybody, but I think, by and large, we’re not opposed to renewable resources. I disagree with the premise. I know, I specifically, personally, am not opposed to renewable resources for clean energy. What I’m opposed to is the government mandates of it, and mandating a technology on a scale that it’s not ready for. That’s what the problem is, because in fact, that impacts real people in a negative way. It makes the energy that they need, to survive and to live, too expensive. So I guess that’s the answer to that question.

The next one was about carbon capture being expensive. Why would we want to support a policy that’s going to increase costs? Again, I disagree with the premise. It is the Democrats’ energy bill that was passed last term that mandated if we’re going to allow gas generation of electric energy, it’s going to have to have at least 80 percent of carbon capture. We didn’t put that mandate in, you guys did. So it’s your mandate that you guys passed last term, that is causing this additional cost to come in. The question of this bill is whether or not we should allow the permitting at the state level or not, not whether or not we should mandate carbon capture. So, for both of those questions, I disagree with the premise, and I feel like we’re on strong ground to be a “yes” on this.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 395, entitled

A bill to amend 1929 PA 16, entitled “An act to regulate the business of carrying or transporting, buying, selling, or dealing in crude oil or petroleum or its products, or certain substances consisting primarily of carbon dioxide through pipe lines; to authorize the use of public highways and the condemnation of private property; to regulate the purchase and storage of crude oil or petroleum or certain substances consisting primarily of carbon dioxide; to provide for the control and regulation of all corporations, associations, and persons engaged in such business, by the Michigan public service commission; to define the powers and duties of the commission in relation thereto; and to prescribe penalties,” by amending section 1 (MCL 483.1), as amended by 2014 PA 85.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

Roll Call No. 220

Yeas—31

Albert	Daley	Lauwers	Runestad
Anthony	Damoose	Lindsey	Santana
Bellino	Hauck	McCann	Singh

Brinks
Bumstead
Camilleri
Cavanagh
Cherry

Hertel
Hoitenga
Huizenga
Johnson
Klinefelt

McMorrow
Moss
Nesbitt
Outman
Polehanki

Theis
Victory
Webber
Wojno

Nays—6

Bayer
Chang

Geiss
Irwin

McBroom

Shink

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 396, entitled

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” by amending sections 502 and 1301 (MCL 324.502 and 324.1301), section 502 as amended by 2004 PA 587 and section 1301 as amended by 2018 PA 451, by adding section 52509, and by adding subchapter 6 to chapter 3 of article III.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator McBroom offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 28, following line 14, by inserting:

“(3) Notwithstanding subsection (2), the authority to promulgate rules under this part expires 12 years after the effective date of the amendatory act that added this section.”.

2. Amend page 41, line 1, after “**24.328.**” by inserting “**The authority to promulgate rules under this part expires 12 years after the effective date of the amendatory act that added this section.**”.

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Senator McBroom offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 4, line 10 after “**credited**” by striking out the balance of the subsection and inserting “**to the Michigan natural resources trust fund provided for in part 19.**”.

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

Senator McBroom offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 4, line 10 after “**credited**” by striking out the balance of the subsection and inserting “**to the neighborhood road fund created in section 13c of 1951 PA 51, MCL 257.663c.**”.

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

Senator Bayer offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 18, line 25, after “**The**” by striking out the balance of the line through “**division**” on line 26 and inserting “**department may issue a permit if the department**”.

2. Amend page 20, following line 8 by inserting:

“(h) The sequestration project will not contaminate groundwater or drinking water or pose a risk to human health or the environment.

(i) If carbon dioxide leaks from the injection well or compressor, the carbon dioxide will not flow or accumulate in a location where it would endanger public health or safety.

(j) The sequestration project will not use the surface land of or the pore space underlying a state park; local park; state designated wilderness or natural area; or area of state land that is being conserved or managed for biological diversity or to protect ecologically significant features, plants, or wildlife.

(k) The location of each injection well and each compressor in the project meets the following minimum setback requirements, with setback distances measured from the nearest edge of the perimeter fencing of the carbon dioxide sequestration project:

Setback Description	Setback Distance
Occupied community buildings, schools, hospitals, or clinics located on nonparticipating surface estate	2,000 feet from the nearest point on the outer wall
Public road right-of-way	50 feet measured from the nearest edge of a public road right-of-way
Nonparticipating residential surface estate	2,000 feet measured from the nearest shared property line".

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Senator Shink offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 22, following line 4, by inserting:

"(4) If groundwater monitoring required by a permit issued or by rules promulgated under this part or required by a class VI well permit issued by the United States Environment Protection Agency indicates that a source of drinking water has been rendered unsafe for drinking by humans or livestock, the carbon sequestration project operator shall provide an alternate supply of potable drinking water within 24 hours after the monitoring results become available and an alternate supply of water that is safe for other necessary uses within 30 days after the monitoring results become available. The operator shall continue to provide alternate supplies of both potable water and water that is safe for other uses until additional monitoring by the carbon sequestration project operator shows that the original source of drinking water is safe for drinking and other uses or until a permanent alternate supply of water is identified and provided.

(5) If there is a significant leak of carbon dioxide from an injection well, monitoring well, or other point on the surface, that is associated with the carbon sequestration project, all individuals residing within 1 mile of the point of the leak at the time of the leak are entitled to medical monitoring. The monitoring shall be of a scope and duration determined by the department of health and human services and be conducted at the expense of the carbon sequestration project operator."

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

Senator Bayer offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 29, line 2, by striking out **"division,"** and inserting **"department,"**.

2. Amend page 29, line 3, by striking out **"division a fee set by the division for each"** and inserting **"department a fee of \$1.20 per"**.

3. Amend page 29, line 4, after **"year."** by striking out the balance of the line through **"injected."** on line 10 and inserting:

"(2)".

4. Amend page 29, line 11, after **"adjust"** by striking out **"this maximum amount"** and inserting **"the fee"**.

5. Amend page 29, line 16, after **"(a)"** by striking out **"10%"** and inserting **"20%"**.

6. Amend page 29, line 19, after **"(b)"** by striking out the balance of the line through **"The"** on line 20 and inserting **"5% in the"**.

7. Amend page 29, line 21, by striking out **"(ii) The"** and inserting **"(c) 20% in the"**.

8. Amend page 29, line 22, by striking out **"(iii) The"** and inserting **"(d) 10% to the"**.

9. Amend page 29, line 23, by striking out **"(c) The balance to"** and inserting **"(e) 45% in"**.

10. Amend page 31, line 27, after **"section"** by striking out **"65115(3)(c)"** and inserting **"65115(3)(e)"**.

11. Amend page 32, line 2, after **"The"** by striking out **"division"** and inserting **"department"**.

12. Amend page 32, line 4, after **"The"** by striking out **"division"** and inserting **"department"**.

13. Amend page 32, line 6, by striking out the balance of the section and inserting:

"(a) Not less than 70% for grants for projects that reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases by installing electric vehicle charging stations, otherwise electrifying end uses currently fueled by fossil fuels, increasing renewable energy production in this state, installing energy-efficient heat pumps, improving energy efficiency or weatherization of homes, installing battery storage, and installing small-scale solar energy facilities. Priority in awarding grants shall be given to projects located in or benefiting environmental justice communities and low-income residents.

(b) Not less than 30% for statewide mapping of groundwater resources and aquifers in this state and any information technology infrastructure or databases needed to support housing groundwater data or integrating groundwater data with other datasets and databases. If, in any given state fiscal year, the department determines that less than 30% of the fund is needed for the purposes of this subdivision, the department may expend the lesser needed amount, and the amount not spent under this subdivision shall be expended under subdivision (a)."

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Senator Bayer offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 11, line 8, by striking out the balance of the line through **"(b)"** on line 9 and inserting: **"(a)"** and relettering the remaining subdivisions.
2. Amend page 11, line 10, after **"Reforestation"** by striking out **"and other forest management activities"**.
3. Amend page 11, line 11, after **"forest"** by striking out the balance of the section and inserting **"and increase natural sequestration of carbon dioxide."**

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Senator Bayer offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 21, line 17, after **"65110(c)."** by striking out the balance of the subsection and inserting: **"(3) The owner or operator of a carbon sequestration project may be liable for damage, including, but not limited to, wrongful death, bodily injury, or tangible property damage, caused by a release attributable to the sequestration activity, including, but not limited to, damage caused by carbon dioxide or other fluids released from the carbon sequestration project, regardless of who holds title to the carbon dioxide, the pore space, or the surface estate. Liability for damage caused by a release attributable to the sequestration activity that is within a carbon sequestration project or otherwise within an operator's control, including carbon dioxide being transferred from a pipeline to the injection well, may be joint and several with a third party adjudicated to have caused or contributed to the damage.**
- (4) A claim of subsurface trespass is not actionable against an operator or an owner of a sequestration project conducting sequestration activity in accordance with a class VI well permit and a permit issued under this part, unless the claimant proves that either of the following applies to injection or migration of carbon dioxide:**
 - (a) It substantially interferes with the claimant's reasonable use and enjoyment of their real property.**
 - (b) It has caused wrongful death or direct physical injury to a person, an animal, or tangible property."** and renumbering the remaining subsection.
2. Amend page 22, line 12, after **"care"** by striking out the balance of the line through line 7 on page 23 and inserting **"plan for not less than 50 years after the last date of injection. Monitoring required by a postinjection site care plan shall continue until the department certifies the carbon sequestration project as closed."** and renumbering the remaining subsections.
3. Amend page 23, line 9, by striking out **"division"** and inserting **"department"**.
4. Amend page 23, line 10, by striking out **"completion. If the division"** and inserting **"closure. If the department"**.
5. Amend page 23, line 11, after **"project"** by striking out **"completion"** and inserting **"closure"**.
6. Amend page 23, line 12, by striking out **"division"** and inserting **"department"**.
7. Amend page 23, line 16, after **"The"** by striking out **"division"** and inserting **"department"**.
8. Amend page 23, line 17, after **"project"** by striking out **"completion"** and inserting **"closure"**.
9. Amend page 23, line 18, after **"The"** by striking out **"division"** and inserting **"department"**.
10. Amend page 23, line 22, after **"the"** by striking out **"division"** and inserting **"department"**.
11. Amend page 23, line 23, after the first **"project"** by striking out **"completion"** and inserting **"closure"**.
12. Amend page 23, line 24, after **"The"** by striking out **"division"** and inserting **"department"**.
13. Amend page 23, line 25, after the first **"project"** by striking out **"completion if the division"** and inserting **"closure if the department"**.
14. Amend page 23, following line 26, by inserting: **"(a) A minimum postinjection period of 50 years has passed."** and relettering the remaining subdivisions.
15. Amend page 24, line 2, after **"the"** by striking out **"division"** and inserting **"department"**.
16. Amend page 24, line 5, after **"any"** by inserting **"surface or other"**.
17. Amend page 24, line 5, after **"the"** by striking out **"division"** and inserting **"department"**.
18. Amend page 24, line 6, after **"the"** by striking out **"division"** and inserting **"department"**.

- 19. Amend page 24, line 9, after “**under**” by inserting “**state rules and**”.
 - 20. Amend page 24, line 12, after “**under**” by inserting “**state rules and**”.
 - 21. Amend page 24, line 13, after “**other**” by inserting “**state rules and**”.
 - 22. Amend page 24, line 15, after “**(c)**” by striking out “**Project**” and inserting “**Location-specific**”.
 - 23. Amend page 24, line 16, after “**reservoir,**” by striking out “**and**”.
 - 24. Amend page 24, line 17, after “**emplaced**” by striking out the balance of the subdivision and inserting a comma and “**and the carbon sequestration project and carbon dioxide stream will not contaminate groundwater or pose a risk to human health or the environment.**”.
- The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.
The question being on the passage of the bill,
The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 221

Yeas—29

Albert	Daley	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Anthony	Damoose	Lauwers	Santana
Bellino	Hauck	McCann	Singh
Brinks	Hertel	McMorrow	Theis
Bumstead	Hoitenga	Moss	Victory
Camilleri	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Webber
Cavanagh	Johnson	Outman	Wojno
Cherry			

Nays—7

Bayer	Geiss	Lindsey	Shink
Chang	Irwin	McBroom	

Excused—0

Not Voting—1

Runestad

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senators Irwin and Shink, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill Nos. 394, 395, and 396.

Senator Irwin moved that the statement he made during the discussion of Senate Bill No. 394 be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Irwin’s statement, in which Senator Shink concurred, is as follows:

I am rising to offer a “no” vote explanation on this package of legislation because carbon capture is a boondoggle that is expensive, potentially dangerous, and uncertain. What it is certain to do, it is certain to keep the party going for fossil fuel companies who don’t want to reckon with the damage to our health and

our climate that their operations are causing. Now, it's been said that we should step up here in the Great Lakes State and regulate this practice here. I agree with that. I think we should do it, not let the federal government do it, particularly given the irresponsible hands that the federal government is in right now when it comes to environmental protection. But if we were to do it here in Michigan, we should do it with best practices. Best practices like requiring that if we're going to allow carbon capture, that it actually reduce the amount of carbon. If we're using more carbon, if we're generating more pollution just to put this other pollution under the ground, that's a foolish trade off, and we shouldn't allow it here in Michigan. We should have the best practices. We should have best practices that allow our environmental regulators to protect the most sensitive areas in Michigan, to protect formations that are most likely to leak, or that exist in our most sensitive areas, that are critical to our economy. Finally, if we're going to do this, we should do with best practices that don't leave the taxpayers holding the bag at the end of the day. Allowing these companies to walk away, leaving a mess in our ground, and then expecting the taxpayers to pick it up isn't best practices, so we should step up here in Michigan and we should do it with best practices.

Now, I've heard here on the floor over the many years I've been here and the debates on energy how expensive it is to electrify it, how expensive it would be to convert to clean, homegrown sources like wind, solar, and storage, but as I've said on this floor many times before, that's just not true. These renewable sources are actually cheaper now, and so I ask, Why is it that those who oppose cheaper sources like wind and solar are now supporting this more expensive approach? This more expensive approach, that will not just pollute our environment more but will leave our ratepayers paying more. I would hope that the voters and the taxpayers themselves would ask this question. Why are members here on this floor who oppose cheaper sources like solar and wind and storage, why are they supporting more expensive approaches like carbon capture? I would suggest it's because it keeps the profits flowing at the fossil fuel companies.

Now, they tried a carbon capture project up in Ontario not that long ago to test just how expensive it would be, and they determined that at that power plant, it would double the cost of electricity coming out of that one power plant. The purveyors of this boondoggle carbon capture have been promising for the last decades that the price of these carbon capture systems would come down, but they're not coming down. Once again, it doubled the cost of electricity coming out of a power plant at our neighbors.

It's not only more expensive, but I would argue it's just simply not in the public interest to allow these companies to operate not just on private land but on public land, storing and hopefully retaining this CO₂ if the process results in more carbon released into the atmosphere. Also, I would argue that EGLE should have the authority to protect sensitive areas, and that's why we should adopt the amendments that would allow them to deny permits when they find that these formations would damage Pure Michigan.

Perhaps the part that is most frustrating to me, because I hope to leave a better world for those who come behind me, perhaps the part that's most frustrating to me is that why are we asking taxpayers to backstop the liabilities for these companies? I mean, even if these are taxpayers who we will never meet because this bill is going to come due long after we're all dead, even if we're setting this time bomb to explode 50 or 70 years down the line, why are we doing it? Right now, we're dealing with bad decisions from decades before us. I'll just give you one example. Right now, the taxpayers of Michigan and my district and your districts are having to pay for all of these dilapidated dams that were reverted to taxpayer ownership. Millions and millions and millions of dollars that we're dealing with in the budget we're debating right now. So, why is it that we're talking about—and I know it's a long way in the future—but why is it that we're talking about leaving this liability to future generations? Just because it's too complicated to ask these companies that are going to make millions of dollars off of this to take care of their own dam mess.

This is a package of bills that is being advanced to facilitate the continued burning of fossil fuels in Michigan, and I oppose it because it would be cheaper and cleaner to electrify our environment, move towards cleaner and cheaper sources now, and not saddle our residents with more pollution and higher costs with this fossil fuel boondoggle.

Senators Bayer and Geiss, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill Nos. 394, 395, and 396.

Senator Bayer moved that the statement she made during the discussion of Senate Bill No. 396 be printed as her reasons for voting "no."

The motion prevailed.

Senator Bayer's statement, in which Senator Geiss concurred, is as follows:

Obviously I voted "no" on those previous two bills, and I want to encourage everyone to vote "no" on Senate Bill No. 396 simply because these bills are putting our people and our environment at risk. I do agree that it really is time for us to be addressing the climate change issues that we're facing already today and the need to reduce carbon pollution. That critical, planet-changing work has to be done responsibly with science,

with public health in mind, with environmental justice in mind, but at this point, this package of bills is not ready, not ready to send to the Governor, not ready to enact, not ready to impose high risks on our people and our environment. They just don't have strong enough safeguards for our families, our water, and the future of the state.

If we're going to implement carbon capture in Michigan, we need to make sure that it actually works. This means requiring these new facilities to capture and store more carbon than they actually release in this process, and ensuring that they reduce harmful coal pollutants that worsen air quality in nearby neighborhoods. This is happening in other states that are already doing carbon capture. We can fix this. Without those safeguards, we are putting Michiganders at risk and the heaviest burdens on environmental justice communities that are already overexposed to pollution.

The bills also invite Michigan to become a dumping ground for out-of-state carbon waste, while failing to generate the resources that we need for monitoring, emergency response, and community protections. Just recently, we voted to set our landfill tipping fees at \$1.20 per ton because we recognize that managing hazardous waste has a cost. Carbon sequestration is no different. We should treat it with the same level of care and responsibility. When it comes to protecting our people and our natural resources, this package just falls short. Families need confidence that their drinking water and groundwater will be safe, that the parks and natural areas we all enjoy will be protected. These protections should be the foundation of any responsible framework for carbon capture legislation. Legislation that is providing change on a geologic level, literally planet-changing.

Finally, these bills allow the state to assume the long-term liability for the carbon storage sites, as we've already heard, before the 50-year monitoring period is complete. At a person's discretion, they can shorten that time frame to whatever they like. Carbon moves underground for decades. If something goes wrong, Michigan taxpayers, not the companies profiting from these projects, Michigan taxpayers will be left paying the price. While companies doing the sequestration are getting \$85 a ton, this bill suggests that we get 32 cents of that. Eighty-five dollars a ton versus our 32 cents. The proposed 32 cents per ton may cover the management cost but is unlikely to cover the potential issues that could arise after this site has become our state's full responsibility.

Michigan families deserve better. We need a framework that protects our health, safeguards our water, and ensures that carbon capture is done safely, effectively, and equitably. I believe there's a way to be more responsible with this, and these bills fall short. We had the first set of amendments already turned down. It is not too late for us to get together, pause for a short period of time, and put some fixes in place, improve these bills, and make it safer for our families and our environment.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator McBroom's first statement is as follows:

I bring to you an amendment in regard to the length of time and duration that the department can have free rein over writing its regulations for this program. It is a longstanding problem here in Michigan that laws get put in place and rulemaking authority is given to the departments and yet, they go on making new rules for decades. The commercial fishing one, for instance, went 60 years with no one changing the law and the law being basically completely unimportant to the new practices in place. This happens repeatedly. That's why in the '80s a commission was formed that recommended mandatory sunsets on laws. My amendment says that the department will have twelve years of rulemaking authority and then will have to come back to the Legislature to reup that and have the law itself have another chance to be looked at.

Senator McBroom's second statement is as follows:

Mr. President, the Constitution of Michigan, article IX, section 35, sets up the Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund. This trust fund is required to be paid into for the removal of resources from our state lands, including the extraction of gas, which has greatly benefited the Natural Resources Trust Fund and the support it provides to our state. My amendment seeks to take these funds that are collected from this program and carbon sequestration, which is basically putting back into the ground an alternative to what we've extracted, and take those funds and put it towards the Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund rather than the current proposal which gives the money to the game and fish fund. I don't believe the game and fish fund is appropriate, both for constitutional purposes as well as how it has been traditionally utilized by the Department of Natural Resources. It would be far more proper for this state for these funds to be placed in the trust fund. I recommend a "yes" vote.

Senator McBroom’s third statement is as follows:

Perhaps the third time will be the charm, Mr. President.

If we can’t place the monies where I believe they would naturally and rightly belong, in the trust fund for natural resources, then perhaps something more appropriate and less likely to be utilized as a slush fund for a department with a long history of using dollars to countermand things the Legislature asks for or working against the people of this state, such as the DNR has a history of doing, would be appropriate. That’s why this amendment directs those monies into the neighborhood road fund created under MCL, chapter 257. Why not give this money to roads, something we’re all so desperate to do? I recommend a “yes” vote.

Senator Shink’s statement is as follows:

I’m going to speak to the amendments that Senator Bayer brought to us, and I’m going to preface my comments—for anybody who cares—with that I’ve been working on climate change issues since the ’90s and the things that are happening now, like the flooding and the droughts and the fires, were projected to be happening at the end of this century, not now, back in the ’90s. They’re happening sooner. Climate change is a real issue and it’s an important one to address. I also know that carbon capture isn’t a perfect technology and that there are some simple things we could add to these bills that would make carbon capture work better and also continue to allow it, it’s not going to prove—none of these amendments would prevent carbon capture from happening in Michigan. As somebody who’s been in the environmental community and as a local elected official who is working on climate change issues and trying to understand how much carbon was being produced or released in my community, some of these things would be very, very helpful.

It disturbs me that we might not adopt these amendments. I’m encouraging everybody, regardless of how you feel about climate change, to vote “yes” on these amendments.

The first amendment would allow EGLE to have the authority to deny a permit if it will pose a risk to groundwater, drinking water, public health, and the environment. That seems pretty simple, and in a community like mine that has a lot of pore space, I think, and that may receive a lot of carbon, I can tell you that we have a lot of well issues already in groundwater. Issues from other things that have been put into our ground or taken out so my community would really appreciate your “yes” vote. It wouldn’t allow sequestration or unitization of ecologically sensitive areas or in local parks or natural areas. It would require setbacks from surface water, local parks, and residences for sequestration for pipelines.

The second amendment would allow liability to transfer to the state 50 years after the last injection. The current draft includes a loophole that allows the division director to transfer liability sooner. The state taking on liability for industrial, privately-led activity is extreme and this is just putting a few more guardrails on that extreme change.

The third amendment means that in the case of drinking water, alternative drinking water would be provided within 24 hours because this could poison somebody’s drinking water, and right now there are no provisions for them to have safe drinking water.

Fourth: it increases the per-ton fee to \$1.20. We’re already quibbling about dumping fees in Michigan. Let’s do it right this time.

Amendment No. 5: ensure that we are not using carbon sequestration fees or royalties generated from state pore space to destroy forests or fund ineffective carbon credit programs.

Again, I urge a “yes” vote.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 398, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 6230 and 6234 (MCL 333.6230 and 333.6234), as added by 2012 PA 501.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

Roll Call No. 222

Yeas—37

Albert	Daley	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Anthony	Damoose	Lauwers	Runestad
Bayer	Geiss	Lindsey	Santana
Bellino	Hauck	McBroom	Shink
Brinks	Hertel	McCann	Singh
Bumstead	Hoitenga	McMorrow	Theis
Camilleri	Huizenga	Moss	Victory
Cavanagh	Irwin	Nesbitt	Webber
Chang	Johnson	Outman	Wojno
Cherry			

Nays—0

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss, assumed the Chair.

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

Statements

Senators Moss, Anthony, Polehanki, McMorrow and Runestad asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Moss' statement is as follows:

I presided over the Senate yesterday as the Minority Leader attempted to blame the current road funding crisis on Democrats, which is an absolute farce. I would actually lay the problem right back over there. He was part of the House Republican leadership team that passed the last road plan ten years ago in 2015. You might remember it, it was the road funding plan that failed to fix our roads. We needed to raise, at the time, at least \$2 billion to bring our roads into good condition. You raised \$600 million. That doesn't make our roads better over a longer period of time, it just makes our roads worse over a longer period of time. Then, you said you would find another \$600 million in future—unspecified cuts. That never happened.

Then, when it passed, your Republican speaker, Kevin Cotter, said on the floor at the time, "This is a plan that will be protected against time. We will not leave the problem for future legislators that follow us." Not quite Nostradamus right there. You had the Republican majority in this chamber up until three years ago. Was your Republican road funding plan ever in the room with us? Because I don't remember you introducing anything of the like. Then, this guy across the building takes over as Speaker and proclaims he has a road funding plan. And, what is it? Future unspecified cuts. Wow. Where have I heard that before? Did it work out the last time? Sounds like a winning plan. I can print out Kevin Cotter's speech so you can read it when this passes.

But finally, after nine months, we learn what these Republican cuts are to pay for roads: cutting the State Police, cutting our hospitals and health care, cutting prosecutors' offices and their funding for sexual assault kits, cutting a staggering amount of more than \$1 billion to our schools, literally stealing kids' lunch money by removing the free meal program, cutting funding to the Charles H. Wright African American History Museum, the Arab-American National Museum, and the Holocaust Memorial Center. Let me be clear, I will not let you steal from the Holocaust Center to cobble together a roads plan. That is not a roads plan. There is no Republican roads plan.

If you want to work together to solve this problem, then let's solve this problem. Come to the table, roll up your sleeves, and let's negotiate, but lies and insults are not a substitute for the hard work of governing.

Senator Anthony's statement is as follows:

This week, I got a chance to do something that I love to do, which is visit a school in my district. This particular school was real elementary school, it's in the heart of Lansing, and I was able to help serve lunch to some of the cutest kids in the state. I remember looking at them, and their hardest decision of the day was probably to get the grilled cheese option or the pasta, which I just loved being able to serve them that day. And as I was doing so, I was thinking about the hundreds of parents I have heard from across the state, wondering what in the world are we doing in this Capitol building. I thought about a community gathering I had over the summer in which an older woman came up to me, she grabbed my hand, and said, "Baby, I don't know what's happening with health care. We see what's happening at the federal level, I don't know what the House Republicans are going to do in their budget, but because I need and rely on Medicaid, I'm starting to cut my medication in half, my pills every day. Sure, I get a little lightheaded, but I don't know if I'll be able to afford this medication that helps to make sure I'm here for my grandchildren."

Here in mid-Michigan, we have thousands of government employees. Now, these are not the employees that Republicans like to attack. These are people that keep our water safe and clean. These are State Police officers that make sure many of us get home safely. These are individuals that help administer health care to men, women, and children across the state. And they ask us that same question, What's happening in that Capitol building? Why don't we know if we'll be able to have our paychecks in October?

We are days away from a government shutdown, and this didn't happen by accident. For folks who have not been paying attention—and I know men and women across this state have so many things that they're balancing, they don't have time to think about elected officials doing their job, but it is important for folks to bear witness to what's happening in the halls of power—just last week, months after a statutory deadline, House Republicans finally decided to pass a budget, and it was worse than we expected. Many of us knew that in July, when that big ugly bill was passed at the congressional level, we saw a copy-and-paste job here in Michigan. Michigan's very own big ugly bill. And they used an opportunity—one that we could have built upon the amazing investments that we've seen over the past few years—and instead of coming to the table with real investments—yes, some reductions, some cuts—they decided to slash billions of dollars from programs that people in this state rely on. Slashing free meals for children across this state, literacy programs, mental health and safety; eliminating over a billion dollars from the Department of Health and Human Services—which guts food assistance, Medicaid, health programs, water affordability. And for the party that wants to make sure that we are funding the police, they did a whack job to the State Police funding. Talk about defunding the police. It is a disgrace that we again are weeks away from a government shutdown. And in a time in which our Senate Majority Leader and the Governor's team have been ready to negotiate for months, when we want to be at the table and spend hours in this building hashing out our differences, we're met with long press conferences. We are met with insults, and social media graphics.

The time is up. We are at a critical juncture. So, instead of us taking a playbook from Trump and the congressional Republicans, I implore the House to come to the table and stand up—not for special interests, not for the MAGA base. I ask them to stand up for the ten million Michiganders who rely on food assistance and housing programs to make sure that our state thrives.

Senator Polehanki's statement is as follows:

Madam President, half a dozen construction workers came to my office yesterday wanting to talk about Michigan's roads. I was struck by the great pride with which they talked about the careers that they built making Michigan's roads smooth and safe for us to travel on. We agreed that Michigan needs a sustainable plan to keep our roads fixed, and fixed the right way so that they last as long as possible.

When we talked about road funding, the guys I spoke with did not want to pay for roads by cutting money from our public schools. I showed them how around 46 percent of Republican Speaker Matt Hall's roads plan is paid for out of the School Aid Fund. Forty-six percent of Hall's roads plan is paid for out of the School Aid Fund. They didn't like that, and agreed that we have to find a way to fund roads that isn't on the backs of Michigan's public schools, which are still underfunded by billions of dollars each year. Speaker Hall's roads plan is a clever shell game involving holding schools harmless on the revenue side only to inflict serious harm on the appropriations side as it pushes \$1.47 billion of higher-ed appropriations currently paid for using the General Fund to the School Aid Fund. Speaker Hall's budget proposal also strips \$600 million of the MPERS savings the Democrats gave back to schools.

In all, his plan guts school funding to the tune of over \$2 billion. So when you hear him say, We pay for roads with no new tax cuts—please know that he can claim that because his plan blows a \$2 billion hole in school funding, but doesn't raise taxes. It's classic smoke and mirrors. I look forward to voting on a real roads plan that leaves our great public schools alone.

Senator McMorro's statement is as follows:

I rise today to talk a little bit about the budget that was proposed to us from our House Republican colleagues, and I want to highlight a couple of things that they call supposedly "waste, fraud, and abuse." Because to echo some of my colleagues' sentiment, we've been told that this is our fault, that this is our problem, that we're not coming together to the negotiating table.

I heard my previous colleague talk about a team who shall not be named from another state that is not Michigan, but last night, I had the privilege of joining a group of young people: the Detroit City Lions, which is an organization—a football team—in partnership with the Detroit Police Athletic League—Detroit PAL—and they get together to practice on the campus of Marygrove College. Marygrove is a college in my district in Detroit that closed a number of years ago, a women's college, and the campus sat empty. And thanks to millions of dollars from investment, from us, from philanthropy, from organizations all across the state of Michigan, this incredible group of young boys and girls got together last night in the cold and the rain to kick off their football season. And I bet they're going to have a great track record. Now I look at these faces of these kids who are working with an organization—Detroit PAL—that is looking to give kids sports opportunities and bring them together to make sure that they find a calling and a purpose, that they have something to do, they have somewhere to go, and that they can take pride in being a part of the team. And I asked my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Are they waste, fraud, and abuse?

I met with a group of teachers recently, and we've talked a lot about the universal breakfast and lunch program that has been so popular for parents. But I had a teacher recently tell me something that I hadn't even thought of. She told me how much she loved this program because as a teacher, she is now saving hundreds of dollars a year. You see, this teacher was keeping food in her desk in her classroom, Lunchables, snacks, so that she could feed kids that came to school hungry. She wanted to make sure, out of the goodness of her own heart, that there was no child in her classroom who ever had to worry about being hungry. So she told me she's got an entire empty drawer in her desk now that she can fill with other things because of the good work that we did here in this Legislature to pass a program that has become wildly successful, and also, by the way, supports Michigan farmers, Michigan suppliers. And I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and in the other chamber across the hall, Is that waste, fraud, and abuse?

Finally, I want to uplift the story of Kimberly Elise, who is the owner of a business called Lily's and Elise Tea House. It is on Livernois Avenue in the Avenue of Fashion. It was supported by Invest Detroit, which is a CDFI that we've invested in significantly here in the state of Michigan. She is the first—I did not know this—the first Black woman tea sommelier in the entire country. She has traveled the world to get this certification, and she opened up this beautiful space in Detroit—custom design. She offers an incredible experience. She is employing Detroiters. She's offering an experience that you could get in Paris, and she's doing it right here in our community. Now, the Republican budget that we got completely eliminates funding for CDFIs. And I ask for somebody who has traveled the world to come back to Michigan, to her home state, to her home city, to create jobs, Is that waste, fraud, and abuse?

So yes, we need to do our core function of government. We need to have a sustainable road funding plan that ensures that we actually fix the roads that are most heavily driven on. But we cannot do it at the expense of kids who need to make sure they are not hungry when they go into the classroom, at the expense of business owners who are making a real impact on their community, and on the backs of kids who are starting their season at the Detroit City Lions and looking to have a great year.

Senator Runestad's statement is as follows:

It's interesting, the comments from the colleague on the other side of the aisle from the 8th District about Marygrove College. I remember years ago, going there for a visit. I can't remember what the reason was, but I was driving in a completely unprotected area, the gates were open, and I was watching a couple of young kids drive their car, hop out, and check each door, and if the door was open, they'd go in and take everything they wanted out. They went from car to car. I'm just driving around. I'm watching this. No security. These poor students that come in here, parking in this parking lot, the gates are open, and all of their stuff is being stolen.

So when you say that there's no issues—that we as a state can't intervene and ask questions about waste, fraud, and abuse—there is a lot of issues that are pertaining to waste, fraud, and abuse. That the Democrats have not produced anything I've seen on road funding when the Governor kept saying, We got to fix the damn roads, over and over again. When we had \$9 billion in one-time funding—\$9 billion—I kept telling all the people across from Michigan, We're going to put so much money into infrastructure and roads, \$200 million—\$200 million for the roads.

These Medicaid cuts that the Democrats keep basically lying about, telling people—like we just heard—that somebody's going to lose their Medicaid. What the proposal is at the federal level, in here, is that if you are able-bodied without dependents—so what I hear the Democrats saying, Well, if you've got 12 kids and you are in a wheelchair, how are you going to—no, it's all lies. It's lies. What the proposal is, is able-bodied without dependents will do what? Will be asked to do what to receive this benefit? Well, they're going to be asked to work 80 hours a month—20 hours a week—to do what? To go to school or to volunteer at something, or to do some kind of work. I think, when it's told truthfully, the vast majority of people out there in the state of Michigan say, Hell yes you should be required to do something to receive this benefit if you are able-bodied and you have no dependents. The same thing with the food program.

The MSP cuts were primarily for programs like I was just reading, implicit bias. A lot of them are vacant positions currently. There also needs to be a negotiation, in my view, about what we are going to do about the crash and burn disaster of MSP's leadership. There's got to be something done to bring the Governor to account when 98 percent of all of the people, the employees, at MSP, this, And we're so concerned about the troopers. There's no concern about the troopers. Ninety-eight percent of the troopers say that this is a disastrous, worst administration ever in the history of Michigan, and nothing is being said about it. I'm glad that they're going to call them into account so we can have a negotiation about what to do about these rotten people at the top that the troopers are trying to get rid of. Rightfully so.

So there's a lot of things in this budget that need to be addressed more truthfully, and are not being addressed. I think we need to have a real discussion about what to do about the roads. I was talking to a guy from out of state last week. He said, You know, I came to Michigan and I went to your capital, and I traveled the whole world, I couldn't believe the roads, it's like something I've seen in the Third World. I said, Yeah, that's Michigan, that's our capital. Roads crumbling, and there needs to be money put to roads. That's what the State House is doing. There needs to be negotiation on getting some money to the roads to fix this disaster.

Announcements of Printing and Enrollment

The Secretary announced that the following House bills were received in the Senate and filed on Wednesday, September 3:

House Bill Nos. 4017 4358 4359 4362 4398 4698 4699 4746

The Secretary announced that the following bills were printed and filed on Thursday, September 4, and are available on the Michigan Legislature website:

Senate Bill Nos. 511 512 513 514 515 516 517

Committee Reports

The Committee on Health Policy reported

Senate Bill No. 501, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 16335, 17801, and 17821 (MCL 333.16335, 333.17801, and 333.17821), as amended by 2009 PA 55, and by adding sections 17820a and 17820b.

With the recommendation that the bill pass.

Kevin Hertel
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Hertel, Santana, Wojno, Cherry, Klinefelt, Geiss, Webber, Hauck, Huizenga and Runestad
Nays: None

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Health Policy reported

House Bill No. 4101, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” (MCL 333.1101 to 333.25211) by adding section 16188.

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

Kevin Hertel
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Hertel, Santana, Wojno, Cherry, Klinefelt, Geiss, Webber, Hauck, Huizenga and Runestad
Nays: None

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

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Health Policy submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, September 3, 2025, at 12:30 p.m., Room 1100, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators Hertel (C), Santana, Wojno, Cherry, Klinefelt, Geiss, Webber, Hauck, Huizenga and Runestad

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Joint Committee on Administrative Rules submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, September 3, 2025, at 9:00 a.m., Room 521, 5th Floor, Anderson House Office Building

Present: Senators Wojno and Theis

Absent: Senators Bayer, McMorrow and Runestad

Senator Singh moved that the Senate adjourn.
The motion prevailed, the time being 12:22 p.m.

The Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss, declared the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, September 9, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.

DANIEL OBERLIN
Secretary of the Senate