

CONFIDENTIAL
LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2013

Bill Number: H.26 Name of Bill: An act relating to technical corrections

Agency/ Dept: Public Service Author of Bill Review: Asa Hopkins

Date of Bill Review: 1/23/2013 Status of Bill: (check one):

☒ Upon Introduction ☐ As passed by 1st body ☐ As passed by both bodies ☐ Fiscal

Recommended Position:

☒ Support ☐ Oppose ☐ Remain Neutral ☐ Support with modifications identified in #8 below

Analysis of Bill

1. Summary of bill and issue it addresses. *Describe what the bill is intended to accomplish and why.*

Implements various technical corrections, with the intention of not changing the meaning of the law. In Title 30 there are three corrections: 1) removing a reference to "non qualifying SPEED resources" (which used to mean natural-gas CHP, but is no longer defined); 2) removing a reference to RPS requirements; and 3) Clarifying that GHG credit-instigated changes in the standard offer apply to both provider and non-provided blocks.

2. Is there a need for this bill? *Please explain why or why not.*

Yes; it clarifies areas of obsolescence or error in the statute.

3. What are likely to be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for this Department?

None.

4. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for other departments in state government, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?

Title 30 aspects will not affect others.

5. What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for others, and what is likely to be their perspective on it? *(for example, public, municipalities, organizations, business, regulated entities, etc)*

Vermont Gas may object to removal of non-renewable natural gas CHP from the state's 60 MW CHP goal. However, the main change (removing such facilities from the SPEED program) already happened last session, and the change here is simply for consistency.

6. Other Stakeholders:

6.1 Who else is likely to support the proposal and why?

6.2 Who else is likely to oppose the proposal and why?

Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word document to drusilla.roessle@state.vt.us

7. Rationale for recommendation: *Justify recommendation stated above.*

Changes are minor and correct inconsistencies or errors in the statute.

8. Specific modifications that would be needed to recommend support of this bill: *Not meant to rewrite bill, but rather, an opportunity to identify simple modifications that would change recommended position.*

Secretary/Commissioner has reviewed this document:  **Date:** 1/29/13