

CONFIDENTIAL
LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2015

Bill Number: H.108 Name of Bill: An act relating to electrical installations

Agency/ Dept: PSD Author of Bill Review: Andrew Perchlik

Date of Bill Review: 3/12/15 Related Bills and Key Players _____

Status of Bill: (check one): ☒ Upon Introduction _____ As passed by 1st body _____ As passed by both _____

Recommended Position:

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

Analysis of Bill

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

This bill proposes to require

1. that any existing electrical circuit that is disconnected after an electrical emergency may not be reconnected until inspected by a master or journeyman electrician.
2. That the current exemption from electrical licensure for single and two-family buildings be eliminated (AKA the "handy-man exemption")
3. That a new exemption be added for certain aspects of solar energy installations

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

It depends on one's interests/position. The bill sponsors say there is a need to provide safer electrical installations. Those opposed say that the current system works fine and there is no need for more regulation and that the "buyer beware" principle should rule single-family electrical work.

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

There would be no impact on the PSD.

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?

There would be some impact on the Dept. of Public Safety. DPS would have a slightly increased work load as would the State Electrical Board.

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)

There would be a likely increased cost for the electrical work that would require a licensed electrician to do work that before could be done by an un-licensed worker.

6. Other Stakeholders:

Electricians, electrical worker union, solar installers, home owners, small construction companies

Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word document to laura.gray@state.vt.us and jessica.mishaan@state.vt.us

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

Electricians and the electrical worker union (IBEW) would likely support as it supports more work for them and recognition of their trade as a requirement for such work.

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

The small contractors that currently do electrical work in single family homes w/o a license, as they want to continue to do so. Homeowners may oppose as they like the option of hiring a non-licensed individual for light electrical work.

Solar installers (represented by REV) could oppose or support based on the exemptions for solar in the bill.

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

Remain neutral in regards to the “handy-man” exemption.

Support section on re-connection of service after emergencies and Support bill if the solar installers are not required to get a full electrical licensed, letting them to continue with the way they work now.

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.*

3/25/15 UPDATE: The bill has been modified substantially to where concerns about its effect on the solar industry have been adequately dealt with.

9. Gubernatorial appointments to board or commission?

Secretary/Commissioner has reviewed this document: _____ **Date:** _____