

No. 93
STATE OF MICHIGAN
Journal of the Senate
102nd Legislature
REGULAR SESSION OF 2024

Senate Chamber, Lansing, Wednesday, October 30, 2024.

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
McDonald Rivet—present
McMorrow—present

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

Senator Jeremy Moss of the 7th District offered the following invocation:

God of holiness, we hear Your message: Justice, justice, you shall pursue. God of freedom, we hear Your charge: Proclaim liberty throughout the land.

Inspire us through Your teachings and commandments to love and uphold our precious democracy. Let every citizen take responsibility for the rights and freedoms we cherish. Let each of us be an advocate for justice, an activist for liberty, a defender of dignity, and let us champion the values that make our nation a haven for the persecuted—a beacon of hope among the nations.

May our actions reflect compassion for all people within our borders and abroad. May our leaders and officials embody the vision of our founders: “to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity.”

We pray for courage and conscience as we aim to support our country’s highest values and aspirations, the hard-won rights that define us as a people, and the responsibilities that they entail. We pray for the moral strength that we may be guardians of these rights for ourselves and for the sake of all people, now and forever. Amen.

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

Senator Nesbitt entered the Senate Chamber.

Motions and Communications

Senator Lauwers moved that Senator Outman be excused from today’s session.
The motion prevailed.

Senator Singh moved that Senator Geiss be temporarily excused from today’s session.
The motion prevailed.

Senator Singh moved that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, October 31, it stand adjourned until Wednesday, November 6 at 10:00 a.m.
The motion prevailed.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

Introduction and Referral of Bills

Senators Wojno, Polehanki and Chang introduced

Senate Bill No. 1051, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending section 20954 (MCL 333.20954), as amended by 2024 PA 48.

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

Senator Camilleri introduced

Senate Bill No. 1052, entitled

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” by amending sections 11102, 11110, 11125, 11132, 11514b, 62501, and 62502 (MCL 324.11102, 324.11110, 324.11125, 324.11132, 324.11514b, 324.62501, and 324.62502), sections 11102 and 11125 as amended by 2010 PA 357, section 11110 as amended by 1995 PA 61, section 11132 as added by 2018 PA 688, section 11514b as amended by 2022 PA 245, section 62501 as amended by 1998 PA 467, and section 62502 as added by 1995 PA 57, and by adding sections 11122, 62508b, and 62509d; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

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

Senators Anthony, McCann, Damoose, Shink, Cavanagh, Polehanki, Chang and Geiss introduced

Senate Bill No. 1053, entitled

A bill to amend 1951 PA 51, entitled “An act to provide for the classification of all public roads, streets, and highways in this state, and for the revision of that classification and for additions to and deletions from each classification; to set up and establish the Michigan transportation fund; to provide for the deposits in

the Michigan transportation fund of specific taxes on motor vehicles and motor vehicle fuels; to provide for the allocation of funds from the Michigan transportation fund and the use and administration of the fund for transportation purposes; to promote safe and efficient travel for motor vehicle drivers, bicyclists, pedestrians, and other legal users of roads, streets, and highways; to set up and establish the truck safety fund; to provide for the allocation of funds from the truck safety fund and administration of the fund for truck safety purposes; to set up and establish the Michigan truck safety commission; to establish certain standards for road contracts for certain businesses; to provide for the continuing review of transportation needs within the state; to authorize the state transportation commission, counties, cities, and villages to borrow money, issue bonds, and make pledges of funds for transportation purposes; to authorize counties to advance funds for the payment of deficiencies necessary for the payment of bonds issued under this act; to provide for the limitations, payment, retirement, and security of the bonds and pledges; to provide for appropriations and tax levies by counties and townships for county roads; to authorize contributions by townships for county roads; to provide for the establishment and administration of the state trunk line fund, local bridge fund, comprehensive transportation fund, and certain other funds; to provide for the deposits in the state trunk line fund, critical bridge fund, comprehensive transportation fund, and certain other funds of money raised by specific taxes and fees; to provide for definitions of public transportation functions and criteria; to define the purposes for which Michigan transportation funds may be allocated; to provide for Michigan transportation fund grants; to provide for review and approval of transportation programs; to provide for submission of annual legislative requests and reports; to provide for the establishment and functions of certain advisory entities; to provide for conditions for grants; to provide for the issuance of bonds and notes for transportation purposes; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state and local agencies and officials; to provide for the making of loans for transportation purposes by the state transportation department and for the receipt and repayment by local units and agencies of those loans from certain specified sources; to investigate and study the tolling of roads, streets, highways, or bridges; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” (MCL 247.651 to 247.675) by adding section 10q.

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

Senator Geiss introduced

Senate Bill No. 1054, entitled

A bill to require individuals, hospitals, human milk banks, and human milk banking companies to comply with certain standards; to provide for education and support of certain breastfeeding individuals; to prescribe the duties of certain state departments and agencies; and to prescribe penalties.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Housing and Human Services.

Senator Geiss introduced

Senate Bill No. 1055, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 12m of chapter XVII (MCL 777.12m), as amended by 2019 PA 134.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Housing and Human Services.

Senator Geiss introduced

Senate Bill No. 1056, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” (MCL 400.1 to 400.119b) by adding section 109o.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Housing and Human Services.

Senators Santana, Geiss and Anthony introduced

Senate Bill No. 1057, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” by amending section 109 (MCL 400.109), as amended by 2022 PA 98.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Housing and Human Services.

Senators Anthony, Geiss and Santana introduced

Senate Bill No. 1058, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” (MCL 400.1 to 400.119b) by adding sections 109q and 109r.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Housing and Human Services.

Senator Singh introduced

Senate Bill No. 1059, entitled

A bill to amend 1990 PA 187, entitled “The pupil transportation act,” by amending section 10 (MCL 257.1810), as amended by 2006 PA 107.

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

By unanimous consent the Senate returned 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 Camilleri as Chairperson.

Recess

Senator Singh moved that the Committee of the Whole recess subject to the call of the Chairperson.

The motion prevailed, the time being 10:24 a.m.

10:29 a.m.

The Committee of the Whole was called to order by the Chairperson, Senator Camilleri.

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 bills:

Senate Bill No. 963, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 14b of chapter XVII (MCL 777.14b), as added by 2002 PA 29.

Senate Bill No. 822, entitled

A bill to amend 1998 PA 386, entitled “Estates and protected individuals code,” by amending section 5507 (MCL 700.5507), as amended by 2024 PA 1.

Senate Bill No. 823, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 453, entitled “Elliott-Larsen civil rights act,” by amending section 301 (MCL 37.2301), as amended by 2023 PA 6.

Senate Bill No. 825, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 2701, 2705, 2709, and 2723 (MCL 333.2701, 333.2705, 333.2709, and 333.2723), section 2701 as amended by 2022 PA 38, section 2705 as amended by 2022 PA 37, section 2709 as added by 1990 PA 16, and section 2723 as amended by 2014 PA 173.

Senate Bill No. 983, entitled

A bill to amend 1993 PA 23, entitled “Michigan limited liability company act,” by amending section 705a (MCL 450.4705a), as amended by 2014 PA 559.

Senate Bill No. 984, entitled

A bill to amend 1972 PA 284, entitled “Business corporation act,” by amending section 123 (MCL 450.1123), as amended by 2012 PA 569.

Senate Bill No. 1050, entitled

A bill to amend 1967 PA 281, entitled "Income tax act of 1967," by amending sections 12, 607, 699, 701, 805, and 845 (MCL 206.12, 206.607, 206.699, 206.701, 206.805, and 206.845), sections 12 and 607 as amended by 2018 PA 38, section 699 as added by 2011 PA 309, section 701 as amended by 2022 PA 148, and sections 805 and 845 as added by 2021 PA 135, and by adding section 339.

The bills were 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. 872, entitled

A bill to amend 1994 PA 203, entitled "Foster care and adoption services act," (MCL 722.951 to 722.960) by adding section 8f.

Substitute (S-2).

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:

Senate Bill No. 964, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 90, entitled "Youth employment standards act," by amending sections 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 20 (MCL 409.102, 409.104, 409.105, 409.107, 409.108, 409.110, and 409.120), section 2 as amended by 1996 PA 438, section 4 as amended by 2011 PA 80, and section 5 as amended by 2020 PA 323, and by adding sections 4a, 4b, 4c, and 4d.

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:

Senate Bill No. 965, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 90, entitled "Youth employment standards act," by amending sections 3, 20, 21, and 22 (MCL 409.103, 409.120, 409.121, and 409.122), section 3 as amended by 1997 PA 132 and section 22 as amended by 1980 PA 436.

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:

Senate Bill No. 818, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled "Public health code," by amending sections 2227, 2617, 2617a, and 2618 (MCL 333.2227, 333.2617, 333.2617a, and 333.2618), section 2227 as added by 2006 PA 653 and section 2617a as added by 2016 PA 479, and by adding section 2617b.

Substitute (S-2).

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:

Senate Bill No. 819, entitled

A bill to create the biased and unjust care reporting act; and to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities.

Substitute (S-2).

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:

Senate Bill No. 820, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 20201 and 21513 (MCL 333.20201 and 333.21513), section 20201 as amended by 2016 PA 499 and section 21513 as amended by 2022 PA 265, and by adding section 21537.

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:

Senate Bill No. 821, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 2434 (MCL 500.2434), as added by 1986 PA 173.

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. 5826, entitled

A bill to establish a doula scholarship program for eligible individuals; to provide for the administration of the doula scholarship program; to create the doula scholarship fund; and to prescribe certain powers and duties of certain state officers and entities.

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:

Senate Bill No. 982, entitled

A bill to amend 1883 PA 129, entitled “An act for the organization of telephone and messenger service companies,” (MCL 484.1 to 484.10) by adding section 7.

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:

Senate Bill No. 813, entitled

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending section 2163a (MCL 600.2163a), as amended by 2018 PA 343.

Substitute (S-3).

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:

Senate Bill No. 165, entitled

A bill to amend 1986 PA 182, entitled “State police retirement act of 1986,” by amending sections 3 and 4 (MCL 38.1603 and 38.1604), as amended by 2018 PA 674.

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:

Senate Bill No. 166, entitled

A bill to amend 1943 PA 240, entitled "State employees' retirement act," by amending section 55 (MCL 38.55), as amended by 2011 PA 264, and by adding sections 50b, 50c, 50d, 64a, 64b, and 64c.

Substitute (S-5).

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:

Senate Bill No. 167, entitled

A bill to amend 1986 PA 182, entitled "State police retirement act of 1986," (MCL 38.1601 to 38.1674) by adding sections 24c, 24d, and 24e.

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.

During the Committee of the Whole, Senator Geiss entered the Senate Chamber.

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 Third Reading of Bills, be placed on their immediate passage:

Senate Bill No. 165

Senate Bill No. 166

Senate Bill No. 167

Senate Bill No. 963

Senate Bill No. 964

Senate Bill No. 965

Senate Bill No. 982

Senate Bill No. 983

Senate Bill No. 984

Senate Bill No. 1050

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

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

Third Reading of Bills

Recess

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.
The motion prevailed, the time being 10:35 a.m.

11:11 a.m.

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

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

House Bill No. 4361

House Bill No. 5328

House Bill No. 5522

Senate Bill No. 165

Senate Bill No. 166
Senate Bill No. 167
Senate Bill No. 963
Senate Bill No. 964
Senate Bill No. 965
Senate Bill No. 982
Senate Bill No. 983
Senate Bill No. 984
Senate Bill No. 1050
 The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4361, entitled

A bill to amend 1967 PA 281, entitled “Income tax act of 1967,” (MCL 206.1 to 206.847) by adding section 280.

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. 393

Yeas—35

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

Nays—1

Lindsey

Excused—1

Outman

Not Voting—1

Bellino

In The Chair: Moss

The question being on concurring in the committee recommendation to give the bill immediate effect, The recommendation was not concurred in, 2/3 of the members serving not voting therefor.

Pursuant to Joint Rule 20, the full title of the act shall be inserted to read as follows:

“An act to meet deficiencies in state funds by providing for the imposition, levy, computation, collection, assessment, reporting, payment, and enforcement by lien and otherwise of taxes on or measured by net

income and on certain commercial, business, and financial activities; to prescribe the manner and time of making reports and paying the taxes, and the functions of public officers and others as to the taxes; to permit the inspection of the records of taxpayers; to provide for interest and penalties on unpaid taxes; to provide exemptions, credits, rebates, and refunds of the taxes; to create certain funds; to provide for the expenditure of certain funds; to impose certain duties and requirements on certain officials, departments, and authorities of this state; to prescribe penalties for the violation of this act; to provide an appropriation; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

Pursuant to rule 1.306, Senator Bellino made the following statement:

I will be abstaining from this vote on House Bill No. 4361 as I am a recent donor and I could potentially benefit from this bill package.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 5328, entitled

A bill to amend 1992 PA 234, entitled “The judges retirement act of 1992,” by amending section 714 (MCL 38.2664), as amended by 2002 PA 95.

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. 394

Yeas—35

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

Nays—2

| | |
|--------|---------|
| Albert | Johnson |
|--------|---------|

Excused—1

Outman

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The question being on concurring in the committee recommendation to give the bill immediate effect, The recommendation was not concurred in, 2/3 of the members serving not voting therefor.

Pursuant to Joint Rule 20, the full title of the act shall be inserted to read as follows:

“An act to establish a judges retirement system; to provide for the administration and maintenance of the retirement system; to create a retirement board; to prescribe the powers and duties of the retirement board;

to establish certain reserves for the retirement system; to establish certain funds; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments and certain state and local officials and employees; to provide for certain disqualifications; to prescribe penalties and provide remedies; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 5522, entitled

A bill to amend 1990 PA 195, entitled “An act entering into the midwestern higher education compact; and for related purposes,” by amending section 2 (MCL 390.1532).

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. 395

Yeas—27

| | | | |
|-----------|----------|----------------|---------|
| Anthony | Cherry | Klinefelt | Santana |
| Bayer | Daley | Lauwers | Shink |
| Brinks | Damoose | McCann | Singh |
| Bumstead | Geiss | McDonald Rivet | Victory |
| Camilleri | Hertel | McMorrow | Webber |
| Cavanagh | Huizenga | Moss | Wojno |
| Chang | Irwin | Polehanki | |

Nays—10

| | | | |
|---------|----------|---------|----------|
| Albert | Hoitenga | McBroom | Runestad |
| Bellino | Johnson | Nesbitt | Theis |
| Hauck | Lindsey | | |

Excused—1

Outman

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The question being on concurring in the committee recommendation to give the bill immediate effect, The recommendation was not concurred in, 2/3 of the members serving not voting therefor. The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 165, entitled

A bill to amend 1986 PA 182, entitled “State police retirement act of 1986,” by amending sections 3 and 4 (MCL 38.1603 and 38.1604), as amended by 2018 PA 674.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Albert offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 9, following line 6, by inserting:

“(2) “Member” does not include a qualified participant who is not a member of Tier 1 under section 24c.” and renumbering the remaining subsections.

2. Amend page 10, following line 8, by inserting:

“Sec. 24c. (1) The retirement system shall permit each qualified employee who first becomes a qualified participant and first works for the employer after September 30, 2024 to make an election to not become a member of Tier 1 and become only a qualified participant in Tier 2.

(2) The retirement system shall determine a method of accepting elections under subsection (1) and the employer shall secure those elections during the period beginning on the date of the individual’s employment and ending on the expiration of 75 days from the individual’s first payroll date. An election under subsection (1) is irrevocable. The retirement system shall provide a form on which each qualified employee who first becomes a qualified participant and first works for the employer after September 30, 2024 may make an election under subsection (1). The form described in this subsection must be accompanied by a description of the benefit options. The form must include an acknowledgment that the qualified participant has received the description of the benefit options.

(3) A qualified employee who first becomes a qualified participant and first works for a reporting unit after September 30, 2024 who does not make an election under subsection (1) for any reason on or before the close of the election period is considered to have made an election to become only a qualified participant in Tier 2.

(4) An individual who is a qualified participant described in subsection (3) is considered to have made an election to not become a member of Tier 1 and is subject to all of the following as of the date of his or her employment:

(a) The individual is not eligible to accrue any service credit or qualify for any retirement allowance under Tier 1.

(b) The individual is only a qualified participant under Tier 2.

(5) As used in this section, “qualified employee” means an individual described in section 4(1)(c), (e), or (g).”.

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. 396

Yeas—25

| | | | |
|-----------|-----------|----------------|---------|
| Anthony | Damoose | McBroom | Santana |
| Bayer | Geiss | McCann | Shink |
| Brinks | Hertel | McDonald Rivet | Singh |
| Camilleri | Huizenga | McMorrow | Victory |
| Cavanagh | Irwin | Moss | Webber |
| Chang | Klinefelt | Polehanki | Wojno |
| Cherry | | | |

Nays—12

| | | | |
|----------|----------|---------|----------|
| Albert | Daley | Johnson | Nesbitt |
| Bellino | Hauck | Lauwers | Runestad |
| Bumstead | Hoitenga | Lindsey | Theis |

Excused—1

Outman

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senators Albert, Runestad and Theis, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 165 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 Albert’s statement is as follows:

The well-being of the dedicated men and women serving as corrections officers in Michigan prisons has been a priority of mine since I joined the Legislature. There is no question that we must do more to help with recruitment and retention efforts to improve conditions for these officers and the other state employees covered in this legislative package.

Something must be done. It is clear there are significant retention issues and it is causing critical staffing shortages, particularly for corrections officers, but this proposal—while well-intentioned—is not the solution. To think that an employee is going to gut out 20 years at a job that mandates overtime and does not pay well, relative to other jobs with significantly less risk, for a pension is an oversimplification. For starters, I contend we would see much more success in improving retention through wage increases for these officers, who are a critical component of our public safety.

The Legislature does not set corrections officer pay—this is bargained by the executive and the Michigan Corrections Organization—but the Legislature could encourage higher wages by setting aside money to pay for one within the state budget process. Based on preliminary estimates my office has received, setting aside roughly \$25 million to \$50 million could support corrections officer pay increases of between five and ten percent. We also should consider policy changes that would address employee wellness, and potentially waive some of the college credit completion requirements for being a corrections officer.

A pension may be appealing, but it’s not enough when everything else in the job is grueling. I’m not going to say a pension means nothing, but to think that it is everything is to miss the bigger picture. What is going to happen if this proposal becomes law and we find no improvement in staffing recruitment or retention in one, five, or even ten years? Employees very well may see no difference in staffing rates, and wages will then be constrained by growing unfunded liabilities.

This proposal would move corrections officers, conservation officers, and others into the Michigan State Police Retirement System. Over the long run, this plan increases risk for both the Michigan taxpayer and the state troopers already in the fund.

Before getting into the specifics of this bill package, it is worth noting that I have dedicated a good portion of my time in the Legislature helping to ensure our public retirement systems are adequately funded upfront. I have personally negotiated billions of new dollars into the pension funds and worked on numerous reforms to help improve the structure of the funds—adding sustainability. In 2019, when Governor Whitmer and her administration raided the public school employee retirement pension system by erroneously lowering the payroll growth assumption, I pushed back and defended the fund. Even our Attorney General agreed that the administration’s maneuvering was in violation of state statute. It would have shortchanged the pension fund by hundreds of millions of dollars over time.

I worked to right that wrong and improve the system’s health for two main reasons. First, we have an obligation to ensure that employees in these systems receive the benefits they expect and deserve in retirement. Secondly, we also have an obligation to make sure these benefits are affordable and sustainable for taxpayers. We must not burden our children and grandchildren with future debt they did not create. Unfortunately, this system was again raided this year with the erroneous interpretation of there being two contribution floors—which resulted in \$670 million being diverted from the teacher retirement system this year alone.

It’s important that policymakers and the taxpayers they represent know the true costs of pension and retiree health systems. For example, in the 2023-2024 fiscal year alone, our state spent an estimated \$229 million of the corrections budget on legacy costs alone. This is for a plan that was closed 27 years ago. We need to know the extent of these costs in order to make better decisions moving forward, which is why I believe Democrats did taxpayers a disservice when they removed bill sections from the department budgets identifying how much these legacy costs are.

One might ask, What can happen when information on faltering public pensions gets ignored? You don’t have to look far to see the consequences. It happened in Detroit roughly ten years ago. Retirees had their pension benefits reduced, and cost-of-living adjustments were eliminated. Many retirees were also stuck with previously unexpected health costs. This was the result of poor planning and management, and we have an obligation to prevent situations like this from happening again.

We have made improvements in recent years to avoid this same situation from occurring at the state level, but there is still a long, long way to go. Michigan's pension systems still face massive debt. The latest audited reports show the state owes roughly an aggregate \$40 billion of retirement debt. We pay billions annually to help offset this debt. We cannot afford anything that might move our state backwards on this issue. When trying to get out of a hole, it does not make sense to dig deeper.

While the State Police pension system has improved in recent years, the fund is still in less than ideal fiscal shape. The most recent audited financial report shows the troopers' retirement system being at about 66 percent funded with nearly \$1.2 billion in unfunded liabilities. I was glad to spearhead a \$100 million principal deposit in the last legislative session, but it still has a long way to go. To put it bluntly, it is nowhere near healthy enough to be making this material expansion.

There are no shortage of historical examples illustrating how cost estimates on running a healthy pension system are massively understated. In fact, a well-funded government pension system is the exception not the rule. Governments have a poor track record when it comes to this. There is nothing in this proposal that looks to learn from the experience of the past and avoid the same mistakes. We are going to do the same thing and expect different results, which is the definition of insanity.

I can tell you from experience, both from working at the state pension fund and from working on pension legislation while working in the Legislature, the future financial risks to current state troopers is being underestimated. First and foremost, I agree with this bill's advocates that the new employees who are proposed to enter into this system will be in a differing unit than the existing employees—that is true, and it does separate the bank accounts, if you will. But that does not isolate the risk as it is applied in the event of unfunded liabilities going forward. I'll give an example. Let's say the discount rate that is used to calculate the payment for a corrections officer who has 15 years of service is six percent. They will be given a specific amount needed to purchase their years of service to transfer into the pension fund. If the actual investment returns that are experienced over the next ten years are actually four percent, then the estimates are wrong and it will cost more to pay for that employee's pension than expected. That creates more debt. This debt will be spread out over all employees in the system, including state troopers who receive no benefit from this proposal. I presented this scenario in committee to the director of the Office of Retirement Services—they confirmed its accuracy. We are adding risk to those who receive no benefit, and that is unfair and unjust.

This proposal unnecessarily adds risk to the State Police Retirement System. At a very minimum, if we are going to add state employees back into the pension system, it is much more prudent to do so using the State Employees Retirement System. This will avoid a situation where existing state troopers are responsible to pay for unfunded liabilities created by this proposal.

On top of that, there is another aspect of this bill package which is unfair. New hires, going forward, will not be given a choice on which type of retirement they can elect. They will be forced into the pension system. There is no reason to prevent them from having a choice between managing their own retirement or deferring to the state because the defined contribution style 401(k) is already in place. As I said earlier, we already do this for public school employees. For whatever reason, a number of employees who prefer to manage their own money—there will be no reason for them to have this option that's being taken away from them.

The good news is that we have other ways to address these concerns. I will be offering an alternative plan for a later bill in this package. This plan makes reforms to improve our current system rather than moving back to the failed policies of the past. My plan would address the issue of these employees not saving enough in their 401(k) accounts and offer a defined benefit option if they want one through an annuity option. The 401(k) employee match is more than tripled after a five-year phase-in. This will increase the 401(k) contributions from up to 10 percent of their paycheck to 24 percent. Additionally, if an employee wants a defined benefit income, they could do it through a regulated annuity option provider. Additionally, my plan would provide corrections officers and others covered in this legislative package up to \$10,000 in retention bonuses split up over a four-year period. This plan addresses the staffing and retirement problems while being less expensive and more sustainable in the long run.

Again, corrections officers need our help, but this is not the solution. I must vote "no" on this legislative package as it is presented today. I ask my colleagues to do the same, and support the alternative I have proposed instead as part of a broader solution to help corrections officers and their staffing situation.

Senator Runestad's statement is as follows:

I'm sure everybody in this chamber is 100 percent in favor of supporting law enforcement. In fact, I gave a floor speech on this when this was brought up before, when we had \$9 billion one-time funding that basically got poured down every rat hole imaginable, and advocated that we give a gigantic raise to corrections officers to retain and to recruit them, and that was shot down. Now, the Democrats are putting on the table increasing massively the liability costs which I think have to be considered very carefully because it's already currently underfunded. What we should have done is give a gigantic increase to these corrections officers.

As to the conservation officers, my staff has been trying to confirm that we're having a problem there. I have known—I have in my extended family corrections officers. It is a difficult job. It's one of the toughest jobs. You're going in eight hours a day, dealing with some of the worst criminal element in the world. Corrections officer? Not quite the same level of stress but I couldn't get any correct information as to what is the need for conservation officers to be added into this.

On the basis of putting in the conservation officers with corrections which I think is unfair, and the underfunded liabilities and the fact we didn't do anything when we had the big pot of money, I'll be voting "no" and urge my colleagues to do the same thing.

Senator Theis' statement is as follows:

I'd like to make note that the department—MSP—has specifically requested that we be "noes" on these bills, saying they have significant concerns with respect to them. While I absolutely agree that our corrections officers need better pay and we need to address how we're doing that, putting them into an account that's already underfunded is absolutely not the answer.

Senators Albert, McDonald Rivet, Damoose, Cherry and McBroom asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert's statement is as follows:

This amendment is very simple. It would give new hires in this plan a choice either to enter into the pension system or to manage their own money through a 401(k) plan. I can see no justification to limit new hires to only going into the pension system. Like it or not, the younger generation likes the ability to be mobile. For some potential new hires, a pension might be a dealbreaker, and allowing them to manage their own funds might be attractive. There is no reason to limit their options. This is the same thing we do for the teachers' pension system.

Some may argue that the pension plan will have a 401(k) component, so a 401(k) option is not needed. The fact of the matter is the pension component is the overwhelming majority of the retirement. The 401(k) match in the new hybrid plan is very small relative to the match in the state 401(k) plan. Hybrid plans like the State Police pension were created to reduce the cost-of-living adjustments by offering a small defined contribution match. This match was never intended, nor could it ever provide enough in savings for one to retire within itself. This is a commonsense option that should be added into this plan. Thank you, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Senator McDonald Rivet's statement is as follows:

This amendment is quite simply a gutting of the intent of this bill. At the end of the day, what we need to ask ourselves as a chamber is, Do we stand with law enforcement? Do we stand with first responders? Do we stand with our corrections officers? It is not enough in a campaign ad to say you back the blue and then walk into the Senate and try to strip critically-needed retirement benefits and other things that make this an attractive profession for people to go into, for people to stay in. At the end of the day, we need to make sure there is a protected retirement for those who give everything, often for our safety, and make sure we have their backs not just in rhetoric—not just in rhetoric—but in actually putting up a vote. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Senator Damoose's statement is as follows:

I rise today in support of Senate Bill Nos. 165 through 167. We have an opportunity before us to right a wrong that has been devastating to many of our state's corrections workers. Corrections is an impossibly tough job in and of itself. These men and women work long hours in an environment that can turn dangerous very quickly. These stressors are being compounded by a lack of new applicants within the department and retention problems that is causing undue stress on those who continue to show up for work every day. Those who are able to show up for work are often faced with even longer hours, including mandatory overtime with little to no notice whatsoever which has sadly increased severe mental health issues, family problems, and substance abuse issues among the workers. This is not an environment that I or anyone in this chamber should stand for.

Since my first visit to the Kinross Correctional Facility and the numerous meetings I've had there since, and in talks with dozens of prison employees, I have never seen a more frustrated and demoralized workforce in my life—and they are rightfully upset. What we are seeing is far from a model of success for any industry, let alone one that requires careful diligence at every turn. Everyone I've spoken with has told me that giving access to the State Police pension fund is a big part of the solution to address both hiring and retention issues, and will serve as a huge morale boost for Michigan's corrections workers. I've spoken with so many people who offer different ideas—we should do this, we should do that—and I always ask them, Why don't we do what they're asking because they know it will work? That's what these bills are.

I'm proud to have worked with the Senator from the 27th District to get this legislation moving and I'm happy to finally see it reach each and every one of our desks so we can have an opportunity to show these workers that we mean business. There are a lot of people saying they have concern for our corrections officers, but now it's time to do more than just talk. We need everyone in this room to stand up and do what it takes to fix the problem, so please join me in voting "yes" on these important bills.

Senator Cherry's statement is as follows:

First, I want to extend my gratitude to—there were many Senators who have advocated and supported this package, including the Senators from the 14th, the 21st, the 29th, the 35th, 37th, and 38th Districts at various times throughout this session and I'm very grateful for those Senators because this is very meaningful legislation for really thousands of state employees who are in a very difficult situation.

Before I go and talk about that, I want to clarify a little bit. The fiscal analysis actuarial studies that have gone through show that this does not—as it's structured—create any unfunded liability and really, when you're adding people to a pension system, it strengthens the financials on it. If you have an underfunded pension system and that debt is distributed over more people, the cost allocation per employee drops. It is easier to get that system up to fully funded. And actually, when we look at what we've done to our teacher retirement systems, when you cut people off from the system it actually hurts the financials on the system. This in fact will strengthen this system.

We've heard over a number of different statements throughout this session about the difficult situations that a lot of employees are facing and I think the Senator from the 37th District spoke well about that already. I'd like us to step back for a minute and put yourself in somebody's shoes and if you were working 16-hour shifts, mandatory overtime, how would that affect your life, the life of your spouse, the life of your children, really, and quite frankly, your physical and mental health in what is, I think, probably the most difficult job in state government? What we've asked from our corrections officers and others has really been unsustainable, and what we've heard is the staffing crisis that faces our Department of Corrections really is a crisis of retention. When we talk to those folks who are choosing not to stay, they say this would make a major impact on retaining officers. When you retain the officers, you can reduce the vacancy rate and then reduce the overtime. Just a few weeks ago, I was informed that the most recent numbers on an annual basis of overtime that we're paying within the Michigan Department of Corrections is \$112 million—\$112 million in overtime in a year. When we look at the fiscal analysis that says this costs \$16 million, I think this is a very easy investment.

In my remaining time, I also want to extend a thank you to a gentleman by the name of Michael Montgomery, who's a retired trainer from the Michigan Department of Corrections I had the pleasure of carpooling with for two years when I was in civil service and who taught me a lot about the situation that's faced the Michigan Department of Corrections over the past 20 or 30 years, who taught me about the Milliken Report, and who taught me that it is unfortunately the case that the only time we correct problems is after people have been hurt due to unrest within our prison system. That is not the situation we want to face. We should take proactive action. The Milliken Report outlined a number of items that caused unrest. Two of which: understaffing, and lack of training. The proposals that have been out there to address our understaffing right now—reducing education and training requirements—fit right into creating that crisis.

Mr. President, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" and I appreciate this bill being brought up for a vote.

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, a great feeling of accomplishment to see this bill come before us today. I introduced Senate Bill Nos. 156 and 157 to address this concern and I'm glad to see these very similar bills getting their chance and moving forward. While I am somewhat—I don't think it was necessary or even wise to include others outside of Corrections in this, the bulk of this need, the urgency of this issue trumps those concerns about the list of those who are eligible being expanded beyond just corrections officers.

I would echo some of the concerns we heard from one of my colleagues earlier. Corrections needs to have this benefit. The job is not just incredibly dangerous and stressful but is a job that is almost necessary to be done by those who are not yet of retirement age and who oftentimes have to leave this profession before they reach retirement age. Leaving that large gap in there is a really big problem and a major part of why our corrections officers and why our police officers, not just in Michigan but around the country, depend on these systems to support them when they retire. I do agree that there were other methods and ways of approaching this and I worked on this issue for many years, but the urgency we have at Corrections right now cannot be avoided any longer.

We are in a crisis—a staffing crisis, and a violence crisis—at our state facilities. Retention of our officers is a major crisis, and I don't know how many of you have seen the recent report to the Legislature that is offered to us through boilerplate language, and it's required annually from the department to report on employee departures. In the last year, employee departures who had worked for less than one year was 108, and those who had worked between one and three years was also 108, which is almost 50 percent of the

recruiting class leaving. We have people going to other states where starting pay is better, where the end-of-career pay is better, where the end-of-career benefits are better. Clearly we need to step up our game because the situation is dangerous and people are being hurt—officers are being hurt, inmates are being hurt. The situation is intolerable and shouldn't be tolerated any longer.

I want to challenge us to recognize that this alone is not enough to address this crisis. We have both an urgent immediate need, we have a short-term need and we have a long-term need, to address with our corrections officers and with the department. This is addressing the long-term, hoping to keep people retained longer, but until our starting pay competes with Wisconsin and Kansas and other neighboring states, we're still going to be missing the boat. Until we address the fact that we're leaving them hanging for post-employment healthcare before Medicare kicks in, we're still missing the boat, especially considering so many of them get out ten years before Medicare with significant injuries or mental health needs. We have to do more and we need to do it soon.

I encourage a "yes" vote today and continued work to follow.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 166, entitled

A bill to amend 1943 PA 240, entitled "State employees' retirement act," by amending section 55 (MCL 38.55), as amended by 2011 PA 264, and by adding sections 50b, 50c, 50d, 64a, 64b, and 64c.

The question being on the passage of the bill,
Senator Albert offered the following substitute:
Substitute (S-4).

The substitute was 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. 397

Yeas—25

| | | | |
|-----------|-----------|----------------|---------|
| Anthony | Damoose | McBroom | Santana |
| Bayer | Geiss | McCann | Shink |
| Brinks | Hertel | McDonald Rivet | Singh |
| Camilleri | Huizenga | McMorrow | Victory |
| Cavanagh | Irwin | Moss | Webber |
| Chang | Klinefelt | Polehanki | Wojno |
| Cherry | | | |

Nays—12

| | | | |
|----------|----------|---------|----------|
| Albert | Daley | Johnson | Nesbitt |
| Bellino | Hauck | Lauwers | Runestad |
| Bumstead | Hoitenga | Lindsey | Theis |

Excused—1

Outman

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

My alternative plan offered here would keep corrections officers, conservation officers, and other state employees in the plan in their current retirement systems. The officers and the other state employees covered in this package would be offered a much better 401(k) or defined contribution plan than they receive now. Currently, they’re in a fund that provides a four percent flat contribution from the state, and then an additional matching component of up to three percent. My plan would keep that four percent flat contribution but then improve the matching component based on the following schedule: if you work 0-3 years of service, you’d get a six percent match instead of the current three. Those with 3-5 years of service would get an eight percent match. Those with five or more years of service would get a match of ten percent.

This plan would also create an annuity option which employees can elect within their 401(k). If they desire a defined benefit income, they can choose one from a highly-regulated insurance provider. That is much more financially healthy than the state pension plan.

Another component introduced separately is a retention bonus of up to \$10,000 for corrections officers, conservation officers, and other eligible employees who stay on the job. Any officer or other eligible employee who works two years after this measure is signed—they would receive a \$5,000 retention payment. Any officer or eligible employee who works an additional two years after that would get an additional \$5,000. So if an employee worked for four years, they’d get \$10,000 in retention bonuses under this program.

This substitute plan is also reflected in the previous legislation I have introduced—Senate Bill Nos. 496 and 497. I appreciate your consideration.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 167, entitled

A bill to amend 1986 PA 182, entitled “State police retirement act of 1986,” (MCL 38.1601 to 38.1674) by adding sections 24c, 24d, 24e, and 24f.

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. 398

Yeas—25

| | | | |
|-----------|-----------|----------------|---------|
| Anthony | Damoose | McBroom | Santana |
| Bayer | Geiss | McCann | Shink |
| Brinks | Hertel | McDonald Rivet | Singh |
| Camilleri | Huizenga | McMorrow | Victory |
| Cavanagh | Irwin | Moss | Webber |
| Chang | Klinefelt | Polehanki | Wojno |
| Cherry | | | |

Nays—12

| | | | |
|----------|----------|---------|----------|
| Albert | Daley | Johnson | Nesbitt |
| Bellino | Hauck | Lauwers | Runestad |
| Bumstead | Hoitenga | Lindsey | Theis |

Excused—1

Outman

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Shink’s statement is as follows:

I appreciate the important work done by the corrections officers who keep Michigan safe, and a lot has already been said on that topic. I’ve heard from the officers, and what I’ve heard is that this package of bills is what they most want to help make their work and their lives better. I’ve heard too many stories of corrections officers who’ve basically said that their marriages have been ruined, their relationships with their children and friends have been ruined, and that this pension, which they believe will increase their ranks, will also give them hope for a better retirement. That’s worth working for and worth continuing to serve for.

This bill amends the State Police Retirement Act to require the plan to grant service, under this act, for service rendered under the State Employees’ Retirement Act if the member pays to the SPRS an amount equal to the actuarial value of the services determined by the SPRS actuary. The bill does not require members to purchase any service credit, nor are they required to purchase service credits for the entirety of their service rendered under the State Employees’ Retirement Act. This means that that act would be voluntary. Again, I urge my colleagues to support Senate Bill No. 167.

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

Senate Bill No. 982

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 982, entitled

A bill to amend 1883 PA 129, entitled “An act for the organization of telephone and messenger service companies;” (MCL 484.1 to 484.10) by adding section 7.

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. 399

Yeas—37

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

Nays—0

Excused—1

Outman

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. 983, entitled

A bill to amend 1993 PA 23, entitled “Michigan limited liability company act,” by amending section 705a (MCL 450.4705a), as amended by 2014 PA 559.

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. 400

Yeas—37

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

Nays—0

Excused—1

Outman

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. 984, entitled

A bill to amend 1972 PA 284, entitled “Business corporation act,” by amending section 123 (MCL 450.1123), as amended by 2012 PA 569.

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. 401

Yeas—37

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

Nays—0

Excused—1

Outman

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. 1050, entitled

A bill to amend 1967 PA 281, entitled “Income tax act of 1967,” by amending sections 12, 607, 699, 701, 805, and 845 (MCL 206.12, 206.607, 206.699, 206.701, 206.805, and 206.845), sections 12 and 607 as amended by 2018 PA 38, section 699 as added by 2011 PA 309, section 701 as amended by 2022 PA 148, and sections 805 and 845 as added by 2021 PA 135, and by adding section 339.

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. 402

Yeas—37

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

Nays—0

Excused—1

Outman

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Senator Singh moved that the Senate adjourn.
The motion prevailed, the time being 12:01 p.m.

The President pro tempore, Senator Moss, declared the Senate adjourned until Thursday, October 31, 2024, at 10:00 a.m.

DANIEL OBERLIN
Secretary of the Senate

