

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

**AUGUST 21, 2019
11:00 AM**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Senator Gary Stevens, Chair
Representative Louise Stutes, Vice Chair
Senator John Coghill
Senator Cathy Giessel
Senator Lyman Hoffman
Senator Natasha von Imhof
Representative Bryce Edgmon
Representative DeLena Johnson
Representative Jennifer Johnston
Representative Chuck Kopp
Representative Steve Thompson

MEMBERS ABSENT

Senator Mia Costello
Senator Bert Stedman
Representative Neal Foster

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT

AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
COMMITTEE BUSINESS
EXECUTIVE SESSION

SPEAKER REGISTER

Jessica Geary, Executive Director, Legislative Affairs Agency (LAA)
Megan Wallace, Director, Legal Services, LAA
Steve Daigle, Chief of Security, LAA

[11:00:31 AM](#)

I. CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR STEVENS called the Legislative Council meeting to order at 11:00am in the Anchorage Legislative Information Office (LIO) Large Conference Room. Present at the call were: Senators Coghill, Giessel, Hoffman, Stevens, von Imhof; Representatives Edgmon, Johnson, Johnston, Kopp, Stutes, Thompson.

Senators Costello, Stedman, and Representative Foster were absent.

11 members present.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. JUNE 13, 2019

[11:01:51 AM](#)

VICE-CHAIR STUTES moved and asked unanimous consent that Legislative Council approve the minutes dated June 13, 2019, as presented.

CHAIR STEVENS asked if there were corrections or additions to those minutes. Seeing none, the minutes are approved.

III. COMMITTEE BUSINESS

[11:02:55 AM](#)

CHAIR STEVENS requested a brief at ease.

[11:03:17 AM](#)

CHAIR STEVENS returned from brief at ease.

A. AMENDMENT TO WELLS FARGO LEASE

[11:03:20 AM](#)

VICE-CHAIR STUTES moved that Legislative Council approve the amendment to the Wells Fargo Lease.

CHAIR STEVENS objected for purpose of discussion. The Legislature has been contacted by Ompa Incorporated, a private investment company, and was asked to sell the small satellite parking lot that was included with our purchase of this building and is located a couple blocks away. The Legislature does not use the lot, but wanted to ensure there were no problems in the

lease or city ordinances that would prevent the sale and learned there were none. LAA staff contacted Wells Fargo to see if they were willing to amend their lease to remove that parking lot and they agreed. Chair Stevens asked Ms. Geary to please provide additional information and answer any questions.

JESSICA GEARY, Executive Director, Legislative Affairs Agency, responded that according to the lease, this lot is overflow parking for Wells Fargo employees when the main parking lot is full. The satellite parking lot has not been used, so when Ompa Inc. expressed interest, LAA researched it and found a sale is possible.

Currently, the lot is assessed with the Municipality of Anchorage for slightly over \$337,000. Generally, an assessment does not equal an appraisal, so the Agency is procuring a market analysis and appraisal to determine the lot's value, then will bring to Council the sale terms and determine whether to sell it to Ompa Inc. The first step is approving this amendment to the Wells Fargo lease. Ms. Geary said she is happy to answer any questions.

CHAIR STEVENS said when in Anchorage, he checks to see how the lot is being used and always finds it empty. He asked if there were any comments or questions about how to proceed.

SENATOR COGHILL asked Ms. Geary if the code requirement for parking for the Anchorage Legislative Office Building will be satisfied without this satellite lot?

MS. GEARY replied yes, the Agency contacted the Municipality and verified there are no restrictions and that there are ample parking spaces in the existing main lot.

SENATOR VON IMHOF confirmed that the assessed value is \$337,000 and LAA is getting an appraisal or valuation. She asked about timing and if a sale could potentially occur between now and Christmas? Where would the proceeds go? To Legislative Council?

MS. GEARY replied the timing may be a little longer than that because one of the renovation scopes of this building was to redo the parking lot, so the thought was to keep the satellite parking lot for use until that project is complete, and currently it is in the RFP phase. Regarding where potential proceeds may go depends on the Legislature—it could be put as an item in the budget for receipt authority to the Legislature, or into the general fund bank account.

SENATOR HOFFMAN asked would the Legislature proceed with a public notice stating it would be available for sale to the highest bidder.

CHAIR STEVENS said that is a very good question. He understood the party who expressed interest may own the adjacent property. However, does the Legislature offer it to the person interested, or open it up to the public and let everyone bid on it, then sell to the highest bidder. He asked Ms. Geary for comment.

MS. GEARY said there is a restriction on the sale and it cannot go to a business that would be in direct competition with Wells Fargo. So, when it changes hand from the Legislature that is the stipulation.

SENATOR HOFFMAN said so that would be another bank.

MS. GEARY replied that is correct.

SENATOR HOFFMAN said so the Legislature could put it up for sale with the stipulation that no other bank can bid on it.

MS. GEARY said that is correct and that would be a Legislative Council decision. Once the appraised value is known, she could bring it back before the Council for information and discussion.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON added that would also include any bank or investment firm because Wells Fargo has an investment side of their business too.

MS. GEARY said the Legislature would explore the exact exclusions when we reach that point.

SENATOR HOFFMAN said he did not want the Legislature to be perceived as doing an inside deal.

CHAIR STEVENS said he is exactly right. The principal is to ensure the Legislature receives the maximum amount of funds from any sale, but fairly. An appraisal will identify its worth, then a decision needs to be made about how to actually sell it—whether to open it up or discuss further with Ompa. Council must ensure it is done fairly and everyone has an opportunity to bid on it.

SENATOR VON IMHOF said she is trying to determine the purpose of this amendment. Ms. Geary mentioned earlier that the Legislature is using this parking lot for staging vehicles during the renovation, but the lease states, "the lessor intends to sell the satellite parking lot." She asked if this lease is being

removed to prevent our paying for it as we negotiate new terms, and why is an amendment needed if the plan is to potentially sell it? She said she worries this amendment is an extra step and could open it up, especially when it says that each party represents that the other has no dealings with any real estate broker. If the Legislature is going to park things there temporarily, we should pay for it.

CHAIR STEVENS asked Megan Wallace, who worked on this amendment, to offer comment.

MEGAN WALLACE, Director, Legal Services, Legislative Affairs Agency, said the reason the amendment to the lease is necessary is the Legislature's lease with Wells Fargo; as owners of the building, we have contracted with Wells Fargo to allow them to utilize the satellite parking lot. So if we sell that parking lot, we no longer can provide that to Wells Fargo to use. So we need to amend the contract to remove language with respect to the satellite parking lot before we can move forward with selling that lot.

CHAIR STEVENS said so this is just the first step.

MS. WALLACE replied, yes, the first step to separate the utilization of the parking lot by Wells Fargo from the Legislature's ties to the parking lot.

SENATOR VON IMHOF asked if someone slips and falls in that parking lot, who is responsible? After this amendment is done, who will own and be responsible for that parking lot- i.e. managing, plowing, salting, slips and falls, etc.?

MS. WALLACE said after this amendment is done, the Legislature will be the sole owner and land owner of the satellite parking lot.

SENATOR VON IMHOF asked if the Legislature will lease it to whomever? So while awaiting an appraisal or the conclusion of the renovation, what will be the use of that parking lot until it is sold?

MS. WALLACE replied that is a better question for Ms. Geary.

MS. GEARY responded that it is the Legislature's parking lot, so it would be overflow parking for our employees while construction happens in the main parking lot.

CHAIR STEVENS asked when that construction may end.

MS. GEARY said that construction has not yet begun, so it will not likely be accomplished this season. The funding has been approved, but the competitive bid process is still ongoing.

REPRESENTATIVE KOPP asked the exact location of the satellite parking lot.

MS. GEARY replied that it is directly across the street accessible through the CHARR parking lot—a very short walk.

REPRESENTATIVE KOPP asked how many spaces are in that lot.

MS. GEARY said she believed there are 74 spaces, but can confirm back.

REPRESENTATIVE KOPP confirmed there has been just one person who has contacted us about buying it.

MS. GEARY said that is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE KOPP asked if there is an advantage to leasing versus selling it.

MS. GEARY said that is certainly possible to explore. The Legislature was approached last year with that question and the primary concern was liability. She said the individual who reached out manages a trust that owns the adjacent properties, so they are looking to expand their existing property. She did not imagine they would be interested in leasing, but that could be explored.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSTON asked if the Legislature currently has liability for the parking lot.

MS. GEARY said, yes, it is the Legislature's parking lot and liability, and per the lease terms, Wells Fargo is able to park on it.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSTON followed up that changing the lease has nothing to do with liability, it is clear that it is still ours.

MS. GEARY replied that is correct.

CHAIR STEVENS said this is the first step in correcting the agreement with Wells Fargo—there are lots of steps to go to get an appraisal, decide how to sell it, so Council will be involved every step of the way. But this is the first one that needs to happen so we can begin the process. Any further questions or comments?

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON asked about the requirement to provide parking and is that a separate parking lot or separate restriction, or is it just a blanket statement that says the Legislature will provide parking.

MS. GEARY said it is a blanket statement in the lease that says we will provide parking and a certain number of parking spaces. This amendment just removes the ability to park in the satellite lot.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON clarified that is an amendment to the lease, not a deed restriction. Is there a deed restriction saying that the Legislature cannot sell it to anyone besides those in competition?

MS. GEARY said it was a requirement in the terms of the purchase from Wells Fargo when we bought the building and the parking lot.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON said that if there is a deed restriction on the entire parking area and an appraisal is done, it would be best to get the agreement with Wells Fargo taken care of and the contract with them amended, because that can reduce the value of the property. If that can be lifted before a sale, it is worth looking into.

MS. GEARY replied that she agrees and once this amendment is approved then we can explore further into the purchase, sale, and exclusion clause detail and bring that information back before Council.

CHAIR STEVENS asked if there were further questions or comments. He said this will be a long process. He said that, oddly, while he was involved in the purchase of this building, he was not aware of the satellite lot for some time, so encouraged everyone to stop by that location.

There is a motion on the table to approve the amendment to the Wells Fargo lease. Is there further discussion? Seeing none, he requested a roll call vote.

A roll call vote was taken.

YEAS: Senators Coghill, Giessel, Hoffman, Stevens, von Imhof; Representatives Edgmon, Johnson, Johnston, Kopp, Stutes, Thompson.

NAYS: None

The motion passed 11-0.

B. CHANGE TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MOVING & TRAVEL POLICY

11:21:28 AM

VICE-CHAIR STUTES moved that Legislative Council approve the amendment to the Legislative Council Moving & Travel Policy.

CHAIR STEVENS objected for purpose of discussion and asked Ms. Geary to please discuss the reasoning for this matter.

MS. GEARY said she was approached earlier this year after a recent change to tax code. As Council is aware, staff who come to Juneau for session do not receive per diem. Previously, they could write off a significant amount of those expenses on their personal tax return, but due to the Tax Cut and Jobs Act, that is no longer an option. She did hear from several staff after preparing their taxes this past year, they owed significantly more.

She was asked to look into possibilities for paying staff some sort of a stipend or housing allowance and how the Legislature could make it non-taxable to staff. She did some research and consulted with a CPA firm and now has a method. This amendment to the Moving and Travel Policy will allow for the Presiding Officers to set a stipend amount that does not bind them from year to year and can be decided on a Legislature or annual basis. She said she envisioned it being added to the Presiding Officer Travel Guidelines approved at the beginning of each Legislature, but that is completely at the discretion of the Presiding Officers. She said in whole, there is not a change, but now it allows for this to happen and she is glad to answer any questions.

CHAIR STEVENS said this would be handled separately by the Speaker and the President, it does not have to be the same, but they would make that decision.

MS. GEARY said technically they could both be different amounts, but that she saw it being more of a collaborative discussion about treating staff in both bodies the same.

SENATOR COGHILL asked respectfully why Legislative Council did not come up with a policy and left it to the discretion of the Presiding Officers.

CHAIR STEVENS replied Council certainly could, if members chose to pursue that, but left that responsibility to the Presiding Officers instead.

SENATOR COGHILL said so based on the discretion, there may or may not be tax liability, because if it is overly generous, then there would be a tax bracket question based on the value of the stipend. The Presiding Officers must consider that, correct?

MS. GEARY said each individual staff will have their own tax basis which will depend on several different circumstances, so there will be a form for them to complete and submit to the Accounting Office to take care of that.

Your greater point, whether or not the Presiding Officer have to factor in those considerations, is a valid point. The reason it was not set as a flat amount in policy is because it constrains the Agency to follow this set amount, and we cannot put a finite budget amount on it since we do not know how many staff will claim lodging allowance or what the lodging allowance will be. This made it more flexible and opened it up for discussion. In policy, we could establish a cap to not exceed a certain amount. These are all excellent questions that are open for discussion.

SENATOR COGHILL said he recalled the Legislature amended ranges and travel a few years ago, partly due to the cost of moving in and out of the Capital. Was travel to and from changed recently?

MS. GEARY responded that prior to 2008, staff were not reimbursed the cost of travelling to Juneau for the session. That was changed in 2008, and in 2009 it was amended again so staff could bring their vehicles to Juneau.

SENATOR COGHILL asked if we did a range adjustment during that time.

MS. GEARY said it was her understanding that particular policy has been more budget driven than anything else.

SENATOR VON IMHOF said it would be interesting to know if there are other per diem amounts paid elsewhere, particularly with the administration, whether it be commissioners or deputy commissioners or Health and Social Services employees, whomever that travel in and around the state. Is per diem paid to people for hotel, meal, rental car, etc. on the executive and administrative level? If so, what are those amounts and does it make sense to do something within a close range of those for the Legislature? She supports putting some type of dollar figure in this document, even if it is a narrow range and said that can

help budget. There is a finite number of staff that can be calculated for ninety days. It is fair to put in a number so the Speaker and President are not on the spot each year. What is the per diem being paid now in other branches of government, including the judiciary?

MS. GEARY said she can certainly put together that information. She said the legislature is unique in how it treats its staff and that they do not always know the duration of their assignment. The executive branch for example received a long term allowance of thirty-three dollars per day with many caveats that dictate the amount they are paid, whether it is taxable, and why they are paid. She can certainly provide information on those different scenarios.

REPRESENTATIVE KOPP said that a summary of other State employee benefits in this area would be helpful. Council would also have to keep in mind that the Executive branch travel policy always presumes staff is being deployed out from where they live, so necessarily they will pay considerably more. Whereas the Legislature hire twice yearly, just for the purpose of avoiding having to pay travel and per diem. He said frankly, it is the most unfriendly employee policy he has ever seen and as a strong advocate of employee benefits, he is always amazed, but the Legislature has great employees and there are other benefits with the job.

He said he is pleased that Council is going this way for a couple reasons; he knows from his time being a staff person that this affects employees about \$4,000 take home. This is a significant cash outlay because of the tax increase to them--thousands of dollars more they are paying. Taking this very seriously about what we can do to recognize that staff are being rehired with Juneau as their home base, when really it is not... but we rehire staff to save a lot of money. We ought to do something. It does not have to be the same as the executive branch, because necessarily their travel policy presumes they are away from home. Any stipend at all would be appreciated by staff. He would not advocate for a large amount, but even twenty-five dollars per day is significant and could help offset their rent.

Whatever the number, he supports the idea of a hard cap to not exceed, which also relieves pressure from the Presiding Officers. It sends a message to Legislative employees that we recognize that it was hard before, it got harder now, and we are doing something tangible to show we appreciate their service.

CHAIR STEVENS said the comments that both Representative Kopp and Senator von Imhof made are very appropriate on finding out what others are doing and having a dollar figure to know what we will be budgeting. In addition, Senator von Imhof suggested we work with NCSL or CSG and learn how other states compensate their legislative staff.

SENATOR GIESSEL said it was her staff who approached Ms. Geary and researched how best to provide this stipend without substantially increasing the tax liability for legislative employees. What was envisioned was an amount not to exceed a certain amount per month. The suggestion that we had initially made was \$600 per month, but there would be a cap and the employee would have to produce their housing receipt, so that if they were staying at a friend's house at a reduced rate of \$200 per month they would not receive the \$600. That would be the cap on the amount, but it would otherwise be lower than that if they were not paying that much. She said that is where this originated and she appreciated Ms. Geary who directed her staff to tax attorneys who looked into this. Perhaps it could be refined a bit more, but she did not want the refinement process to carry on too long because she would like this to be available for staff starting in January.

She and the Speaker, in these last special sessions, actually provided stipend for essential staff—leadership staff and key committee staff including their transportation to Juneau and back to their home. We have been endeavoring to really help out legislative staff who are quite challenged with the unpredictable special sessions.

CHAIR STEVENS said everyone has offered excellent comments regarding finding out what others have been doing, identifying a dollar figure, and a not to exceed figure. He suggested, this needs a little more thought and it might be appropriate to have a motion to table it until our next meeting if members are comfortable with that. As Senator Giessel said, we do not want to wait too long so it can be in place by January. He asked the pleasure of the Council.

SENATOR VON IMHOF moved to table this item just to get information from NCSL, CSG, and potentially other branches of government to offer ideas and refine the not to exceed amount.

CHAIR STEVENS said we have a motion on the table that is not debatable. Is there any objection to the motion to table? Seeing none, this issue will be tabled until the next meeting. He thanked everyone for the excellent discussion.

C. ADDITION OF A LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ID BADGE POLICY

CHAIR STEVENS said he does not want to take action on this item at this time, but it is here for discussion to determine how to proceed on this new policy. He asked Ms. Geary to please explain the reasons for recommendations on the ID badge and the Chief of Security, Steve Daigle, is also on line to discuss this issue.

MS. GEARY said that Legislative Council put together a Security Subcommittee earlier this year and discussed various security measures to help make the Capitol complex more secure. One of the suggestions put forward was to require staff to wear identification badges, now a common practice in most public buildings. The subcommittee proposed a lanyard with an ID card clipped to it, and perhaps the key card clipped to the back of that. We reviewed various prototypes to identify which might be best. Aesthetics aside, this is really an issue of Security being able to easily identify people who do not belong in the building, which is a challenge in a public building where people come and go all the time. Our Chief of Security thought this would be very helpful for his team.

There were some evolutions of who should be required to wear a lanyard and whether it is limited to just staff. Members of the media are already required to wear a Press Pass, so we widened the scope to include visitors, contractors, etc. Right now the scope is large and could be refined. She said initially, she did not include badges for Legislators since the notion was everyone knows them, then it was suggested that perhaps Legislators should wear them also. Another suggestion was to have lobbyists wear badges. There is a lot still to discuss and this is putting a rough draft before you. Mr. Daigle, would you like to add anything?

STEVE DAIGLE, Chief of Security, Legislative Affairs Agency, said [AUDIO PICKED UP MID SENTENCE] ...we can bundle them to together, but that would be a nice feature. He did not know if we have that capability. Lobbyist IDs would be good to have, they do not have access to the building now, so that is not a problem. The other issue would be if someone lost an access card, whoever found it would immediately know that this belongs to the Capitol they would have access. The card could always be deactivated. And then the visitors, we get about two or three groups of school kids coming in daily and there may be twenty or thirty in the group, so he would put a visitor badge on the escort so there are not so many cards lost as souvenirs.

He said this is a great idea. He likes to know who is coming in and a lot of people do not put their photos on the intranet and if he lets a staffer into a door, he must run down to the computer, pull them up on the intranet, and see if they actually belong to that office. With an ID badge, that would be much easier. Again, he supports this and thinks it is a good idea. He does not know how labor intensive it would be. He would like the ID and key card in one, but was not sure if we can do that.

MS. GEARY responded, yes, we could do that, however the issue is it is quite expensive to print ID badges with key card access. It is approximately four dollars per badge, so with our turnover it could be a significant cost.

MR. DAIGLE continued that he still supports the badge proposal and said it will also help staff identify each other.

CHAIR STEVENS asked Ms. Geary to please pass around the samples and asked where they come from.

MS. GEARY said these samples were made by our Media Services team and the lanyards samples are a few different styles that were loaned to us by a local print shop—some break away, some unclip, etc. If the decision is made to require staff to wear these lanyards, she proposed a tasteful navy blue lanyard.

CHAIR STEVENS said Council appointed a Security Subcommittee and this was a suggestion they brought forth for consideration. He said there will not be action on this now, but appreciated members thoughts and will consider this for the future.

SENATOR COGHILL said he thought it is a good idea, but agrees the front Security desk would be busier. When crowds come in, it could put additional work on the Security team. It would be nice to know who is in and out of the building. There was discussion about lobbyists probably more than anyone, because they tend to be in the building more and nobody really knows who they are. Keeping the access key and ID badge separate is smart. However, for for me, it is one more thing to lose.

REPRESENTATIVE KOPP said he thought for a variety of reasons this is a good policy. He appreciated Mr. Daigle and our Security Subcommittee bringing this forward. There is no excuse for not knowing names anymore—knowing the names of people in the building is important. While the ID may be a hassle, he said Security may have to put some sort of a turnstile in up front so there is a break to the pace when walking in where Security would see each person and they would come in. If someone does not have a badge, Security would wave them over and get them set

up. It would be more labor intensive at the front door, but we live in a day and age where we have to adapt. The legislature has been pretty lax and has been fortunate. The Security Subcommittee prompting us to be more responsive to the security of the building, if it is done right, will not inhibit visitors from feeling welcome—they get their welcome visitor badge and off they go. It really is just at the front door and he thinks it is needed.

CHAIR STEVENS said there has always been a concern about security in the building, whether there is enough or too much. Many legislators in the past have discussed how important it is that this is the people's building and that they are not denied access. This is a fairly simple thing to pass out these badges. Any other comments or thoughts? He said he appreciated all the input and Council will consider this at a future date.

D. UPDATE ON GOVERNOR EGAN BUST

CHAIR STEVENS said there will be no action on this item today, but asked Senator Coghill to please provide an update on where we are in this process.

SENATOR COGHILL said he spoke with Roy Peratrovich on August 20, 2019, who apologized and said between his physical ability and acquiring photos, it has not gone as fast as he would like. Senator Coghill put him in touch with the University of Alaska archives to provide some photos, specifically a side profile and back profile photo of the Governor. Mr. Peratrovich assured him that it could be done by the first of the year. This could be one of his last sculptures as he is beginning to feel the effects of his malady. Senator Coghill encouraged patience, but is open to discussion.

CHAIR STEVENS said that a long time has passed since Governor Egan was in office, so we can be patient for a few more months to ensure this is done right and is glad he is doing the sculpture. He asked if there were any comments and thanked Senator Coghill for representing us on this and moving ahead so smartly.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. EDUCATION LITIGATION UPDATE

B. TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO THE REDISTRICTING PLANNING COMMITTEE

11:49:22 AM

VICE-CHAIR STUTES moved and asked unanimous consent that Legislative Council go into executive session under Uniform Rule 22(B)(1), discussion of matters, the immediate knowledge of which would adversely affect the finances of a government unit and 22(B)(3), discussion of a matter that may, by law, be required to be confidential. She asked that the following individuals remain in the room or on-line; Jessica Geary, Megan Wallace, Alpheus Bullard, Howard Trickey and any legislative staff working for Council members. We also welcome any Legislators who are not on Legislative Council to remain in the room or on-line.

CHAIR STEVENS asked if there was objection to the motion. Hearing none, Council will go into Executive Session.

11:50:18 AM

Council went into Executive Session.

12:36:25 PM

Council came out of Executive Session.

VICE-CHAIR STUTES moved and asked that Legislative Council authorize the expenditure of funds, not to exceed \$250,000, upon request of and for the Redistricting Planning Committee to make necessary arrangements for the Redistricting Board in accordance with AS 15.10.300.

CHAIR STEVENS objected for purpose of discussion and asked Senator Giessel to briefly explain why funds need to be transferred to the Redistricting Planning Committee.

SENATOR GIESSEL explained that the statute Representative Stutes cited has Section E which calls out the work of the Planning Committee—not the Redistricting Board, the Board itself is five people who are appointed next year who do the actual work of drawing district lines. The Planning Committee does the logistics work that puts in place an office where the Redistricting Board can work, provides them with desks, chairs, tables, computers, printers—they need a large printer for maps.

They will need to immediately get to work since they have only thirty days after getting the data. They also need to have legal representation in case there was litigation related to their adopted plan. All of this logistics work must be done ahead of time. The Planning Committee is five members: two appointed by the Governor; one by the Senate President; one by the Speaker of the House; and one by the Chief Justice of the Court System.

The funding for this committee's work was inadvertently left out of the FY20 budget. There was a small amount provided, \$50,000, which was appropriated to the Governor's Office for capital expenses, but typically this Planning Committee has a first appropriation of about \$350,000. We are asking for only \$250,000 and believe that would be ample and do not expect the Planning Committee to even use all those funds. It is my intent, and the Speaker can also assert, that we will request in the FY21 budget a restoration of any funds that this committee might use from Legislative Council's appropriation so that Legislative Council is kept whole. With that, I will take any questions.

CHAIR STEVENS asked if there were any questions. Seeing none, he said he thought everyone understands the issue here and he appreciates this being brought up. The Planning Committee is extremely important. Seeing no discussion, he removed his objection and requested a roll call vote.

A roll call vote was taken.

YEAS: Senators Coghill, Giessel, Stevens, von Imhof; Representatives Edgmon, Johnson, Johnston, Kopp, Stutes, Thompson.

NAYS: None

The motion passed 10-0.

CHAIR STEVENS reminded everyone that there is an Open House today in the LIO from 4:00-6:00pm. He said this is a functional building that has worked out quite well and encouraged anyone listening to come and participate.

VICE-CHAIR STUTES shared that today is Chair Stevens' birthday and wished him a very happy birthday.

CHAIR STEVENS thanked Representative Stutes.

V. ADJOURN

CHAIR STEVENS said if there is nothing further to come before the Council, we are adjourned.

[12:42:26 PM](#)