

HOUSE FINANCE COMMITTEE
February 14, 2024
8:35 a.m.

8:35:11 AM

CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair Foster called the House Finance Committee meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Bryce Edgmon, Co-Chair
Representative Neal Foster, Co-Chair
Representative DeLena Johnson, Co-Chair
Representative Julie Coulombe
Representative Mike Cronk
Representative Alyse Galvin
Representative Sara Hannan
Representative Andy Josephson
Representative Dan Ortiz
Representative Will Stapp
Representative Frank Tomaszewski

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

ALSO PRESENT

Ryan McKee, Staff, Representative George Rauscher; Representative George Rauscher, Sponsor; Sana Efird, Executive Director, Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education, Department of Education and Early Development; Deb Riddle, Operations Manager, Division of Innovation and Education Excellence, Department of Education and Early Development; Laural Shoop, Legislative Liaison, Department of Education and Early Development; Karen Morrison, Director, Division of Finance and Facilities, Department of Education and Early Development; Representative Louise Stutes; Representative Justin Ruffridge; Representative Andi Story; Representative Rebecca Himschoot.

PRESENT VIA TELECONFERENCE

Jeffrey Schmitz, Director, Division of Motor Vehicles, Department of Administration; Faye Tanner, Program Coordinator, Department of Education and Early Development.

SUMMARY

HB 81 VEHICLES/BOATS: TRANSFER ON DEATH TITLE

HB 81 was REPORTED out of committee with ten "do pass" recommendations and one "no recommendation" recommendation and with one new fiscal impact note from the Department of Administration.

HB 148 AK PERFORMANCE SCHOLARSHIP; ELIGIBILITY

CSHB 148(FIN) was REPORTED out of committee with ten "do pass" recommendations and one "no recommendation" recommendation and with four new fiscal impact notes from the Department of Education and Early Development.

HB 155 ESTABLISH AK MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMISSION

HB 193 was REPORTED out of committee with eight "do pass" recommendations, two "amend" recommendations, and one "no recommendation" recommendation and with one new fiscal impact note from the Department of Education and Early Development.

HB 193 INTERNET FOR SCHOOLS

CSHB 155(FIN) was REPORTED out of committee with ten "do pass" recommendations and one "no recommendation" recommendation and with one new fiscal impact note from the Office of the Governor.

Co-Chair Foster reviewed the meeting agenda.

#hb81

HOUSE BILL NO. 81

"An Act relating to the transfer of a title on the death of the owner; and providing for an effective date."

8:37:29 AM

Co-Chair Foster noted that no amendments had been received for the bill. The committee would review the one fiscal note from the Department of Administration.

JEFFREY SCHMITZ, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF MOTOR VEHICLES (DMV), DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION (via teleconference), stated that he had just been informed that the fiscal note submitted by the DMV had been changed by the committee. He believed the note was now indeterminate or zero. He could not speak to the reasons why the committee had changed the note.

Co-Chair Foster replied that he did not believe the fiscal note had been changed by the committee. He looked at fiscal note with the OMB component number 2348 showing total operating expenditures of \$75,000 designated general funds (DGF). He thought it was likely the original fiscal note.

8:39:16 AM

AT EASE

8:39:50 AM

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Foster noted that Mr. Schmitz may be looking at an earlier version of the fiscal note generated in the House Transportation Committee, which was no longer relevant. He clarified that the committee was addressing OMB component number 2348.

Mr. Schmitz apologized for the confusion. He detailed that the DMV fiscal note included \$75,000 for programming needed to change DMV's information system in accordance with the bill. He elaborated that the cost had been provided by the Office of Information Technology (OIT) [under the Department of Administration]. He explained that there were no other DMV costs.

Co-Chair Foster asked the bill sponsor to come to the table to ensure the fiscal note was accurate.

RYAN MCKEE, STAFF, REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE RAUSCHER, confirmed the fiscal note was correct. He explained that the House Transportation Committee had changed the fiscal note to indeterminate, but it had reverted back to the

prior fiscal note with cost of \$75,000 when it reached the House Finance Committee.

Co-Chair Johnson thought that the title transfer would already take place when someone passed away. She wondered why the funds were needed if the step was not additional.

Mr. Schmitz responded that it was not something that happened automatically when an individual died. He explained that the DMV or individuals involved did not automatically know who [a vehicle title] should be transferred to. He expounded that sometimes a vehicle could be subject to probate. He explained there were a variety of other features that could direct a path of ultimate ownership in different directions. He was certain it was the reason for the bill, in order to clarify what would happen when an owner died. The programming involved would be to change all of the fields needed to display the intent of the owners upon death clearly on the title.

[8:44:33 AM](#)

Co-Chair Johnson observed that it would take 600 programming hours [based on the information in the fiscal note]. She estimated that was about 15 weeks.

Mr. Schmitz responded affirmatively. He stated it was the information provided by OIT. He explained it was a complicated item, particularly pertaining to ownership fields. He elaborated that it had to be tested and regression tested. He stated that it could take an OIT team awhile to work on it and he did not know the exact process or the number of programmers involved.

Co-Chair Johnson thought it seemed to be a lot of programming to do a title transfer.

Co-Chair Foster noted Leslie Isaacs, Administrative Service Director, Department of Administration, was in the room for questions as well.

REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE RAUSCHER, SPONSOR, stated it was hard for him to understand why it would take the specified length of time to make the change. He had seen other bills with similar changes that had a zero fiscal note.

[8:46:55 AM](#)

Co-Chair Edgmon asked if the committee was disputing the fiscal note.

Co-Chair Foster clarified they were asking questions.

Co-Chair Edgmon asked if they were information gathering on the fiscal note. He was uncertain what the committee was doing.

Co-Chair Foster remarked that it sounded like there were some questions on the note. He stated that the department felt it needed the money for the work. He reasoned that if the funding was not provided the department may have to request a supplemental appropriation later on. He was comfortable going forward with the fiscal note.

Co-Chair Edgmon wanted to see the bill move and thought they should move it forward. He surmised that the fiscal note was likely not what the bill sponsor wanted to see, but in the scheme of things the cost was fairly nominal. He believed they should go for the greater good and move the bill.

Co-Chair Johnson also wanted to see the bill move. She did not want to get bogged down on the \$75,000 fiscal note. She thought she would need to spend some time looking into how the numbers were determined on fiscal notes coming to the committee.

Representative Hannan stated that she did not know anything about computer programming. She deferred to the OIT expertise. She was very supportive of the bill. She shared that she had just gone through a complicated probate process with her sister. She understood that things that should be simple and straight forward were sometimes not. She remarked that they were talking about vehicle and boat titles, which could add a layer of complexity. She reminded the committee that DMV was one of the few places in the state budget that generated millions of dollars to the general fund that lapsed annually. She stated her understanding that the \$75,000 in the fiscal note was the maximum cost and the cost may not reach that amount. She supported moving the bill.

Co-Chair Foster added that the funds were a one-time amount.

[8:50:43 AM](#)

Co-Chair Johnson MOVED to REPORT HB 81 out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note. There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

HB 81 was REPORTED out of committee with ten "do pass" recommendations and one "no recommendation" recommendation and with one new fiscal impact note from the Department of Administration.

[8:51:29 AM](#)

AT EASE

[8:52:37 AM](#)

RECONVENED

#hb148

HOUSE BILL NO. 148

"An Act relating to the Alaska performance scholarship program."

[8:52:52 AM](#)

Co-Chair Foster noted there were no amendments for the bill. He stated that the committee would review the four fiscal notes. He asked the director of the Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education (ACPE) with the Department of Education and Early Development (DEED) to review the first three notes.

SANA EFIRD, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ALASKA COMMISSION ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT, began with OMB component number 2990 pertaining to student financial aid programs. The note pertained to the Alaska Performance Scholarship (APS) awards passed through as grants on the grants and benefits line and funded through the Higher Education Investment Fund. The note included \$2,264,000 for FY 25, \$2,404,200 for FY 26, \$2,545,700 for FY 27, \$2,688,700 for FY 28, \$2,833,100 for FY 29, and \$2,978,900 for FY 30. The bill amended the qualification criteria for the APS applicant by adding an option for and expanding career and technical education to the academic curriculum. The bill inserted the definition for career cluster, removed the minimum score on

a college entrance or standardized examination requirement for eligibility and added language to allow for a GPA or minimum college entrance examination to qualify, instead of requiring both. The bill added a requirement for school districts to notify students in their junior year of their progress towards earning APS eligibility and it required districts to inform students in 9th and 10th grade about the performance scholarship. The legislation increased the annual award amounts and provided an additional two years for students to use the scholarship after high school graduation, expanding the time from six to eight years. The bill allowed eligible award recipients to qualify for an increased award level while enrolled at a qualified postsecondary institution, which was a step-up provision.

Ms. Efird continued to review OMB component number 2990. She highlighted that APS award amounts were being increased from \$4,755 to \$7,000 annually for level one, \$3,566 to \$5,250 annually for level two, and \$2,378 to \$3,500 annually for level three. A table on the fiscal note showed the requirements for the GPA or the minimum scores on the college entrance exams. In order to come up with an estimate for the note, ACPE had considered all of the potential changes in the eligibility requirements resulting from the legislation and a possible increase in the number of scholarship eligible students. Additionally, the increase in award amounts could increase the current appropriation. Therefore, the calculation estimate for the APS fiscal note award amount assumptions began with FY 23 (the most recent completed class) as a base. The note applied the increase scholarship amounts included in the bill to the FY 23 numbers and projected a 2 percent increase in student usage for FY 25 due to expanded eligibility criteria. The subsequent years projected a 1 percent increase in the number of students per year.

[8:59:05 AM](#)

Representative Josephson stated that the legislature had recapitalized the Higher Education Investment Fund with close to \$400 million and had passed a law making it a separate fund to prevent the funds from being swept. He remarked that many legislators had shown a real commitment to the fund. He asked if the draw would be sustainable.

Ms. Efird responded that the fiscal note was an estimate. She elaborated that ACPE wanted to put forward a good

faith, transparent number that could result from the bill; however, currently, the appropriation for the APS award was \$11,750,000. She explained that in the past year, APFC had awarded less than \$8 million of the funds. She relayed that the investment of the fund was managed by the Department of Revenue (DOR) and she did not want to speak on its behalf in terms of sustainability. She explained that DOR provided a 7 percent calculation of the balance to ACPE to distribute two-thirds to the APS and one third for the Alaska education grants. In FY 24, the 7 percent equaled \$26.6 million with \$17.7 million for the APS; however, only \$11.75 million was appropriated and slightly under \$8 million was actually used. The Alaska education grant had an available \$8.8 million to use in FY 24; however, only \$5.8 million was appropriated. She clarified that up to the current point, ACPE had not used the 7 percent total calculation available under statute from the Higher Education Investment Fund; however, any questions about the investments and gains and losses should be directed to DOR.

Ms. Efird speculated it would be five or so years before there may be a concern [about the fund balance]. She underscored that she was not an investment expert. She believed committee members had the most recent APS report showing how the use of the APS had been declining. The current usage was less than half of the peak usage number. She thought it would take four to five years to see all of the new changes opening doors for other students. She stated that there may be a question or funds needed to recapitalize the fund in the future. She emphasized it was a tool that would make a difference for the state's workforce.

Co-Chair Foster recognized that Representative Louise Stutes was in the audience. He noted that the bill was sponsored by the House Education Committee and he recognized members from that committee including Representative Justin Ruffridge (co-chair) and Representative Andi Story.

[9:04:29 AM](#)

Representative Galvin remarked on the bill's language that students would be notified of the APS in their junior and possibly sophomore years. She asked if the notification went home for parents to see as well.

Ms. Efird responded that she was not certain but believed it was students. She would have to double check to verify the information.

Representative Galvin replied that she was very happy to support the legislation and the answer was not pertinent to her support.

[9:05:23 AM](#)

Ms. Efird moved to the second fiscal note OMB Component number 3340 for the Alaska Education Grant Program. The grant program was funded through the Higher Education Investment Fund in the amount of \$1,165,200 in FY 25, \$1,235,300 in FY 26, \$1,306,100 in FY 27, \$1,377,500 in FY 28, \$1,449,700 in FY 29, and \$1,522,600 in FY 30. Based on current statute, the grant would increase as a result of the projected APS increase in the bill. She explained that under AS 14.43.915(c) one-third of the combined amount shall be available solely for payment of grants awarded. Statute directed ACPE to annually allocate two-thirds of the combined amount in the accounts to eligible APS applicants. She elaborated that if an insufficient number of qualified applicants were awarded grants or scholarships or both, the commissioner was directed to redeposit the remaining funds into the Alaska Higher Education Investment Fund. She noted that if the appropriation increased for the APS, it would also increase for the Alaska Education Grant proportionately.

[9:08:17 AM](#)

Ms. Efird reviewed OMB component number 2738 for ACPE program administration and operation. The note pertained to administrative allocation for staffing charged with implementing the program. The note included one-time costs of \$31,200 for personal services and \$16,000 in the services category for a total of \$47,200. She explained that all of the eligibility qualification changes in the two programs would require working with a contractor on the changes to the Alaska Student Aid Portal managed by ACPE. She elaborated that the portal was the platform used to receive information from DEED for eligibility of students and disbursement to the institutions and certification of students. Additionally, the note included \$6,000 for regulation changes needed on the postsecondary side and \$10,000 to update the student portal.

[9:10:37 AM](#)

Co-Chair Foster recognized House Education Committee member Representative Rebecca Himschoot in the committee room.

Co-Chair Foster asked for a review of the final fiscal note.

DEB RIDDLE, OPERATIONS MANAGER, DIVISION OF INNOVATION AND EDUCATION EXCELLENCE, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT, reviewed OMB component number 2796. She relayed that the fiscal note included a one-time cost of \$6,000 for updating regulations on the K-12 side of the APS, which would include updating the curriculum options providing information about the notification for students and removing testing qualifications as outlined in the law. The regulations would be updated in order for districts to have the necessary guidance to work on the scholarship with students.

[9:12:19 AM](#)

Co-Chair Johnson MOVED to REPORT CSHB 148(FIN) out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal notes. There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

CSHB 148(FIN) was REPORTED out of committee with ten "do pass" recommendations and one "no recommendation" recommendation and with four new fiscal impact notes from the Department of Education and Early Development.

[9:13:18 AM](#)

AT EASE

[9:15:15 AM](#)

RECONVENED

#hb193

HOUSE BILL NO. 193

"An Act relating to funding for Internet services for school districts; and providing for an effective date."

[9:15:24 AM](#)

Co-Chair Foster noted there were two amendments for the bill.

Representative Stapp MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 1, 33-LS0817\A.31 (Bergerud, 2/13/24) (copy on file):

Page 1, following line 9:

Insert a new bill section to read:

"* Sec. 2. AS 14.03.127 is amended by adding new subsections to read:

(d) If the total cost to a school district for Internet services exceeds the amount awarded to the district under the federal universal services program combined with the amount awarded under this section and the district uses an Internet services provider that is not approved under the federal universal services program but that meets the needs of the district, the district remains eligible to receive funding under this section, and the school may use funding received under this section to pay for part of the cost of using the Internet services provider.

(e) If the total cost to a school district for Internet services from an Internet services provider that is not approved under the federal universal services program is equal to or less than the amount that would have been awarded to the school under (a) or (b) of this section, the school district is eligible to receive an amount equal to the actual cost for Internet services, up to the amount that the school district would have been awarded under (a) or (b) of this section."

Renumber the following bill section accordingly.

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Representative Stapp explained the amendment. He outlined some of the structural issues he believed to be within the program that were likely not the intent of the bill sponsor. He was offering the amendment because he had compared the Universal Services Program information and all of the E-Rate billings per eligible school (in the committee packets) to the Broadband Assistance Grants (BAG) that some of the school districts receive and had noticed a couple of things that did not add up. First, he determined that after large federal and state subsidies there were

rural schools in small districts that still had to pay around \$50,000 for internet. He highlighted that during public testimony the committee had heard from school districts that were buying systems for internet that were not qualifying for a BAG award. He used the Bristol Bay School District as an example and stated that the total monthly billing from its service provider was over \$100,000. A 90 percent E-Rate discount from the federal government was applied to the school district's bill. Additionally, the school district received \$91,000 for BAG.

Representative Stapp underscored that despite all of the subsidies, the school district paid over \$50,000 for internet the previous year. He relayed that staff within the school district had told him they were looking at buying a different service provider because despite the subsidies, their internet costs were still extremely high. He stated that the school district had options that worked better that cost less money; however, due to the BAG structure, the school district could not receive any state money for those other options. He believed that if the state was going to give the school district \$91,000 in BAG funds and the district wanted to move to a service provider that better met its needs at a cost of \$40,000, the state should be able to give the school district the \$40,000 instead. He reasoned the school district would get the product it wanted, and the state would save money. He noted there were some issues with the amendment that should be discussed.

[9:18:46 AM](#)

Co-Chair Edgmon felt like they were relitigating the bill. He had brought the bill to the committee and explained that the intent was to build off a well established program that had been through the legislature in a couple of iterations and involved a very complex application process at the school district level. He stressed that the program had to meet a complex federal regulatory process in the Universal Services Program. He stated that on top of those things there was the Board of Education regulatory process. He was opposed to relitigating the bill and spending several additional hearings on the topic.

Representative Stapp stated it was not his intent to relitigate the bill. His intent was to withdraw the amendment because he did not believe it met his intended goal. He

believed the intent of the program - when it was enacted in 2014 - was to help rural schools get higher speed internet and act as an equalizer [with urban schools]. He had listened to the meetings from 2014 and 2019. He clarified that he was not out to structurally change the program. His only concern, particularly when it came to the fiscal aspect of the BAG award, was that the discussion was about two separate things that did not depend on each other. He remarked that there were plenty of schools that had E-Rate awards that did not get BAG money. He elaborated that the state grant was not dependent on the E-Rate awards. He reasoned that it was dependent on the fact that E-Rate awards were based on the concept of megabits per second (Mbps).

Representative Stapp emphasized there was no mechanism within the program that considered an internet service provider that did not maintain a constant speed (i.e., 25 to 100 Mbps). He highlighted a scenario where an ISP [internet service provider] offered internet at 100 Mbps that increased to 105 Mbps occasionally and the school district could no longer receive a BAG award. He knew there was a problem, but he did not know how to fix it. He suggested at some point the legislature should look at how to better deliver the goal of the best internet possible for school districts. He stated his intent was to try to deliver a better outcome that districts wanted and to leave the decision up to districts. He believed it would cost the districts and the state less money. He highlighted the goal of lowering the fixed costs paid by districts via the program.

[9:22:02 AM](#)

Co-Chair Foster noted there were two avenues. Withdraw the amendment or explore the issue further.

Co-Chair Edgmon wanted to respect Representative Stapp's ability to investigate the bill; however, he reminded committee members of the hard deadline. He pointed out that there was separate legislation [SB 140] that would need to go through a conference committee if it were to supersede HB 193. He underscored that time was of the essence. He remarked that virtually every school district had visited the building in the past couple of weeks and he had 100 conversations that had touched on the issue. He was not saying the concerns addressed by Representative Stapp were

not legitimate; however, none of the school districts had brought up the issue to that extent. He believed the recognition was that 100 Mbps was the best the state could do, but in a perfect world it would be much higher. He stated there was a large fiscal note attached to the bill.

Co-Chair Edgmon recognized the bill was imperfect in nature as had been the case upon introduction in 2014 and when amended in 2020. The hope was that the billions of dollars in federal funds primarily coming through the Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment (BEAD) program would mean the state did not have to put undesignated general fund (UGF) money into supporting the BAG program. He believed the discussion was worthy, but he stressed that the committee could spend a lot of time in the minutia of the bill and still not have a perfect outcome. He stated the bill helped a lot of schools and may not perfectly fit the scope of every school; however, the business managers and superintendents in his district had told him it was good enough. He highlighted that missing the deadline would mean losing an entire year.

Co-Chair Foster echoed Co-Chair Edgmon's comments in the sense that the program had existed for some time, and he did not want the perfect to become the enemy of the good. He wanted to give DEED time to elaborate on Representative Stapp's comments that there did not appear to be an easy fix. He suspected the department would likely say the same thing.

[9:25:11 AM](#)

Representative Stapp asked to hear from individuals with DEED.

LAURAL SHOOP, LEGISLATIVE LIAISON, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT, introduced herself.

KAREN MORRISON, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF FINANCE AND FACILITIES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT, introduced herself.

Co-Chair Foster asked if there was an easy fix to the issue brought up by Representative Stapp.

Ms. Shoop believed the intent of the amendment was for schools to have alternatives to the federally approved

internet service providers. She explained that the E-Rate program had been long-established by the federal government. She detailed that internet service providers were required to register with the federal E-Rate program in order to be considered in the application process. There was a very specific set of forms school districts were required to use when applying for the E-Rate program. She believed the amendment was intended for internet service providers who were not registered under the federal services program to be eligible for school BAG funding.

Representative Stapp agreed. He clarified that he did not necessarily mean it should be a requirement for the internet service provider to be registered. He thought there were benefits of having the provider registered. He stated that at the end of the day it did not matter. He explained that the intent of the amendment was to give a school district the ability to use a service provider that best suited its needs. He suggested that if the cost was less, the state should give the school districts the lesser amount of money to cover the entirety of their cost as long as it was less than the state would have given school districts under the BAG program. He was not sure how to craft it properly. He asked the department why a hard cap on the Mbps did not work with different service providers.

Ms. Shoop deferred the question to a colleague.

FAYE TANNER, PROGRAM COORDINATOR, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT (via teleconference), asked to hear the question again.

Representative Stapp considered the scenario where the eligible BAG award was increased to 100 Mbps. He asked whether an internet service provider that had a service rate that fluctuated between 80 and 200 was eligible to use BAG money because the rate was not a consistent number.

Ms. Tanner responded that under current statute anything exceeding 100 Mbps would not qualify. She stated it was one of the issues several school districts were having with the use of Starlink or speed that exceeded 100 Mbps. The current speed was 25 Mbps.

[9:29:44 AM](#)

Representative Stapp relayed that he had talked to many school district business managers about their upcoming bids. He relayed that some of the school districts were planning on changing their bids. He WITHDREW Amendment 1.

Representative Coulombe WITHDREW Amendment 2, 33-LS0817\A.7 (Klein/Bergerud, 2/12/24) (copy on file).

Co-Chair Foster highlighted that the fiscal notes had been reviewed the previous week.

Co-Chair Johnson MOVED to REPORT HB 193 out of committee with individual recommendations and the forthcoming fiscal note and the ability for Legislative Legal Services to make technical and conforming changes.

HB 193 was REPORTED out of committee with eight "do pass" recommendations, two "amend" recommendations, and one "no recommendation" recommendation and with one new fiscal impact note from the Department of Education and Early Development.

[9:31:46 AM](#)

AT EASE

[9:33:28 AM](#)

RECONVENED

#hb155

HOUSE BILL NO. 155

"An Act establishing the Alaska Military Affairs Commission; and relating to the duties and powers of the Alaska Military Affairs Commission."

[9:33:32 AM](#)

Co-Chair Foster noted one amendment had been received. He would hear public testimony first.

Co-Chair Foster OPENED public testimony.

Co-Chair Foster CLOSED public testimony.

[9:34:41 AM](#)

Representative Hannan MOVED to ADOPT Amendment 1, 33-LS0701\D.2 (Marx/Gunther, 2/7/24) (copy on file):

Page 3, lines 10-12:

Delete all material and insert:

"(5) assist and advise communities and the state in the design and execution of programs that enhance communities' relationships with installations of the armed forces of the United States and defense-related businesses, including in the areas of public school education, in-state higher education and training, cultural and recreational community assets, and housing and energy affordability;"

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Representative Hannan explained the amendment on page 3, lines 10-12 added a second clause and gave some structure and guidance with issues that would help assist communities in preparing and developing relationships with the armed forces. She listed examples including schools that were available, education, training, cultural and recreational assets, and housing and energy affordability. She wanted to include the items because many local governments communicated that they were issues that arose.

Representative Stapp supported and appreciated the amendment's guiding principles.

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW the OBJECTION.

Co-Chair Foster relayed that the fiscal note had been reviewed the prior week.

There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment 1 was ADOPTED.

Co-Chair Johnson MOVED to REPORT CSHB 155(FIN) out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying or forthcoming fiscal note.

[9:37:42 AM](#)

AT EASE

[9:37:49 AM](#)

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Foster added that the committee gave Legislative Legal Services the ability to make technical and conforming changes.

There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

CSHB 155(FIN) was REPORTED out of committee with ten "do pass" recommendations and one "no recommendation" recommendation and with one new fiscal impact note from the Office of the Governor.

Co-Chair Foster reviewed the schedule for the afternoon meeting.

#

ADJOURNMENT

9:38:53 AM

The meeting was adjourned at 9:38 a.m.