

HOUSE FINANCE COMMITTEE
March 27, 2024
2:40 p.m.

[2:40:59 PM](#)

CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair Johnson called the House Finance Committee meeting to order at 2:40 p.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

Remond Henderson, Staff, Representative DeLena Johnson;
Alexei Painter, Director, Legislative Finance Division;
Representative Jesse Sumner.

SUMMARY

HB 268 APPROP: OPERATING BUDGET; CAP; SUPP; AM

HB 268 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

HB 270 APPROP: MENTAL HEALTH BUDGET

HB 270 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

Co-Chair Johnson reviewed the meeting agenda. The committee would consider amendments to the operating and mental health budgets. She planned to address supplemental amendments first followed by language and numbers. She asked members to keep their comments as concise as possible. She acknowledged the office staff and her operating budget coordinator Remond Henderson.

#hb268

#hb270

HOUSE BILL NO. 268

"An Act making appropriations for the operating and loan program expenses of state government and for certain programs; capitalizing funds; amending appropriations; making capital appropriations; making supplemental appropriations; making reappropriations; making appropriations under art. IX, sec. 17(c), Constitution of the State of Alaska, from the constitutional budget reserve fund; and providing for an effective date."

HOUSE BILL NO. 270

"An Act making appropriations for the operating and capital expenses of the state's integrated comprehensive mental health program; and providing for an effective date."

[2:44:10 PM](#)

^AMENDMENTS

[2:44:19 PM](#)

[2:44:41 PM](#)

AT EASE

[2:45:49 PM](#)

RECONVENED

Representative Ortiz MOVED to ADOPT Amendment Sup 1 (copy on file):

Agency: Special Appropriations
Appropriation: Energy Relief

Allocation: Energy Relief
Transaction Details
Title: Restore FY24 CBR Deposit and Remove Energy Relief Payment
Section: Language
Type: Lang

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)
Personal Services: 0.0
Travel: 0.0
Services: 0.0

Positions
Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Commodities: 0.0
Capital Outlay: 0.0
Grants: -116,500.0
Miscellaneous: -143,500.0
Funding (Amounts are in thousands)
1004 Gen Fund -260,000.0

Agency: Fund Transfers
Appropriation: Undesignated Budget Reserves
Allocation: Const Budget Reserve Fund 1001
Transaction Details
Title: Restore FY24 Surplus and CBR Repayment
Section: Language
Type: Suppl

2024 Session Operating Budget Proposal
Restore FY24 Surplus and CBR Repayment

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)
Personal Services: 0.0
Travel: 0.0
Services: 0.0

Positions
Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0
Funding (Amounts are in thousands)
1004 Gen Fund 143,500.0

Representative Cronk OBJECTED.

Representative Ortiz remarked that the committee's job was to help in the process of crafting a sustainable, reliable budget. He detailed that currently there was not much, if any, headroom for fiscal notes from legislation. For example, the recently passed BAG [Broadband Assistance Grants] bill would cost \$40 million and it was not currently in the budget. Additionally, there was not much headroom for capital projects outside of what had been proposed in the governor's budget.

Representative Ortiz explained that the goal of Amendment Sup 1 was to try to create some headroom in the budget. The amendment would restore what was agreed upon during the budget process the previous year. He explained that after an amount marked for supplementals, the excess revenue would be divided between repaying the Constitutional Budget Reserve (CBR) and paying out the energy relief check. Additionally, the \$116.5 million left over after what was spent on supplementals, would lapse into the general fund and could be used on the FY 25 capital budget items if they were included in the FY 24 supplemental. He reasoned that capital budget projects had lapse dates over multiple years. The amendment would result in a bit more headroom in FY 25 for operating budget items. He explained that under the amendment, \$143.5 million would go to energy relief payments and \$143.5 million would go to the CBR. Additionally, \$116.5 million would go towards appropriations yet to be determined in the FY 24 supplemental.

[2:48:12 PM](#)

Co-Chair Johnson opposed the amendment. She stated that Alaskans had not received a statutory Permanent Fund Dividend (PFD) since 2015. The current budget would provide the third largest PFD in history, while still providing a substantial increase to education and maintaining other essential services that Alaskans had contacted legislators about. Her goal in the budget was to pay the state's bills, fully fund services, and give constituents a boost while they were struggling with record inflation and energy costs. She noted there was currently \$152 million in excess unobligated funds in the budget. She did not know where negotiations would land in the other body or what the

result of the House Finance Committee amendment process would be. She could not support amendments to lower the PFD or energy relief payments at the present time.

[2:49:13 PM](#)

Co-Chair Edgmon stated many factors went into putting a budget together there was a balance between the capital, supplemental, and operating budgets. He preferred to find the balance to provide for a healthy PFD that enabled the state to live within its means and pay for public services and preferably put money into savings. He stated that with the next couple of years with lease expenditures arising from promising oil prospects on the North Slope - Pika and Willow - there would be a downturn in oil revenue. He believed it was the legislature's responsibility to put some money away. He was in a difficult position between balancing a trusting of the process and looking out for the current budget and PFD recipients in addition considering the next year and future years. He knew that whatever PFD emerged from the committee also needed to consider there were other items that would be added to the budget in addition to the capital budget. He referenced various budgetary needs including deferred maintenance, the University of Alaska, and schools. Additionally, all of the federal Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) money was for surface transportation, not for vertical construction or things that only the state budget could provide for. He stressed the need to take a responsible approach to all of the components in the budget. He had not yet decided how he would vote on the amendment.

[2:51:52 PM](#)

Co-Chair Foster stated that he would vote against the amendment. He did not support removing the energy relief payment. He highlighted that it was a promise the legislature made the previous year when the budget was crafted. He explained that legislators had decided to wait to see what the current year's revenues would be when the updated oil forecast was released. There was some surplus and he wanted to follow through on the legislature's promise to provide Alaskans with energy relief.

[2:52:49 PM](#)

AT EASE

2:54:34 PM
RECONVENED

Representative Hannan supported Amendment Sup 1. She noted that although it was not possible to bind future legislatures, the current legislators were all together the previous year. She stated that based on the prediction that oil revenue may be higher than they thought, legislators had struck a deal that half of the extra money, if it transpired, could be used in an energy relief payment for Alaskans and the other half would go into the CBR. She remarked that the amendment appeared to go back to the deal struck the previous year so that half of the extra revenue would go towards energy relief. She elaborated that the amendment still put additional money on top of the PFD into the hands of Alaskans and a small amount into the CBR, which would be available in the future if needed.

2:55:56 PM

Representative Josephson asked how much the current operating budget left for the capital budget.

Co-Chair Edgmon answered it was difficult to put a finger on all of the moving parts because it was not possible to know how many amendments would succeed or fail. He stated that in his ideal world, the capital budget would be significantly bigger than what would likely emerge in the end of session. Currently there was about \$302 million in undesignated general funds (UGF) in the capital budget. He shared his personal hope that the legislature was willing to accommodate that amount and possibly more.

Representative Josephson asked for verification that the \$116 million portion of the amendment that would return to the general fund could be used for additional capital appropriations.

Co-Chair Edgmon answered, "In theory yes."

Representative Stapp opposed the amendment for a couple of reasons. First, the CBR balance would continue to increase due to the fact that money was lapsed from unfilled positions. He remarked on high vacancy rates and funds lapsing into the general fund. Second, if the money was transferred out of the PFD to spend in the general fund, it took money directly out of the PFD and used it on

government spending. He stated that the current bill included a balanced budget with a CBR balance that was above the minimum and enough to get the state through tough times. He preferred to be on the safe side. He stated that currently there was a balanced budget with money allocated to education and space for bills. Additionally, there was a robust capital budget compared to previous years. He reiterated that the amendment would take money from the PFD and put it back into the government for additional spending.

Co-Chair Johnson wanted to keep comments one per member if possible.

Representative Josephson remarked that there was not a budget on either side of the building that fully funded the PFD. He highlighted they were already in a world substantially where they were not paying a full dividend. He noted it was all a question of dimension.

[2:59:32 PM](#)

Representative Galvin understood there had not been a statutory PFD since 2015. She stated the amendment was a fiscally conservative approach, which she appreciated. She believed it was important to protect the CBR to ensure it grew, while also being responsible about the many bills, contract negotiations, vertical capital spend, and deferred maintenance yet to be addressed. She supported the amendment.

Representative Ortiz MOVED conceptual Amendment 1 to Amendment Sup 1.

Co-Chair Johnson OBJECTED for discussion.

Representative Ortiz explained that the conceptual amendment would direct the \$116 million to the Statutory Budget Reserve (SBR) rather than the CBR or general fund. He elaborated that it would allow much quicker access to the funds to address some of the things legislators were concerned about. He stated that it would make the funds more accessible for use on things like the capital budget given that use of the funds required a majority vote [as opposed to a three quarter vote required for use of CBR funds].

[3:02:28 PM](#)

Co-Chair Johnson MAINTAINED the OBJECTION.

Representative Stapp thought the amendment was superfluous. He suggested that if the idea was to cut the PFD, an amendment should specify something else the funds would be spent on. He remarked that using funds from the SBR required a majority vote, the same vote threshold required to pass an amendment on the House floor.

Co-Chair Johnson reviewed the conceptual amendment.

Representative Cronk MAINTAINED the OBJECTION.

[3:03:29 PM](#)

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to adopt conceptual Amendment 1 to Amendment Sup 1.

IN FAVOR: Galvin, Hannan, Josephson, Ortiz
OPPOSED: Cronk, Stapp, Tomaszewski, Coulombe, Foster, Edgmon, Johnson

The MOTION to adopt conceptual Amendment 1 to Amendment Sup 1 FAILED (4/7).

Representative Ortiz provided wrap up on Amendment Sup 1. He clarified that no one on the committee wanted to reduce the PFD. He would personally love to have the PFD as currently described in the bill. He asked if in doing so the committee was being totally forthright in sending the message the legislature was going down a path to receive a \$2,300 PFD. Second, he asked whether it was in the best interest of the state overall. He referenced a growing deferred maintenance list, which was receiving very little money under the current bill. He elaborated that there were schools in need of repairs (e.g., leaky rooves). He asked if it would get any easier in the coming years if the legislature did not address the current capital budget in a meaningful way. He emphasized that prices would continue to increase. He was trying to ensure the legislature was meeting its obligations to address the state's needs that were growing annually in the areas of things like deferred maintenance.

Representative Ortiz disagreed that although on paper there was currently a surplus, there were items such as senior benefits and community revenue sharing that were important to the people of the state. He could easily calculate a point where there was a \$50 million deficit rather than a surplus due to all of the things that needed funding in the future. He was trying to make room in the budget for some of those items to receive funding. He confirmed that the amendment would take money away from the PFD, but it would not remove the energy relief payment, it would restore the deal made the previous year so that half of the funds would go to the energy relief payments and half would go to the CBR. There would still be \$143.5 million going to energy relief payments. He stated that the amendment was responsible and created more headroom. He added that it more realistically dealt with the reality facing the legislature.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion to adopt Amendment Sup 1.

IN FAVOR: Galvin, Hannan, Josephson, Ortiz
OPPOSED: Stapp, Tomaszewski, Coulombe, Cronk, Foster, Johnson, Edgmon

The MOTION to adopt Amendment Sup 1 FAILED (4/7).

[3:08:56 PM](#)

Representative Ortiz MOVED to ADOPT Amendment Sup 2 (copy on file):

Agency: Special Appropriations
Appropriation: Energy Relief
Allocation: Energy Relief

Transaction Details

Title: Restore CBR Deposit from FY24 Revenue Above
Spring 2023 Forecast
Section: Language
Type: Suppl

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)
Personal Services: 0.0
Travel: 0.0
Services: 0.0
Commodities: 0.0

Capital Outlay: 0.0 Funding (Amounts are in thousands)

Grants: 0.0

Miscellaneous: -143,500.0

Positions

Permanent Full-Time: 0

Permanent Part-Time: 0

Temporary: 0

1004 Gen Fund -143,500.0

Agency: Fund Transfers

Appropriation: Undesignated Budget Reserves

Allocation: Const Budget Reserve Fund 1001

Transaction Details

Title: Restore FY24 CBR Deposit Based on Spring 2023 Revenue Forecast

Section: Language

Type: Lang

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)

Personal Services: 0.0

Travel: 0.0

Services: 0.0

Positions

Permanent Full-Time: 0

Permanent Part-Time: 0

Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)

1004 Gen Fund 143,500.0

Representative Cronk OBJECTED.

Representative Ortiz explained the amendment partially did what Amendment Sup 1 attempted. He detailed that the amendment partially restored what was agreed upon during the budget process the previous year by directing money into the CBR and energy relief check like the previous amendment; however, it kept the provision that the \$116 million above what was spent on supplementals would go out as an energy relief check. He remarked that a deal had been made the previous year and everyone had gone forward based on that understanding, yet based on the last vote he surmised they would not live up to the deal.

3:10:14 PM

Representative Cronk MAINTAINED the OBJECTION.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

IN FAVOR: Hannan, Josephson, Ortiz, Galvin, Edgmon

OPPOSED: Stapp, Tomaszewski, Coulombe, Cronk, Foster,
Johnson

The MOTION to adopt Amendment Sup 2 FAILED (5/6).

3:11:10 PM

Co-Chair Johnson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment Sup 3 (copy on file):

Agency: Corrections
Appropriation: Population Management
Allocation: Anchorage Correctional Complex

Transaction Details

Title: Replace Federal Receipts with General Fund
Authority for Anticipated Reduction of Federal Manday
Bed Receipts
Section: Section 1
Type: FndChg

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)

Personal Services: 0.0 Travel: 0.0
Services: 0.0
Commodities: 0.0
Capital Outlay: 0.0
Grants: 0.0
Miscellaneous: 0.0

Positions

Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)

1002 Fed Rcpts -7,960.0
1004 Gen Fund 7,960.0

Explanation

The Department of Corrections (DOC) continues to see a fluctuation in the number of federal mandays that are billed which impacts the amount of federal receipts collected annually. At this time, the department is experiencing a decline in the number of federal holds resulting in federal receipts being under collected by approximately \$7,960.0 in FY2024. This reduction in federal holds is based on the trends observed to-date which are currently anticipated to continue during this fiscal year.

Agency: Corrections
Appropriation: Community Residential Centers
Allocation: Community Residential Centers
Transaction Details
Title: Community Residential Center Contracts
Section: Section 1
Type: Suppl

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)
Personal Services: 0.0
Travel: 0.0
Services: 6,572.9

Positions
Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)
1004 Gen Fund 6,572.9

Explanation
Reinstate Governor's request that was omitted from the committee substitute. Supplemental needed for increased cost of CRC contracts due to new contract negotiations.

Agency: Corrections
Appropriation: Electronic Monitoring
Allocation: Electronic Monitoring

Transaction Details
Title: Electronic Monitoring of Community Placements

Section: Section 1
Type: Suppl

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)
Personal Services: 0.0
Travel: 0.0
Services: 375.0
Commodities: 0.0
Capital Outlay: 0.0
Grants: 0.0
Miscellaneous: 0.0

Positions
Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)
1005 GF/Prgm 375.0

Explanation

Additional funding is necessary to meet the increased costs of Global Positioning System (GPS) electronic monitoring (EM) tracking of offenders placed into the program. This effort is intended to enhance public safety by utilizing available technology allowing the department to monitor an offender's location in real time while they transition back into the community.

The EM program provides an alternative to incarceration and allows offenders that qualify to serve their sentence in a less restrictive setting at a lower cost freeing up institutional "hard" beds for more serious offenders. The average daily count for FY2023 was 192, for FY2024 is 212, and the daily count as of October 31, 2023 was 217. Without this funding, persons would remain incarcerated resulting in increased costs throughout the institutions and physical health care.

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Co-Chair Johnson asked her staff to explain the amendment.

REMOND HENDERSON, STAFF, REPRESENTATIVE DELENA JOHNSON, explained the amendment contained three supplemental amendments requested by the governor and previously

presented to the committee by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) director Lacey Sanders. He explained that the amendments had been excluded from the previous committee substitute (CS). He detailed that \$40 million in supplemental items had been excluded from the Department of Corrections (DOC) until more information could be obtained. He relayed that Amendment Sup 3 added back \$7.9 million to cover the loss of federal funds for the federal and state manday holds. He elaborated that the federal government would no longer pay the state for anyone in a prison under a federal charge at a state charge. The federal government was no longer paying for the federal portion. The amendment also added back \$6.6 million for community residential centers (CRCs) for increased contractual costs and an increase in the number of inmates in CRCs. Lastly, the amendment added back \$375,000 for electronic monitoring (EM). There had been an increased number of individuals on EM, which was paid for with program receipts. The three items added up to approximately \$15 million. He relayed that they had been working with the other body and DOC to determine what would happen with the remaining items.

[3:13:40 PM](#)

Representative Josephson asked how the items added up to \$15 million.

Mr. Henderson answered that the items were \$7.9 million, \$6.6 million, and \$414,800. He noted the number was rounded.

Representative Josephson thought perhaps he was missing a page of the amendment.

[3:14:15 PM](#)

AT EASE

[3:14:26 PM](#)

RECONVENED

Representative Josephson stated the administration sought \$40 million in the amended or supplemental budget. He asked if the administration was now satisfied with just \$15 million.

Mr. Henderson answered in the negative. He clarified that he was not saying the administration was satisfied with the

amount. He explained that the funding in the amendment was the amount they had been able to evaluate and make decisions on thus far.

Representative Hannan supported the amendment. She knew that along the way DOC had been called out for skyrocketing costs. She believed it was important to remember that DOC was an end of the line agency that acted under policy directives when the legislature made decisions pertaining to people held in custody whether under EM or CRCs. The costs were policies dictated and encouraged by the legislature. She stressed that when there was a cost associated with the policies, the legislature needed to own up to them. She noted that the decision about federal mandays and charges was a decision above the legislature's pay grade and perhaps it would adjust how people were charged in crimes so an individual only charged with a federal crime would be paid for by the federal government. She remarked that once the state had an individual incarcerated in its system, it had a legal and moral obligation to pay for the services to do so.

Representative Galvin stated that the last time the committee had an overview of the budget there was \$152 million in remaining funds to cover bills and other expenditures. She asked if they would need to subtract the \$14.9 million from the \$152 million if the amendment passed. She was keeping a running tally.

Mr. Henderson answered in the negative. The amendment would impact FY 24 and there were available funds.

Representative Galvin asked if there was an option to not pay the funds. She asked what would happen if the funds were not allocated.

Mr. Henderson answered that the department would not have adequate funding to pay the amounts due.

Co-Chair Edgmon supported the amendment, though begrudgingly in some respects. He remarked that there had been substantial discussion by the committee about the increase in fixed costs for DOC. However, if the legislature did not provide the funding it would essentially be shirking its constitutional responsibility.

Representative Josephson objected to the amendment. He referenced Mr. Henderson's statement that the funding would come out of FY 24 funds. He thought the budget spent all of the FY 24 funding already. He trusted the DOC commissioner when she said she needed \$40 million. He did not have enough information to challenge it. He understood the amendment was an improvement in the direction he wanted to go, but he would maintain the objection.

Mr. Henderson clarified there was \$116 million remaining from FY 24 to pay for the item. He noted that the amendment would not impact that total because it had been included in the calculation when arriving at the remaining \$116 million figure.

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW the OBJECTION.

Representative Josephson OBJECTED.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

IN FAVOR: Stapp, Tomaszewski, Coulombe, Cronk, Galvin, Hannan, Ortiz, Edgmon, Foster, Johnson
OPPOSED: Josephson

The MOTION PASSED (10/1). There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment Sup 3 was ADOPTED.

[3:21:05 PM](#)

Co-Chair Johnson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment Sup 4 (copy on file):

Agency: Environmental Conservation
Appropriation: Administration
Allocation: State Support Services

Transaction Details
Title: Juneau Air Lab Relocation (FY2024-FY2025)
Section: Language
Type: MultiYr

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)
Personal Services: 0.0
Travel: 0.0
Services: 87.5
Commodities: 0.0

Capital Outlay: 0.0
Grants: 0.0
Miscellaneous: 0.0

Positions

Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)

1004 Gen Fund 87.5

Explanation

The building which houses the Department of Environmental Conservation's (DEC) Juneau offices and the Division of Air Quality Laboratory is a leased space. Building ownership has taken on an extensive remodel of the entire building. As a result of the construction and design, the Division of Air Quality Laboratory has been completely shut down since August 2022 and all samples have been shipped offsite to be processed by

private labs or by the DEC lab servicing the Fairbanks area, resulting in additional costs and delays with lab results.

Current estimates for building out the new space, based on other recent laboratories, is \$125.00 per square foot. DEC is committed to minimizing the general fund need and is anticipating re-using laboratory furnishings, such as benches and cabinets, where possible. DEC does not expect increased lease costs as a result of this move.

The sum of \$87,500 is appropriated from the general fund to the Department of Environmental Conservation for relocation of the Juneau Air Lab for the fiscal years ending June 30, 2024, and June 30, 2025.

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Mr. Henderson explained that the amendment was for relocation expenses to move the Juneau office of the Division of Air Quality. He detailed that the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) had been leasing space, which was shut down in August of 2022. As a result, the

department had to ship air samples out to private entities and Fairbanks. There were a significant number of improvements to the lease space they were in, but the funds would assist the office with beginning to move in FY 24 and continuing into FY 25.

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW the OBJECTION.

There being NO further OBJECTION Amendment Sup 4 was ADOPTED.

Co-Chair Johnson noted that the committee had concluded its supplemental amendment packet and would continue to the Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority (AMHTA) additions, technical corrections, and the language amendments.

[3:22:28 PM](#)

Co-Chair Johnson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment L 1 (copy on file):

Agency: Education & Early Dev
Appropriation: Education Support and Admin
Allocation: Student and School Achievement

Transaction Details

Title: Add Funding for Alaska Autism Resource Center
Section: Section 1
Type: Inc

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)

Personal Services: 0.0
Travel: 0.0
Services: 0.0

Positions

Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)

1037 GF/MH 50.0

Explanation

This aligns with the recommendations from the Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority.

Agency: Health
Appropriation: Behavioral Health
Allocation: BH Treatment and Recovery Grants

Transaction Details

Title: Add Funding for Crisis Now: Mobile Crisis
Response/Crisis Stabilization Grant (Inct FY25-FY26)
Section: Section 1
Type: Inct

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)

Personal Services: 0.0
Travel: 0.0
Services: 0.0

Positions

Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)

1037 GF/MH 500.0

Explanation

This aligns with the recommendations of the Alaska
Mental Health Trust Authority

Agency: Health
Appropriation: Public Health
Allocation: Emergency Programs

Transaction Details

Title: Add Funding for Comprehensive Program
Planning Coordinator (Inct FY25-FY28)
Section: Section 1
Type: Inct

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)

Personal Services: 75.0
Travel: 0.0
Services: 0.0
Commodities: 0.0
Capital Outlay: 0.0
Grants: 0.0

Miscellaneous: 0.0

Positions

Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)

1037 GF/MH 75.0

Explanation

This aligns with the recommendations of the Alaska
Mental Health Trust Authority

Agency: Health

Appropriation: Senior and Disabilities Svcs

Allocation: Governor's Cncl/Disabilities

Transaction Details

Title: Add Personal Services Funding for the
Governor's Council on Disabilities and Special
Education Joint Staffing.

Section: Section 1

Type: IncM

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)

Personal Services: 50.0

Travel: 0.0

Services: 0.0

Positions

Permanent Full-Time: 0

Permanent Part-Time: 0

Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)

1037 GF/MH 50.0

Explanation

This aligns with the recommendations of the Alaska
Mental Health Trust Authority.

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Co-Chair Johnson asked her staff to explain the amendment.

Mr. Henderson explained the amendment would fund all of AMHTA's requests presented to the House Finance Committee on January 31, 2024, with one exception. The amendment included \$50,000 for the Alaska Autism Resource Center, \$500,000 for Crisis Now mobile crisis response, \$75,000 for the comprehensive planning coordinator, and \$50,000 for personal services funding the governor's Council on Disabilities and Special Education joint staffing. The amendment did not contain AMHTA's \$100,000 for the centralized accommodation fund under the Department of Administration (DOA). There was currently no fund authorized in statute at present. Additionally, he had discussed the item with the executive director of AMHTA who indicated that the Governor's Council on Disabilities and Special Education was working with the Department of Labor and Workforce Development (DLWD) Division of Vocational Rehabilitation to identify other options for meeting the needs.

[3:24:44 PM](#)

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW the OBJECTION.

Representative Josephson OBJECTED for discussion. He asked if the entirety of the AMHTA requests for startup crisis grants, mobile crisis, and crisis stabilization would be in the budget if the amendment passed.

Mr. Henderson answered, "Yes."

There being NO further OBJECTION Amendment L 1 was ADOPTED.

[3:25:41 PM](#)

Co-Chair Johnson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment L 2 (copy on file):

Agency: Judiciary
Appropriation: Therapeutic Courts
Allocation: Therapeutic Courts

Transaction Details
Title: Decrement Juneau Mental Health Court-50%
Costs for a Project Coordinator and Probation Officer
Section: Section 1
Type: Dec

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)
Personal Services: -126.1
Travel: 0.0
Services: 0.0

Positions
Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)
1037 GF/MH -126.1

Explanation
This bundle makes a technical correction to reflect the Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority's recommendations. This item was mistakenly entered as an increment instead of a one-time increment.

Agency: Judiciary
Appropriation: Therapeutic Courts
Allocation: Therapeutic Courts

Transaction Details
Title: Add Funding to the Juneau Mental Health Court-50% Costs for a Project Coordinator and Probation Officer
Section: Section 1

Type: IncOTI
Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)
Personal Services: 126.1
Travel: 0.0
Services: 0.0

Positions
Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)
1037 GF/MH 126.1

Explanation
This bundle makes a technical correction to reflect the Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority's

recommendations. This item was mistakenly entered as an increment instead of a one-time increment.

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Mr. Henderson explained the amendment made a technical correction to reflect the AMHTA recommendation to show FY 25 as the last year of funding for the particular item. He elaborated that the transaction was incorrectly entered as an increment instead of a one-time item.

Representative Josephson asked if the amendment as written suggested that the therapeutic court located in Juneau only needed the enhancement for one year.

Mr. Henderson responded that the amendment reflected what had been requested by AMHTA. He explained that an error had been made when the transaction was entered, and the amendment corrected the error to match what was requested by AMHTA. He did not know the answer to Representative Josephson's question.

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW the OBJECTION.

There being NO further OBJECTION Amendment L 2 was ADOPTED.

[3:27:40 PM](#)

Representative Josephson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment L 3 (copy on file):

Agency: Corrections
Appropriation: Health and Rehab Services
Allocation: Physical Health Care

Transaction Details
Title: Add UGF for Inmate Medical Care, Contingent on Passage of HB 116
Section: Language
Type: Inc

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)
Personal Services: 0.0
Travel: 0.0
Services: 7,732.0
Commodities: 0.0
Capital Outlay: 0.0

Grants: 0.0
Miscellaneous: 0.0

Positions
Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)
1004 Gen Fund 7,732.0

Representative Cronk OBJECTED.

Representative Josephson explained that the topic had been discussed earlier in the week when the committee had looked at wholesale changes to who received what out of the restorative justice account. He stated that the committee had learned it would deprive DOC of \$7.7 million for inmate medical care. He stated it was the state's constitutional duty to provide the care. He cited the Cleary court decision [Cleary v. Smith 2001] as the case that addressed the issue the most.

Representative Coulombe appreciated the effort to try to fix the issue. She remarked that HB 116 [legislation sponsored by Representative Coulombe pertaining to restorative justice account appropriations] needed to address the issue in its fiscal notes. She did not think an amendment was needed. She stated work was currently taking place on the issue and she wanted the fix to be included in HB 116.

Representative Hannan asked about process related to fiscal notes. She asked for verification that when a fiscal note took money out of a budget and placed it someplace else it did not typically backfill there.

Co-Chair Johnson asked Representative Hannan to clarify the question. She wondered if Representative Hannan was referring to the conference committee process where fiscal notes were attached from bills that were passed.

Representative Hannan stated that Amendment L 3 anticipated that money would be taken from the DOC budget if HB 116 passed. The amendment was an attempt to make sure that if HB 116 passed - which she supported - DOC would have the money. She stated that it would be moot if HB 116 did not

pass. She stated it was her understanding that the fiscal notes did not necessarily backfill where money had been taken out. She was concerned that without the amendment there would be money to implement HB 116's effort but not enough to make DOC whole. She wanted to ensure the legislature was doing as much truth in budgeting as possible to prevent the continuation of supplementals each year. She supported the amendment because she did not believe fiscal notes could fix the problem that would be created by the passage of HB 116.

[3:32:05 PM](#)

Co-Chair Johnson stated that the committee never knew during the operating budget process what the fiscal notes would add up because it was the earliest budget that went out. She detailed that they tried to anticipate some of the fiscal note costs and sometimes estimates were right and other times they were not. She continued that under the specific case the bill would have to pass in order to use the funding. She explained that the fiscal notes in HB 116 removed the funds from DOC and added it to funding for the bill, but it did not actually decrement the department budget. She stated there could potentially be a need to backfill the funding and potentially HB 116 could pass. She stated that when the budget was passed [by the conference committee] the fiscal notes would be attached. She noted there was a lot of uncertainty within the scenarios. She opposed the amendment.

Representative Coulombe shared that when the issue had arisen when working on the fiscal note [for HB 116], it was her understanding the bill could not decrement DOC without backfilling the funds. She asked Legislative Finance Division (LFD) director Alexei Painter to clarify. She stated the only way she would be able to decrement DOC was to have a following amendment or decrement the funds in a separate transaction. She stated her understanding it had to be a fund swap.

Co-Chair Edgmon thought the appropriation authority was needed, which was provided in the amendment.

Co-Chair Johnson asked to hear from Mr. Painter.

ALEXEI PAINTER, DIRECTOR, LEGISLATIVE FINANCE DIVISION, clarified that the fiscal notes the agencies prepared did

not make any change to appropriations. He explained that the committee would need to prepare a fiscal note to move funding from one agency to another and that note could decrement the money from DOC without backfilling the funding; however, the money was currently appropriated to physical healthcare where there was very little policy ability in the current year to achieve that level of reduction. If the funds were moved to another place in the budget, there would perhaps more flexibility than at present. The conference committee or the House Finance Committee could choose to backfill or not. He explained that the amendment was not necessary to backfill.

3:36:08 PM

Representative Josephson stated that a couple of years ago the administration failed to veto a \$4 billion transfer to the principal [of the Permanent Fund] and had asked the legislature after the fact if it could still do so. He asked if the amendment would relieve the chance of an error in the rush at the end of session. He stated the amendment was a placeholder reminder to the conference committee that there were inmate medical needs. He asked if his understanding was accurate.

Mr. Painter answered that LFD tried not to make errors in the fiscal note packet. He stated that the amendment would be a reminder, but he hoped his division did not need reminders to make sure things got into the fiscal note packet.

Representative Cronk MAINTAINED the OBJECTION.

Co-Chair Johnson clarified they were voting on Amendment L 3.

Representative Josephson stated that the committee had shorted DOC by \$25 million. He was concerned that a conference committee may say the department could absorb the costs. He believed it was a secondary reason to support the amendment.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

IN FAVOR: Hannan, Josephson, Ortiz

OPPOSED: Stapp, Tomaszewski, Coulombe, Cronk, Galvin, Edgmon, Foster, Johnson

The MOTION to adopt Amendment L 3 FAILED (3/8).

3:4000 PM

Representative Josephson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment L 4 (copy on file):

Agency: Education & Early Dev
Appropriation: Education Support and Admin
Allocation: Student and School Achievement

Transaction Details

Title: Alaska Resource Education Grant for
Statewide Workforce Development (FY2025-FY2026)
Section: Language
Type: FndChg

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)

Personal Services: 0.0 Travel: 0.0
Services: 0.0
Commodities: 0.0
Capital Outlay: 0.0
Grants: 0.0
Miscellaneous: 0.0

Positions

Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)

1004 Gen Fund -1,000.0
1102 AIDEA Rcpt 1,000.0

Representative Cronk OBJECTED.

Representative Josephson explained that since his time in the legislature the Alaska Resource Education (ARE) funding had become a new thing. He shared that he had attended the Resource Development Council (RDC) conference for over a decade. He elaborated that the state's investment in ARE was taking on a permanent quality. The amendment would leave the funding the way it was. He could not see that there was any space between the goals of the current Alaska Industrial Development and Export Authority (AIDEA) and

what ARE was trying to achieve; therefore, he believed it made sense for AIDEA to help pay for the item.

Representative Galvin supported the amendment that would hold ARE whole using AIDEA receipts, meaning it would not have to request funding year after year. She stated that clearly AIDEA would benefit from the investment. She stressed the importance of workforce development and believed there was alignment in linking the two.

Representative Cronk stated that the committee members were all "sitting here" because of resource development. He noted the importance of resource development in creating jobs across the state. He detailed that ARE had taught 42,000 kids across the state in 53 communities. He believed the investment was outside of AIDEA's scope and would be an inappropriate ask. He noted that AIDEA paid dividends to the state. He supported the original funding method. He opposed the amendment.

Representative Cronk MAINTAINED the OBJECTION.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

IN FAVOR: Galvin, Hannan, Josephson, Ortiz, Foster, Edgmon
OPPOSED: Tomaszewski, Coulombe, Cronk, Stapp, Johnson

The MOTION PASSED (6/5). There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment L 4 was ADOPTED.

[3:43:35 PM](#)

Representative Josephson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment L 5 (copy on file):

Agency: Education & Early Dev
Appropriation: K-12 Aid to School Districts
Allocation: Additional Foundation Funding

Transaction Details

Title: Additional Foundation Funding to Ensure
Minimum Funding Equivalent to \$680 BSA Increase
Section: Language
Type: Lang

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)

Personal Services: 0.0 Travel: 0.0

Services: 0.0
Commodities: 0.0
Capital Outlay: 0.0
Grants: 0.0
Miscellaneous: 0.0

Positions
Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)

Explanation

The current committee substitute has contingency language that would allow a lower than \$680 base-student allocation amount to be appropriated in this year's budget if passed. This amendment would amend the language so that if a bill to raise the base student allocation is less than \$680 per person, the difference between that bill's fiscal note and this language item would be in the budget.

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED.

Representative Josephson explained that at the end of the bill there was reference to a contingency that the legislature would invest \$680 million [\$680 per student] in one-time funding for K-12 education unless the legislature passed a Base Student Allocation (BSA) bill. He stated that the governor had indicated support for a \$300 BSA bill, which would not be an adequate replacement for the \$680 per student amount. The amendment specified the budget would contain one-time funding to cover whatever the difference was between a BSA bill and \$680.

Representative Coulombe was trying to figure out how the amendment would work. She remarked that the amendment did not contain a dollar amount. She surmised the amendment specified that if the governor vetoed a particular amount of the education funding, the budget would fund the difference.

Representative Josephson replied that the amendment indicated that a BSA bill at not just any amount (e.g., \$300 per student) would satisfy the legislature. The

amendment specified that it was the committee's objective there would be \$174.5 million reflected in the \$680.

Representative Coulombe explained that she was struggling with determining what she would be committing to with the amendment. She asked for verification that the funding amount could not go below \$175 million and if it did, it would be brought back up.

Representative Josephson responded that he was saying the legislature would not forfeit its interest in \$174.5 million with the passage of just any BSA bill. He clarified that the amendment specified that the budget would fill the difference between any BSA bill less than \$174.5 million.

Co-Chair Johnson explained that the \$680 was in the budget currently including intent language specifying that the amount would be removed from the budget if separate BSA legislation were to pass. She explained that the intent language was included because she had heard from other legislators that they would like to have a separate conversation pertaining to the BSA funding. She stated that if the number was lower than \$680, she thought it would make sense that the will of the legislature was to fund it at a lower amount. She explained that at that point, the \$680 would be removed from the budget and the amount decided upon would be funded through a fiscal note attached to a BSA bill. She opposed the amendment.

[3:48:03 PM](#)

AT EASE

[3:54:32 PM](#)

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW the OBJECTION.

There being NO further OBJECTION Amendment L 5 was ADPOTED.

Representative Josephson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment L 6 (copy on file):

Agency: Family and Community Services
Appropriation: Children's Services
Allocation: Children's Services Management

Transaction Details

Title: Funding for Child Advocacy Centers Operating
Costs (FY25-FY26)
Section: Language
Type: MultiYr

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)
Personal Services: 0.0 Travel: 0.0
Services: 0.0
Commodities: 0.0
Capital Outlay: 0.0
Grants: 5,000.0
Miscellaneous: 0.0

Positions
Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)
1004 Gen Fund 5,000.0

Explanation
Child Advocacy Centers are facing an upcoming budget shortfall in the realm of \$5,000,000. These centers use a evidence-based, multi-disciplinary approach to coordinate child abuse investigations, and they provide a safe, child friendly environment for multiple agencies to coordinate these investigations. This funding would assist with services including forensic interviews, medical exams, and advocacy services.

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED.

Representative Josephson shared that he had first heard of the concept of a child advocacy center as a prosecutor. He explained that when a child was believed to be abused or molested, child advocates interviewed the child. He elaborated that it had to be a legitimate, credible interview that was usable in the court of law if needed. He had met with someone from the child advocacy centers during the current session and he had learned that starting in FY 26 the centers would need \$5 million because they were being cut off from some other resource. He had asked Brenda Stanfill [executive director of the Alaska Network on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault] and had learned there was pass-through funding through the Council on Domestic

Violence and Sexual Assault (CDVSA) that was going to lapse; therefore, the state would need to invest in the service. His meeting took place on February 14, 2024, and he had learned that the Alaska Children's Alliance had opened an office in Tok and there had been a 60 percent increase in interviews. He was not suggesting there were many children harmed and they were going unattended to. He stated it was a cliff wall. He compared it to a Medicaid funding scenario where the matching funds decreased suddenly from 56 percent to 50 percent. The amendment would fund child advocacy centers over two years.

Representative Josephson referenced the child advocacy centers' responsibilities outlined by OMB. He detailed that needs assessments in communities would include active engagement with other entities such as schools, medical providers, law enforcement, and tribes. He stressed that the state would need to step up to the plate very soon. The services had been managed without general funds, but that was coming to an end.

Representative Coulombe asked if the money could be expended in two years given it was a multiyear appropriation. She asked if the \$5 million leveraged any federal match. She noted the amendment specified the funds were for operating expenses. She thought it sounded like the funds would go to a general budget shortfall and not a specific activity.

[4:00:31 PM](#)

AT EASE

[4:02:02 PM](#)

RECONVENED

Representative Josephson relayed that the Alaska Children's Alliance reported that the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) contributed 18 percent of the funding and a one-time special grant was ending in June 2025. A federal passthrough grant was managed by CDVSA and 36 percent of the agency's money was from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). He reported there had been no meaningful increase since FY 18. The agency was indicating that the state would need to contribute funding or there would not be sufficient funding to adequately interview children who had been harmed.

Representative Stapp opposed the amendment. He stated that the item had never come up during the budget subcommittee process. He did not doubt that \$5 million could be used, but he did not know what it was intended for. He highlighted that the budget allocated substantial funding to CDVSA. Additionally, there was a separate bill sponsored by Representative Coulombe that would give additional funding through CDVSA. He noted that federal TANF funding came to the state as pass through funds. He wondered where the \$5 million would come from because there was no cut to any other program to pay for the amount. He asked where the cut to pay for the funding was.

Co-Chair Johnson asked Representative Josephson to save any answers until wrap up on the amendment.

Representative Hannan supported the amendment. She shared that she had visited a child advocacy center in Kotzebue when she had been traveling with the state suicide council. The forensic centers were for children who were the victims of abuse, molestation, or sexual assault. She detailed that instead of an exam taking place at the police station or in the emergency room, the centers were much more child friendly.

Co-Chair Johnson interjected that it was the role of the sponsor to explain the amendment. She advised that the debate should pertain to the financial component of the amendment.

Representative Hannan stated that funding would give the ability to interview a child and use it in prosecution. She remarked that \$5 million was a cheap price tag for the work. She believed the funding enabled the support of kids who had been abused.

Representative Josephson requested the full committee be present to vote on the amendment. He requested an at ease.

Co-Chair Johnson stated the committee could take an at ease or roll the amendment to the end.

[4:07:10 PM](#)
AT EASE

[4:11:42 PM](#)
RECONVENED

Representative Cronk opposed Amendment L 6. He confirmed that the agency was losing its federal funding and would need money in FY 26. He had an amendment later on in the process that included intent language meant to highlight exactly what the agency would need in FY 26.

Representative Josephson provided wrap up on Amendment 6. He responded to Representative Stapp's comments and questions. He relayed that he had no authority to offer the amendment in the subcommittee process; it had not been allowed. The funding source for the amendment was the \$152 million surplus in the budget. He added that part of the reason the department [Department of Family Community Services] may not have requested the funding was because it had never been in the department. He highlighted the department noted there were 19 child advocacy centers and 5 were new since 2022. He suspected one of the new offices was located in Tok. He stated that the agency was running out of some of the TANF money and all of the DOJ funding. The state would have to participate.

Co-Chair Johnson accidentally skipped comments from Representative Ortiz.

Representative Ortiz remarked that it was a classic example of the dilemma facing the committee going through the budget process. He stated they were talking about an amendment to assist and help coordinate child abuse investigations. He elaborated that enacting the amendment would provide a safe, child friendly environment for multiple agencies to coordinate the investigations. He believed the amendment was needed and in the spirit of helping to promote public safety and children's safety. He fully supported the amendment and thanked the sponsor.

Representative Cronk OBJECTED.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

IN FAVOR: Galvin, Hannan, Josephson, Ortiz, Foster
OPPOSED: Cronk, Stapp, Tomaszewski, Coulombe, Edgmon, Johnson

The MOTION to adopt Amendment L 6 FAILED (5/6).

[4:16:10 PM](#)

Representative Josephson MOVED to ADOPT Amendment L 7 (copy on file):

Agency: Health
Appropriation: Medicaid Services
Allocation: Medicaid Services

Transaction Details

Title: Autism Services Inflation Adjustment
Section: Language
Type: Inc

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)
Personal Services: 0.0 Travel: 0.0
Services: 0.0
Commodities: 0.0
Capital Outlay: 0.0
Grants: 446.6
Miscellaneous: 0.0

Positions

Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)

1002 Fed Rcpts 223.3
1003 GF/Match 223.3

Explanation

Since 2018, Medicaid rates for behavioral health service codes have been adjusted upward for inflation by 12.76%, except for autism services. This would bring inflationary rate parity to the average cost of autism services.

We would like to add intent language which is as follows: "It is the legislature's intent to increase Medicaid reimbursement rates for autism services by 12.76% to bring payment parity with similar Medicaid behavioral health service codes."

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Representative Josephson explained the amendment included \$223,000 in state funds for autism services to address

inflation under Medicaid Services. The funding would be an increase to Medicaid Services with the intent to increase Medicaid reimbursement rates for autism services. The funding would result in an equal amount of federal matching funds. The increase was 12.7 percent to bring parity with other behavioral health services. In 2018, the state began to require coverage for autism spectrum disorder for individuals under 21 years of age through the Division of Behavioral Health related to a Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) requirement for early diagnostic screening. The belief was that the services would help reduce the need for special education services and improve quality of life. The services opened the doors for further education for children with autism spectrum disorder. He noted that other behavioral health services received annual adjustments, but autism services had not. He stated it was an equity issue and rates for autism services had not been adjusted since at least 2021. He added that autism services were the lowest reimbursed under the Department of Health. He elaborated that \$3.5 million was spent annually, but the 12.76 percent was not received by the department for autism.

Representative Josephson relayed that he met with a man named Phillip Tafs with the Alaska Association of Applied Behavioral Analysis on March 7 and he had described the need for the increase in funding as a way to assist with complex care behavioral collaboratives. He also spoke with a woman named Ms. [Emily] Ice who was a leader in the state on the issue. He shared that Ms. Ice reported that the cost of one individual who ended up going out of state cost the state greatly. He detailed that students ended up going to Utah and other locations in the Midwest. He elaborated that if needs were unmet in Alaska, it cost hundreds of thousands to get the services. He relayed that Ms. Ice had shared there would be a 47 percent gain in functioning for children who received early intervention. He noted that the majority leader spoke in support of the increment during the subcommittee process.

[4:20:25 PM](#)

Representative Stapp appreciated the amendment, but he was slightly opposed at the current time. He had spoken with Ms. Ice and there were four things he was working on with the department to determine whether it had the appropriate effect. The four things included the upper payment limit,

whether the service fell under the 1115 [waiver], the existing rebasement study, and the appropriate Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP). He had already identified a general fund reduction in another department to be able to pay for the increment. He relayed that until he figured the four questions out, he would be in opposition. Once the answers were obtained, he would likely support it later on.

Representative Galvin supported the amendment. She stressed it was a population that was not getting what it needed. She knew firsthand that early interventions mattered. She noted that unfortunately when children did not receive the appropriate care, there were parents who did not give a child the attention they deserved because they had not received a diagnosis and parents did not have the training to help their child to become their very best. She believed there should at least be parity to ensure autistic children received the same services as others.

[4:23:06 PM](#)

Representative Hannan MOVED to table the amendment until the following day.

[4:23:29 PM](#)

AT EASE

[4:25:35 PM](#)

RECONVENED

Representative Hannan MOVED to table Amendment L 7 until a later date. [Note: Amendment L 7 was amended during the 3/28/24 1:30 p.m. meeting and adopted on 4/1/24 during the 10:20 a.m. meeting. See separate minutes for detail.]

There being NO OBJECTION it was so ordered.

[4:26:09 PM](#)

Representative Ortiz MOVED to ADOPT Amendment L 8 (copy on file):

Transaction Details

Title: Backstop Funding for Alaska Marine Highway
Calendar Year 2025 Operations

Section: Language

Type: Lang

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)

Personal Services: 0.0
Travel: 0.0
Services: 0.0
Commodities: 0.0
Capital Outlay: 0.0
Grants: 0.0
Miscellaneous: 38,000.0

Positions

Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)

1004 Gen Fund 38,000.0

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Representative Ortiz explained the amendment pertaining to the Alaska Marine Highway System (AMHS) and the potential need for backstop funding. He stressed that AMHS was the highway for coastal Alaska. He stated that if the amendment did not pass it was like saying the legislature would not continue to support a main road leading into Anchorage or Fairbanks. He asked to hear from LFD on the potential need.

[4:27:16 PM](#)

AT EASE

[4:28:31 PM](#)

RECONVENED

Representative Ortiz stated his understanding that in FY 24 the legislature hoped the federal government would provide operating funding for AMHS potentially at the amount of \$70 million; however, the state only received \$38 million. The amendment would provide backstop funding in the amount of \$38 million if the federal funds did not come through for FY 25. He noted that the legislature had included backstop language in the FY 24 budget. He asked Mr. Painter for any additional details.

Mr. Painter confirmed there was \$76 million of federal authority in the FY 24 AMHS budget; however, the state only

received \$38.5 million. He explained that if it occurred again for FY 25, there would be a budget gap of just under \$38 million. The state was eligible for federal funding above the \$76 million, but the federal government had flexibility in how to apply the funds. The legislature would not know the results of the application until after the end of the current legislative session. In FY 24, the legislature appropriated \$20 million in backstop funding in case federal receipts came up short. He detailed that the governor vetoed the number down to \$10 million. He elaborated that the \$10 million would be used in the current year because of the shortfall.

Co-Chair Edgmon stated that given the explanation from Mr. Painter and the fact that there was \$10 million in advance, he wanted to get to a place where the amendment could move forward. He shared that AMHS served his district as well. He completely agreed with the need to have some of the money in place.

Co-Chair Edgmon MOVED to ADOPT conceptual Amendment 1 to Amendment L 8 to reduce the \$38 million to \$20 million.

There being NO OBJECTION, conceptual Amendment 1 to Amendment L 8 was ADOPTED.

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW the OBJECTION to Amendment L 8 as amended.

There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment L 8 was ADOPTED as amended.

[4:33:22 PM](#)

Representative Stapp MOVED to ADOPT Amendment L 9 (copy on file):

Agency: University of Alaska
Appropriation: University of Alaska
Allocation: Fairbanks Campus

Transaction Details

Title: Assist the University of Alaska Fairbanks to Achieve R1 Research Status (FY25-FY27)
Section: Language
Type: FndChg

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)

Personal Services: 0.0
Travel: 0.0
Services: 0.0
Commodities: 0.0
Capital Outlay: 0.0
Grants: 0.0
Miscellaneous: 0.0

Positions

Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)

1004 Gen Fund -10,000.0
1048 Univ Rcpt -10,000.0
1226 High Ed 20,000.0

Explanation

These funds would be used to assist the University of Alaska Fairbanks campus to achieve R1 Research Status as defined by the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. The fund source is being changed from \$10,000,000 in UGF (1004) and \$10,000,000 in Univ Receipts DGF (1048) to \$20,000,000 from the Higher Education Investment Fund (1226) which will provide additional motivation for UAF to succeed in their pursuit of R1 Research status and if successful, provide a return on investment to the University of Alaska in the form of higher enrollment and additional research grants.

Agency: University of Alaska
Appropriation: University of Alaska
Allocation: Systemwide Reduction/Additions

Transaction Details

Title: Provide Additional Funding for Pilot Programs Related to Teacher Prep and Healthcare
Section: Section 1
Type: IncOTI

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)

Personal Services: 0.0 Travel: 0.0
Services: 0.0

Positions

Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)

1004 Gen Fund 3,000.0

Explanation

The University of Alaska has highlighted success with their pilot programs related to Teacher Preparation and Healthcare with over 450 scholarships awarded between the two programs. This one-time increment would expand the amount of students eligible for each program. \$1,500,000 would go towards the Teacher Prep program and \$1,500,000 would go to the Healthcare Program. These funds would also assist in expediting the amount of time a student spends in the program to enter the workforce earlier.

Co-Chair Foster OBJECTED for discussion.

Representative Stapp explained that the amendment would delete \$10 million in designated general receipt authority from the University of Alaska and \$10 million in undesignated general funds (UGF) and would replace the funding with a \$20 million allocation from the Higher Education Fund in order for the University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF) to achieve R1 research status. Additionally, the amendment would add \$3 million for different types of workforce development programs, scholarship opportunities for teacher preparation, and healthcare scholarships at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA). He detailed that \$1.5 million would go toward the teacher preparation program and \$1.5 million would go toward the healthcare program to help facilitate the many workforce challenges and critical teacher and nursing shortages at UAA.

Representative Stapp explained that the Higher Education Fund was designed for scholarship funding and the bulk of the money used by the amendment would go to scholarships for grad students in order to achieve R1 research status. In the event the University could achieve the goal - the University had told the committee it could achieve the goal with the funding - the return on investment would be

substantial. He stated that if the University was unable to achieve the goal, it would slightly deplete the Higher Education Fund, which had a current balance of close to \$390 million.

Representative Stapp shared that in 2018 the legislature appropriated \$35 million out of the Higher Education Fund for Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS) retirement payments. He underscored that Amendment L 9 would take money out of the fund for higher education, which was the fund's purpose. The idea was to incentivize the University to achieve a worthy goal and allow Alaska to have its first R1 top-tier research university.

Representative Josephson thought he liked the amendment. He asked if the governor adopted the \$10 million UGF. He was trying to recall what the governor committed relative to R1. Additionally, he recalled that the teacher preparation and healthcare program was another thing the University Board of Regents wanted.

Co-Chair Johnson noted the questions would be addressed during wrap up on the amendment.

Representative Ortiz asked Representative Stapp to repeat the current balance of the Higher Education Fund during wrap up. He asked for the average draw on the fund for funding scholarships. He was interested in getting a better idea on sustainability of the fund if the amendment were to be adopted.

[4:37:21 PM](#)

Representative Coulombe thanked the sponsor for the amendment. She remarked there had been some UAA/UAF wars and she appreciated it was an olive branch to UAA. She knew the healthcare and teacher programs needed the funding.

Representative Hannan stated the amendment was titled R1 Research, moving money to the Higher Education Fund, but the second part with the pilot program incentives for teacher prep and healthcare were not tied to the Higher Education Fund and were general fund allocations. She was supportive, but wanted to make sure the funding to the pilot programs was not tied to the conditional language about the R1 funding.

Representative Galvin thanked the maker of the amendment. She believed there would be a return on investment in many ways. She stated there would be a return on investment from the R1 research, which would keep young residents in Alaska. Additionally, there were currently over 1,000 teacher vacancies in Alaska and teacher outmigration was 8 percent, which was a deep concern. She supported the investment proposed in the amendment. She understood that many rural students appreciated the pilot program already and had become teachers. She stated that more Alaskan grown teachers would remain in the state. Additionally, the investment in the healthcare program would make a difference in the overall cost to all Alaskans as healthcare consumers. She noted that paying high salaries to care providers coming in from out of state had impacted the cost of healthcare for Alaskans. She supported the amendment.

[4:40:51 PM](#)

Co-Chair Edgmon agreed with all of the comments about the merits behind the amendment. He got a bit nervous when the legislature started "raiding corpuses" and he wondered what the next step would be in a future year and if there could be a proposal to fund another branch of the University or another entity. He had been around when the Higher Education Fund was established. He was trying to understand the reason for not leaving the funding sources as is and using \$10 million in general funds and \$10 million in University receipts as opposed to taking \$20 million from the Higher Education Fund. He supported the amendment and would have to think about how he would vote.

Representative Ortiz believed there had been legislation earlier in the session trying to broaden access to the scholarship fund to a larger group of students pertaining to workforce development. He asked if the amendment sponsor took that particular draw on the fund into account.

[4:42:41 PM](#)

Representative Stapp responded to members' questions. The governor's existing request in the capital budget was \$10 million in general funds and \$10 million in designated receipt authority from the University, which was money the University did not have. He noted \$10 million of the funding was also conditional on the University achieving

the R1 status; therefore, the nature of the capital project was relatively worthless because it was money the University could never receive. The current fund balance or the Higher Education Fund was about \$380 million. He elaborated that the peak fund balance was \$460 million in FY 14 and the lowest balance was \$340 million after money was appropriated to pay for retirement obligations. He agreed that the legislature should not be in the practice of raiding funds to pay for things. He relayed that R1 research status could only be achieved under a certain timeframe. The University president was in support of using higher education funds to achieve R1 research status.

Representative Stapp addressed Co-Chair Edgmon's question about the reason for changing the funding sources. He explained that the University did not have \$10 million in designated general funds (DGF) to achieve the goal, meaning they would be better off cutting the program entirely rather than keeping the current fund source allocation. He relayed that currently the fund draw was 6.2 percent and separate legislation would increase it to 7 percent (HB 148). Each scholarship ranged from \$2,378 to \$4,755 annually. He elaborated that \$1.5 million would be the reduction and overall draw, which would reduce available scholarships by about \$400 per year for the next several years. He believed the goal of achieving R1 research status was worth the investment, as did the University. He highlighted that the amendment would reduce the overall state budget liability by \$7 million in state funds while resourcing UAA's critical teacher and healthcare programs. The amendment would help the University and state achieve a long held goal to have the first top tier research facility in the state. He thought members likely remembered the provost who gave the presentation on what it would mean for the additional unlocking of federal funds, additional students, and the retention of existing professors. He relayed that the funding for UAA was general fund dollars and did not have conditional use language attached [pertaining to the teacher preparation and healthcare programs].

[4:46:27 PM](#)

Co-Chair Johnson thanked Representative Stapp for finding the item and realizing it was not fully funded. She appreciated that he found a way to fund the item. She

thought it was a good solution. She was excited about the prospect of a top tier research university in Alaska.

Co-Chair Foster WITHDREW the OBJECTION.

Co-Chair Edgmon OBJECTED.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

IN FAVOR: Galvin, Hannan, Josephson, Stapp, Tomaszewski, Coulombe, Cronk, Foster, Johnson
OPPOSED: Ortiz, Edgmon

The MOTION PASSED (9/2). There being NO further OBJECTION, Amendment L 9 was ADOPTED.

Representative Stapp WITHDREW Amendment L 10 (copy on file).

[4:48:47 PM](#)

Co-Chair Foster MOVED to ADOPT Amendment L 11 (copy on file):

Agency: Permanent Fund
Appropriation: Permanent Fund Dividends
Allocation: Dividend Fund 1050

Transaction Details
Title: Statutory PFD
Section: Language
Type: Inc

Line Items (Amounts are in thousands)

Personal Services: 0.0
Travel: 0.0
Services: 0.0
Commodities: 0.0
Capital Outlay: 0.0
Grants: 801,200.0
Miscellaneous: 0.0

Positions
Permanent Full-Time: 0
Permanent Part-Time: 0
Temporary: 0

Funding (Amounts are in thousands)
1041 PF ERA 801,200.0

Explanation

Pays a statutory PFD when including the energy rebate.

Representative Hannan OBJECTED.

Co-Chair Foster requested an at ease.

[4:49:10 PM](#)

AT EASE

[5:11:34 PM](#)

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Foster spoke to the amendment. The amendment would provide for a full statutory PFD. The PFD currently in the budget was approximately \$2,272 [per person] and the amendment would add \$1,242 to bring it to approximately \$3,514. He explained it was the amount that should be paid under the current statutory PFD formula. The amendment would use an additional \$801,200,000 million from the Permanent Fund Earnings Reserve Account (ERA). The ERA currently had a balance of about \$7.3 billion. The amendment would bring the percent of market value (POMV) draw up to 6.1 percent as opposed to the statutory draw of 5 percent. He considered which statute the legislature wanted to follow. He and his constituents wanted to follow the law paying out the full statutory PFD.

Representative Ortiz opposed the amendment. He stated that the legislature had heard over and over that although it would be nice to receive a statutory PFD, it was not sustainable for future generations. He believed it was prudent for the legislature to consider current and future generations.

[5:14:13 PM](#)

Representative Galvin asked about the POMV history and the implications if the draw exceeded the statutory amount.

Mr. Painter asked for a repeat of the question.

Representative Galvin stated her understanding that the statutory POMV draw from the ERA was a maximum of 5 percent.

Mr. Painter responded by nodding his head in agreement.

Representative Galvin asked if the draw had ever exceeded 5 percent.

Mr. Painter replied in the negative. He detailed that the statute used to read 5.25 percent in the first few years and had gone down to 5 percent. The legislature had not ever exceeded the statutory draw.

Representative Galvin asked what implications exceeding the draw may mean for other things. She asked if it would put the state's stability at risk and if there were ratings associated with following statute that would be impacted.

Mr. Painter replied that any additional draw from the ERA would mean reduced earnings in future years. He elaborated that an \$800 million draw at 7.6 percent earnings would mean ~\$50 million less in the future, which would mean smaller future POMV draws. He added that any draw resulted in the increased risk of the ERA not having enough money to make the POMV draw in future years. He could not speak to the question about credit ratings. He noted that generally following a framework resulted in the state being viewed more favorably.

[5:17:27 PM](#)

Representative Galvin understood there was a dilemma because statute specified paying a certain amount, but there was not another accessible funding source to draw from. She understood the perspective that the full statutory PFD may be the only avenue to go. She believed there were other broad-based measures that would be fairer and more longitudinally helpful when looking at the future. She stated the importance of being fiscally responsible for future generations. She referenced Mr. Painter's statement that the draw could result in \$50 million less revenue in the future. She opposed the amendment.

Co-Chair Johnson clarified there were two statutes on the books and while the legislature may not have drawn beyond the current amount since the POMV statute was passed, the

standard withdrawal had been from the ERA in the past. She asked for the accuracy of her statement.

Mr. Painter agreed. The legislature had not followed the PFD statute since FY 17.

Co-Chair Johnson asked if the amendment violated the current statute.

Mr. Painter answered that the amendment would violate the POMV draw statute as it would exceed the maximum draw; however, it would pay the PFD as outlined in the PFD statute.

Co-Chair Johnson remarked they were dueling statutes.

Representative Stapp appreciated Co-Chair Foster for bringing the amendment forward. He stated that numbers did not lie. He referenced a presentation by Mr. Painter where he had told the committee there was a high probability of running into a liquidity crisis under the current 5 percent POMV draw. He asked if he was accurate.

[5:20:50 PM](#)

Mr. Painter confirmed it was the case based on research by LFD and the Permanent Fund.

Representative Stapp asked if 6.1 percent draws would increase the risk there would not be money remaining for PFDs or anything else.

Mr. Painter agreed.

Representative Stapp remarked on the proposal to increase the POMV draw from the ERA under a situation where they already believed the current draw was too much. He stressed it would create a liquidity crisis where PFDs and other things could not be paid. He suggested reducing the size and scope of the state's government as another solution.

Representative Stapp MOVED conceptual Amendment 1 to Amendment L 11 to demonstrate what it would take to cut \$801 million out of the state's operating budget.

Co-Chair Edgmon OBJECTED.

Representative Stapp proposed cutting \$801,877,100 from the state's operating budget to compensate for a statutory PFD. The first cut was \$407,552,200 from the Department of Corrections (DOC), which would liquidate the entire DOC budget, close all prisons, and release all prisoners. The second cut was \$150,690,200 from the Court System because courts would not be necessary without prisons. The third cut was \$177,635,600 to the Department of Public Safety (DPS) because public safety officers would not be necessary if there were no courts or prisons. Additional cuts included \$14,046,500 to the Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development, \$22,156,900 to the Department of Labor and Workforce Development, \$22,171,600 to the Department of Environmental Conservation, and \$17,624,100 to the Department of Military and Veterans Affairs.

[5:23:47 PM](#)

Representative Ortiz OBJECTED.

Co-Chair Edgmon stated it was the kind version because it was pretty dramatic. He understood that Co-Chair Foster's constituents had asked him to bring the amendment forward. He had known Co-Chair Foster for many years, and he had not varied from the stance. He knew many of Co-Chair Foster's constituents and understood where he was coming from. He stated that the nature of the conversation had changed over the years. He recalled when he was speaker of the House in 2017 there had been a very dramatic vote on the PFD that resulted in a vote of 21 to 19 in support. He stated it was a watershed moment because the body was split on a full PFD for the first time. He had been present in 2016 when former Governor Bill Walker had to make what became an infamous reduction to the PFD because oil prices plummeted from over \$100 per barrel to \$26 per barrel resulting in a hole of over \$4 billion. He would support the conceptual amendment if Representative Stapp moved forward with it.

[5:25:25 PM](#)

Representative Galvin stated she had been elected to make sure families were feeling safe, secure, and for children to have the opportunity to be smart. She thought there was a true disconnect among many Alaskans and perhaps there was not an understanding about the cost of services. She noted there were also many people who understood the services

cost money and were willing to give up a bit to have a good life in Alaska. She stated those were the individuals she was thinking about when she voted no to the conceptual amendment.

Representative Hannan opposed the conceptual amendment and the underlying amendment. She believed Representative Stapp had illustrated the point and dilemma that it was hard to do everything for everyone. He shared that in the six years she had served in the legislature she heard consistently that the state's bills needed to be paid and they needed to be truthful in what things cost. She stated there were several amendments that would address the PFD amount. She appreciated that Co-Chair Foster continued to advocate for his constituency and their needs; however, her constituents largely argued the exact opposite stance. She was not supportive of devastating state government and public safety at the expense of dispensing as much money into individual hands as possible. She supported a collective agreement about protecting and providing for Alaska and its long-term future.

[5:27:44 PM](#)

Representative Ortiz MAINTAINED the OBJECTION.

Representative Stapp provided wrap up on the conceptual amendment. He relayed that he had the list of all of the reductions in the state's operating budget if members wanted to know how he had arrived at \$801 million in state general funds. He thought it was poor form for him to vote against an amendment he had offered. He did not support his proposal because he believed the state should have corrections, a court system, and public safety. One of his goals when he got elected was that in order to pay a statutory PFD, the state needed to reduce expenditures on government or tax people. He stressed there were no other options. He stated that reducing \$801 million from the state's operating budget literally meant the entirety of the budget items he had previously listed. He believed the size and scope of Alaska's state government could be reduced, but he did not believe it was possible to cut \$801 million or \$1 billion without catastrophic consequences. He did not support unbelievable levels of irresponsibility in terms of budget.

Representative Stapp WITHDREW conceptual Amendment 1 to Amendment L 11. He opposed the underlying amendment.

[5:29:44 PM](#)

Representative Cronk stated it was the same fight every year. He stated the issue would be solved with a complete fiscal plan and not just reducing the PFD to a 25/75 split. He supported the amendment. He highlighted the importance of solving the issue.

Representative Tomaszewski referenced Mr. Painter's statement that the last time a full PFD had been paid was in FY 17. He stated that a reduction in the PFD was a regressive tax on the individuals making the least amount of money including seniors living on a fixed income. He stressed that adding up the amount that had not been paid to Alaskans [since FY 17] came close to the current balance of the ERA. He stated the legislature had banked its savings accounts on the backs of the lowest earners in the state. He emphasized that the thirst for government spending would never cease. He stated there would always be someone asking for increases because there were a lot of good programs that needed support. He highlighted there was no spending cap or other revenue. He thanked Co-Chair Foster for standing up for his constituents. He would stand up for all of the constituents by voting yes on the amendment. He stressed the state was facing high inflation and it was taking funds from people's pockets to increase the size and scope of government.

Co-Chair Johnson thought the issue highlighted that the two statutes resulted in a very difficult situation. She stated it was very difficult to pay out a full statutory PFD with only the POMV draw. She stated there was a mismatch in the statutes. Without the ERA draw, the state could not afford to pay the full statutory PFD. She found it unfortunate. She wished it was not the situation, but it was.

[5:34:31 PM](#)

Representative Coulombe had been a constituent two years earlier. She relayed that many constituents found it hard to understand that the state had \$7.3 billion, and people could not receive a full PFD. She stated that at least half her district did not have money for childcare, could not pay their energy bills, were trying to pay their mortgage,

and were trying to deal with the current crazy economy. She was trying to recall prior to her time in the legislature and how she would receive that information. She was conflicted because she had always said "follow the law or change the law." She stated it was clear there were two conflicting statutes. She understood the current scenario was not fiscally responsible going forward and that the state's budget could not handle it. She stated it was the scenario she had entered into, and the situation had not been dealt with by the legislature. She elaborated that no one wanted to put forward a fiscal plan. She had put cuts forward and very few supported cutting any government. The law was for a full statutory PFD. She noted that her district was pretty split on the issue. There were many individuals who wanted fiscal stability and supported government services, while there were many others who needed the full PFD. She understood how much needed to be cut in order to pay a full PFD. She thought at some point they needed to deal with the situation. She did not like how it had been a battle for numerous years. She supported the amendment.

[5:37:32 PM](#)

Representative Josephson remarked that the amendment was surprisingly going to be a very close vote. He did not have any memory in his 12 years in the legislature of anyone overdrawing the POMV. He underscored he would be a no vote on the House floor. He asked if he was the last conservative in the body. He thought about Yorktown, Virginia in 1781 where they played the song The World Turned Upside Down because the Americans had just beat a mighty empire. He thought it was what the current issue sounded like. He remarked that he was supposed to be the generous progressive who wanted to help people with autism and Alzheimer's, which he would continue to do. He believed he was a true conservative on the issue at hand. He referenced an op-ed by former Senator Joe Paskvan of Fairbanks who strongly made the argument there was no such thing as a state citizen's entitlement to the oil in the ground. The former senator also stated that part of the reason the PFD became unaffordable was because the Permanent Fund had done so well. He stated that billions of dollars in the fund did not come to it in the normal constitutional way with a 25 or 30 percent mineral interest. The funds came because of the beneficence of the legislature throwing money at it when possible. He

referenced the idea that the money belonged to the people of Alaska and stressed that the state never received its share of the funding. He underscored that Alaska remained the only state that gave out money to people and had no broad-based tax. He wondered how that was not something celebrated every day. He stated that instead there was a malaise and heaviness. He highlighted that the other body would have to write the budget if the amendment passed. He asked committee members to proceed cautiously.

[5:40:42 PM](#)

Co-Chair Edgmon agreed with the comments made by Representative Josephson. He could not think of a more irresponsible vote he could take. He stated that he was going to vote yes on the amendment "and we're going to see where this is going to go."

[5:41:12 PM](#)

AT EASE

[5:48:03 PM](#)

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Foster MOVED to ADOPT conceptual Amendment 2 to Amendment L 11, which would repeal the oil tax credit of \$8 per barrel.

Representative Stapp OBJECTED.

Co-Chair Foster thanked Representative Stapp for his list of cuts [proposed under conceptual Amendment 1]. He explained that conceptual Amendment 2 did not require cuts because it took money from the ERA and not the general fund. He pointed out that making the cuts was not the only option. He detailed that in FY 24 the state paid \$898 million to oil companies in per barrel tax credits. He elaborated that repealing the program meant there would be sufficient funding to pay for the \$802 million required [for the statutory PFD]. He knew it was not something that he could do through an amendment, he understood it was a bill. His goal with the conceptual amendment was to highlight there were other options. He WITHDREW conceptual Amendment 2.

Co-Chair Johnson acknowledged Representative Jesse Sumner in the room.

Representative Stapp called the question on Amendment L 11.

[5:50:26 PM](#)

AT EASE

[5:50:45 PM](#)

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Edgmon stated the committee was missing a member and he believed the committee should be complete before voting on the amendment.

[5:50:57 PM](#)

AT EASE

[5:52:03 PM](#)

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Johnson relayed that she would adjourn the meeting and return to the amendment the following morning.

#

ADJOURNMENT

[5:52:59 PM](#)

The meeting was adjourned at 5:52 p.m.