

HOUSE FINANCE COMMITTEE
May 10, 2024
3:53 p.m.

[3:53:31 PM](#)

CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair Foster called the House Finance Committee meeting to order at 3:53 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

Justin Ruffridge, Vice-Chair, House Labor and Commerce Committee, Sponsor; Deborah Riddle, Operations Manager, Division of Innovation and Education Excellence, Department of Education and Early Development.

PRESENT VIA TELECONFERENCE

Erica Jones, Self, Anchorage; Carol Simpson, Self, Homer; Amanda Wraith, Self, Wasilla; Lori Zulliger, Self, Wasilla; Scott Gingrich, Self, Anchorage; Matthew Forester, Self, Anchorage; Cherie Taylor, Self, Soldotna; Eric Palin, Self, Big Lake; Adele Pribbenow, Self, Soldotna; Penny Vadla, Self, Soldotna; Kelvin Odegard, Self, Fairbanks; Ellie Ostler, Self, Anchor Point; Dawn Cogan, Self, Fairbanks; Terri Beach, Self, Fairbanks; Brandy Brant, Self, Homer;

Tracy Maxwell, Self, Juneau; Jacintha Mezzeti, Self, Eagle River; Faelyn Simpson, Self, Eagle River; Shad Schoppert, Self, Anchorage; Ashley Bauman, Self, Soldotna; Andrea Flynn, Self, Soldotna; Andrea Boeshart, Self, Soldotna; Alicia Jensen, Self, Sterling; Kimberly Welch, Self, Wasilla; Audrey Madsen, Self, Wasilla; Hannah Murkin, Self, Anchorage.

SUMMARY

HB 400 CORRESPONDENCE STUDY PROGRAMS; ALLOTMENTS

HB 400 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

SB 151 MISSING/MURDERED INDIGENOUS PEOPLE;REPORT

SB 151 was SCHEDULED but not HEARD.

SB 170 EXTND SR BENEFITS; REPEAL LONGEVITY BONUS

SB 170 was SCHEDULED but not HEARD.

SB 183 WORKERS' COMP BENEFITS GUARANTY FUND

SB 183 was SCHEDULED but not HEARD.

SB 189 EXTEND ALASKA COMMISSION ON AGING

SB 189 was SCHEDULED but not HEARD.

SB 205 AHFC AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE BUILDING

SB 205 was SCHEDULED but not HEARD.

SB 259 COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN STATE EMPLOYEES

SB 259 was SCHEDULED but not HEARD.

Co-Chair Foster reviewed the meeting agenda.

#hb400

HOUSE BILL NO. 400

"An Act relating to correspondence study programs; relating to allotments for correspondence study programs; and providing for an effective date."

[3:55:29 PM](#)

Co-Chair Foster invited Representative Justin Ruffridge to the table and asked for a description of the bill.

JUSTIN RUFFRIDGE, VICE-CHAIR, HOUSE LABOR AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE, SPONSOR, thanked the committee for hearing the bill. He referenced the recent court decision regarding the allotment program for correspondence studies that struck down sections of statute dealing with allotments and individualized learning plans. The bill sought to establish uncodified law of a board regulated version of individualized learning plans and constitutional allotment programs with a sunset date of June 30, 2025. The bill stated that individualized learning plans would be regulated by the State Board of Education and allotments would be regulated in accordance with the provisions of the Alaska Constitution dealing with educational spending and regulated by the board; the bill included some audit provisions to ensure it was accomplished.

[3:57:02 PM](#)

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

DEBORAH RIDDLE, OPERATIONS MANAGER, DIVISION OF INNOVATION AND EDUCATION EXCELLENCE, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND EARLY DEVELOPMENT, reviewed the fiscal note OMB component number 2796. The fiscal note totaled \$6,000 for the update and development of regulations to support the legislation.

Co-Chair Foster OPENED public testimony.

[3:58:56 PM](#)

ERICA JONES, SELF, ANCHORAGE (via teleconference), shared that she is a homeschool parent and special needs teacher with the IDEA program. She spoke in support of the bill because it gave the state and the Department of Education and Early Development (DEED) the time to carefully and methodically review the legal concerns. She stated that education needed to be well thought out and deliberate. She noted there were many concerns with a separate education bill, SB 266. She believed the Senate bill rushed to a solution rather than taking time to consider possible consequences. She had strong concerns with the allotment

carryover restrictions in the Senate bill. She explained it would reduce students' abilities to save a portion of funds from year to year for specialized curriculum. Much of the curriculum for special needs students was very expensive, but it could be used for multiple years for each student. Saving funds from year to year was the only way many families could afford the specialized curriculum. She reiterated her support for HB 400.

[4:01:08 PM](#)

CAROL SIMPSON, SELF, HOMER (via teleconference), testified in support of the bill. She had seven adult children she had homeschooled. Over the years she had appreciated the legislature's support for home schooling in general and correspondence programs in particular. She stated the bill appropriately focused on the issues the judge had objected to. The bill also included a sunset clause, which provided for more time to thoughtfully assess needs and develop statutes and regulations in better alignment with the state constitution, while protecting the continuation of correspondence programs. She did not support SB 266, which included provisions beyond the immediate need. The House bill provided relatively broad guidance to the State Board of Education and relied on the board to create specific guidelines for implementation of the legislature's intent. She believed that relying on DEED to carefully determine needed regulations while the legislature was not in session provided for a more thoughtful process and the inclusion of more stakeholders. She reiterated her support for HB 400 and opposition to SB 266. She thanked the committee.

Representative Ortiz asked for verification that Ms. Simpson believed the Senate bill was too prescriptive for reforms that would need to be made and the House bill was more open-ended for DEED to work out.

Ms. Simpson answered that the Senate bill included additional provisions beyond what the judge addressed. She liked that the House bill was specific to the concerns expressed by the judge. Additionally, because HB 400 included a sunset clause, the direction was toward the board to come up with regulations. She noted that originally SB 266 included numerous old regulations, much of which had been dropped; however, it still included additional provisions.

4:04:28 PM

AMANDA WRAITH, SELF, WASILLA (via teleconference), provided a scenario of a group of Alaskan adults who had given up lucrative careers and had dedicated their lives as volunteers for the educational success of a small group of Alaskan students. She stated that the adults studied the gifts and aptitudes of the children from birth to customize a learning strategy. She reported that it was working and the kids were successful. She referenced chronic teacher shortages, overcrowded classrooms, and stressed budgets. She stated there were nearly 30,000 Alaskan students educated at home by independent home educators and home educating partners of the school district. She stated the volunteer educators saved taxpayers and districts hundreds of millions in education funding and teacher salaries annually. She continued to address the benefit of homeschool volunteer teachers. The state had offered often to provide each student a small percentage of the funding for the cost of education. She noted that the homeschool students qualified for only 90 percent of the Base Student Allocation (BSA) that went to their districts each teacher was allowed less than half of the money. She provided funding comparisons between homeschooling and brick and mortar schools. She supported the allotment carryover.

4:09:11 PM

LORI ZULLIGER, SELF, WASILLA (via teleconference), supported the bill. She was a homeschool parent. She relayed that it was through state support by recognizing parent choice and providing allotments that her family had been able to make the educational option for their daughter through the IDEA program. She shared information about her daughter's educational journey. She supported HB 400, which put determining regulations for correspondence programs and allotments back into the hands of the State Board of Education. The bill dealt with the constitutional issue of the initial [court] ruling. She asked the committee to consider the parents and how they may best teach their students, the students and how they may be best served, and the small business vendors who supply services to homeschooling communities in the state. She asked the legislature to tread lightly when regulating options for families homeschooling their children. She highlighted it was important to remember that the educational system was in place to give each student the least restrictive

environment in which to learn and thrive. She thanked the committee.

4:12:24 PM

SCOTT GINGRICH, SELF, ANCHORAGE (via teleconference), is a home school parent with five kids and used the IDEA program. He stated homeschooling and parent involvement was critical for students' success and had positive impacts on academic performance, student behavior, self-esteem, and motivation. He added that parental involvement helped strengthen the bond between parents and schools. He was in favor of the bill. He liked allowing parents the option to opt out of standardized tests. He listed various tests used in the past 20 years. He noted that parents had not received test results for an entire year, and it made it difficult for parents to see value in the tests. He stated that the allotment carryover should not change, and he liked that about HB 400. He did not support the allotment provisions in SB 266. He outlined reasons. He believed the allotment program was constitutional and there should not be a change to the allotment carryover. He addressed the ILP [individualized learning plan], which he believed was good teaching. He thanked the committee for taking the time to listen. He liked the one-year sunset in the bill that allowed the legislature time to get feedback and do more research in order to make the best decision.

Representative Galvin thanked Mr. Gingrich for his testimony and shared that she had gone through IDEA beginning in 1998. She remarked that he had been homeschooling for 20 years and she noted there had been changes during that time. She had been frustrated with the myriad of tests over the years. She asked if Mr. Gingrich's kids were currently participating in the Alaska Reads Act, MAP testing, and others.

Mr. Gingrich responded that he only had one student left at home and he was in the later part of high school and beyond the testing ranges for the tests.

Representative Galvin stated that the allotment carryover was relatively new. She stated that in years past there had been an allotment for curriculum that aligned with the ILP and had to be in accordance with what a licensed teacher advised. She discussed what had been included in the

curriculum. She asked if Mr. Gingrich went through that experience.

Mr. Gingrich affirmatively.

Representative Galvin stated her understanding it had changed. She asked Mr. Gingrich to describe the differences.

Mr. Gingrich responded that instead of being rushed to use allotment dollars, if a parent had a budget, it allowed them to make better decisions with how money was spent. He stated that curriculum was getting more expensive, and saving the money for when it was needed to use on things like college classes was an opportunity to do things gradually. He shared that his oldest two kids ended up with 30 college credits prior to graduating from high school. He elaborated on his kids' experience.

Representative Galvin was supportive of enabling students in Alaska to have concurrent classes. She thought it was a wonderful opportunity for high school students if everyone could afford it. She referenced Mr. Gingrich's testimony about saving money and using it accordingly at a later time. She noted that it had not been possible in the past and the money had just been returned to the system. She asked about supplies. She asked if a book went back to IDEA after a student had used it.

Mr. Gingrich answered that homeschool families were allowed to save a book to use for their other kids. When they were finished with a book it was returned to IDEA to be reused.

Representative Galvin stated her understanding families could save the book as long as they wanted, and it was then returned to the system.

Mr. Gingrich replied that if a family withdrew from the program, they would have to return the book.

Representative Galvin asked if the same was true for a computer.

Mr. Gingrich responded that families had the option to purchase at a depreciated rate depending on how old the computer was, or it could be returned.

Representative Galvin appreciated hearing the information.

[4:23:31 PM](#)

MATTHEW FORESTER, SELF, ANCHORAGE (via teleconference), shared that his family used the IDEA homeschool program. He spoke in support of the current version of the bill and was happy to see the changes. He wished the situation was not happening because he thought the system currently in place worked well. He was glad the bill left the responsibility to the State Board of Education to address the constitutional question and he liked the sunset provision because Alaskans deserved time to evaluate the issues and avoid unintended consequences. He did not support SB 266. He shared information about his family with three kids who had been homeschooled through the IDEA program. He appreciated the legislature trying to take quick action.

[4:26:14 PM](#)

CHERIE TAYLOR, SELF, SOLDOTNA (via teleconference), is a homeschool mom. She supported the bill that no longer included provisions unrelated to the constitutional question. The bill required the State Board of Education to address the constitutional question in particular. She supported the sunset provision of one year, which acknowledged that Alaskans needed more time to weigh the issues carefully and avoid unintended consequences. She strongly opposed SB 266. She stated the bill contained questions that were unrelated to the constitutional question. She highlighted that SB 266 was not temporary. She believed the language would have intended and unintended consequences for homeschoolers and schools. She stated that more time was needed than was left in session to fully have productive discussions about the issues. Families needed homeschooling to continue in the current model with the least disruption for students and families. She concluded that HB 400, version R supported what was needed.

Representative Ortiz stated that several callers had talked about how SB 266 had provisions that were not related to the court's ruling that the program was unconstitutional. He asked for some examples of measures that were not related to the judge's ruling.

Ms. Taylor believed the judge's ruling applied to the part of the constitution specifying that public funds should not be used for private education. She stated that SB 266 addressed items that were not really at play including standardized testing for all families and no allotment carryover.

[4:29:13 PM](#)

ERIC PALIN, SELF, BIG LAKE (via teleconference), shared that he is a homeschool father of four daughters enrolled with the IDEA program. He stated that the IDEA correspondence school had offered incredible freedom for his family. He provided detail about his family and their experience with correspondence. He stated that homeschooling worked at a fraction of the cost of brick and mortar schools. He relayed that IDEA had always been very careful to follow the rules regarding proper reimbursement for educational expenses. The bill supported his freedom and visions for his children's academic success without the controls included in SB 266. He strongly opposed the Senate bill and thought it was inequitable and onerous. He supported HB 400 version R with its set one-year time limit in order to allow for judicial and legislative corrections when time was available. He supported that HB 400 contained no mandatory testing requirements for students and that the allotment was fully maintained without onerous spending limits and restrictions for the fine arts and physical education. He continued to discuss his reasons for opposing SB 266. He urged the committee to support HB 400.

Representative Galvin stated that many of the testifiers were referencing SB 266 and much of the testimony had been that there should not be required testing associated with allotments. Yet, she heard frequently there was not enough accountability associated with the big spending on education. She asked how Mr. Palin would respond to individuals with the specific concern.

Mr. Palin shared that he had an email conversation with Senator Loki Tobin about the topic the previous week about the specific issue. He believed the opposition was to a mandatory requirement requiring taking tests in order to get an allotment. He was happy to do a test, but he did not want restrictions forced upon him. There were other ways to determine if a child was doing well. He stated that ILPs were well defined, and families had monthly feedback from a

contact teacher. Families also submitted quarterly work examples and students could get additional support in areas they were struggling with. He stated that in all actuality he was the teacher and could track how his kids were doing.

Representative Galvin shared that she had opted out for one of her children because she did not believe the particular test would be helpful. She was considering how to answer to many Alaskans seeing public dollars spent to come up with some accountability. She reasoned there may be other ways to check off that box. She asked about the allotment carryover, which she noted was relatively new to the state in the past 10 years. She noted that neighborhood schools were not afforded the opportunity, but correspondence schools were. She knew the Senate bill had a portfolio option instead of a testing requirement.

Mr. Palin answered that the cost for a child in a brick and mortar school compared to homeschooling was about three to one. He noted that funding associated with the [allotment] rollover was a much smaller sum at \$2,700 per child per year under the IDEA program. He noted that the funds were often completely consumed. He stated that music lessons and PE consumed much of the funding. He remarked that it was not like people were rolling over \$5,000 per year. He noted that SB 266 contained provisions that limited spending on specific things like fine arts, music, and PE to 15 percent of the allotment per year. He provided an example of the cost of music lessons. He supported HB 400, version R.

[4:41:42 PM](#)

Representative Galvin appreciated Mr. Palin sharing his perspective. She noted that the committee had not received substantial public testimony from the neighborhood schools because testifiers had been asked not to talk about public education funds during the operating budget public testimony since there had been separate legislation on the topic.

Representative Coulombe stated there was a public testifier on the line. She requested to have the question asked in order to respect people's time.

Representative Galvin stated some schools had been shut down and some had no music classes. She was trying to think through policy for individual families who deserve to teach

their children at home and so many others who were dealing with other issues. She thanked Mr. Palin.

Representative Stapp stated that his issue with the Senate version of the bill was that the testing was only applicable to correspondence school kids. Currently everyone could opt out of testing, but the Senate bill specified that everyone but home school students could opt out of testing. He thought it created an equity issue. His second issue with the Senate bill pertained to the rollover provision. He stated that when the legislature allocated funds to school districts, the state did not take the funding back if the districts did not spend all of the money.

Mr. Palin agreed. He stated that SB 266 included inequitable provisions.

[4:45:13 PM](#)

AT EASE

[5:00:02 PM](#)

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Foster noted there were 19 testifiers remaining. He had a meeting at 5:30 p.m. He asked people to keep the time in mind.

[5:01:19 PM](#)

ADELE PRIBBENOW, SELF, SOLDOTNA (via teleconference), is a homeschool parent and certified teacher working with the homeschool program. She shared that she had been involved in homeschooling in Alaska since 1984. She believed HB 400, version R best addressed the needs of Alaskan homeschoolers by following the law, while not putting a sudden kink in their homeschooling journey. She stated that the one-year sunset date acknowledged that Alaskans needed more time to weigh issues carefully to avoid unintended consequences. She highlighted that SB 266 was not temporary and contained issues that were unrelated to the constitutional question. She thanked the committee.

[5:02:21 PM](#)

PENNY VADLA, SELF, SOLDOTNA (via teleconference), shared that she had worked as a high school and college teacher

beginning in 1977 and had retired in 2006. She was currently in her sixth term on the school board. She thanked the legislature for supporting the state and students in brick and mortar schools and homeschools. She reviewed the guidelines in HB 400 and wanted to ensure the guidelines were monitored. She supported adopting regulations and standards for ILPs with formative and summative assessments. She thought the formative assessments would help the summative assessments. She supported an annual allotment with oversight. She hoped the state would ensure the funds were not used for private schools or religious purposes. She believed in the separation between church and state. She also supported SB 266 but needed to review it again to provide feedback. She had never been a tester and liked portfolios as a measure of success. She stated that testing took a variety of measures to be successful. She highlighted the importance of band participation and lessons were very different from being in band. She shared that she paid for private music lessons for her son and daughter. She did not want to pit one type of schooling with another, she believed both were essential. She thanked the committee.

[5:05:44 PM](#)

KELVIN ODEGARD, SELF, FAIRBANKS (via teleconference), is a homeschooling parent and had been a homeschooled student. He supported the bill that seemed to address the judicial issue and concerns with constitutionality of public education funds going to private schools or religious schools. He liked that the bill primarily relied on DEED to get into the details given the short timeline and that it had a sunset date that would enable more time for any issues to be addressed. He shared that the homeschooling program used by his family had rigorous standards around how things were paid for and ensuring they were returned when finished with them. He appreciated that HB 400 did not get into how programs were run and that it focused on the funding. He did not support the Senate bill that he believed tried to address any issue ever brought up pertaining to schooling. He understood there were numerous issues with brick and mortar and homeschools, but he did not believe a bill should be trying to address everything.

[5:08:33 PM](#)

ELLIE OSTLER, SELF, ANCHOR POINT (via teleconference), shared that supported HB 400, version R, which she believed was superior to SB 266 in every way. She stated that one of the biggest benefits of homeschooling was the ability to create an individualized education for children. She had five children who were homeschooled and paid for private music instruction with their allotment. She stated it would be a financial strain on her family to have a percentage of the allotment for the arts reduced as in SB 266. She remarked that homeschooling was less costly to the state than brick and mortar school models. She noted that the BSA for homeschoolers was reduced twice before going to students. She shared that the IDEA program allowed \$2,700 per child, which included art, PE, and curriculum with oversight from a certified guidance teacher. She elaborated that she had one child with a learning disability who qualified for an individualized education plan (IEP). Her daughter had achieved a higher reading level than they had been told was possible. She stated that many homeschoolers left public schools because they had failed special needs students abysmally. She relayed that rollover allotments were important because some families were purposely setting aside portions of money to pay for opportunities such as trade classes through the Alaska Vocational Technical Center (AVTEC) and college courses. She stated that the people homeschooling their kids were doing so at no cost to the state. She emphasized that children deserved a strong familial and educational foundation, which would build a stronger Alaska. She thanked the committee.

[5:11:47 PM](#)

DAWN COGAN, SELF, FAIRBANKS (via teleconference), shared how homeschooling had benefitted her family. She had enjoyed the freedom of choice to teach her children at home for 18 years. She detailed that her family lived an hour north of Fairbanks and she had opted to homeschool because transportation to and from school was not possible. She relayed that they had faithfully attended school testing annually during that time. She elaborated that when testing became a choice, they had discontinued their participation because the results arrived long after the window to use the status to make informed decisions. She shared information about assessment strategies she had discovered that worked better for her family. She stressed that parents should have the right to opt out of state testing. She relayed that allotment carryover accounts had been a

powerful resource for students pursuing dual enrollment at University of Alaska campuses and pursuing other educational opportunities. She stated that a large amount of the money was kept in state and there was close management by correspondence school programs with policies in place to manage accountable use of the funds. Her daughter used the funds to attend the University of Alaska Fairbanks and graduated high school with over 20 university credits. She shared information about her daughter and son's education and lives. She loved having an individual learning plan and she respected the state's constitution. She hoped lawmakers could reach a decision that honored the state's constitution, while continuing to allow families to utilize state-funded allotments. She stated that SB 266 gave a good option between testing and portfolios; however, it made punitive changes to the feasibility of providing homeschool children an equitable and well-rounded education by limiting allotment carryovers and implementing a 15 percent limit on funds allowed for art, music, and PE vendors. She asked the committee to vote yes on HB 400, version R.

Representative Tomaszewski thanked Ms. Cogan for calling in and for her commitment to the kids in Fairbanks.

[5:15:50 PM](#)

TERRI BEACH, SELF, FAIRBANKS (via teleconference), was a former homeschool parent and remained active in the homeschooling community in Fairbanks. She shared information about her children who had excelled in school. She stated that having an adequate allotment with the freedom to choose quality curriculum that suited their needs made a tremendous difference. She stated that quality curriculum tended to get more expensive at higher grade levels. She had needed support in some areas where she had not been the strongest teacher. She relayed that access to the allotment rollover was very important. She noted that everyone received the rollover but not everyone used it. She shared that when her kids graduated, they had rollover money that was returned to the school district. She was concerned about the financial restrictions the Senate bill put on PE. She explained that her kids had been required to have three semesters of PE, but the funds had been limited. She was concerned about additional oversight in the Senate bill. She supported HB 400, version R.

[5:19:13 PM](#)

BRANDY BRANT, SELF, HOMER (via teleconference), is a homeschool mom of three children currently through the IDEA program. She supported HB 400, version R. She shared that her three children were neurodivergent with disorders including dyslexia, dysgraphia, OCD, and anxiety. The allotment provided her family the freedom to find success in areas that was not necessarily brick and mortar style. She believed HB 400 gave more time to keep progressing in a way that protected those freedoms and respected constitutionality. She had spent 12 years leaning into the system and it had provided support, structure, and accountability. The announcement of the change was unnerving. She supported the timeframe in the bill, which provided more time for nuanced conversations. She stated that the sunset clause allowed the bill to come to an end in a way that allowed things to move forward.

[5:21:48 PM](#)

TRACY MAXWELL, SELF, JUNEAU (via teleconference), is a homeschool parent of two neurodivergent daughters who had struggled in different academic areas. She detailed that an individualized education taught them to use their strengths and manage their differences. She shared information about her daughters. She relayed that their stories were testaments to the success of homeschooling. She supported HB 400, version R because it allowed homeschooling to continue without disruption. The bill also gave time for careful consideration of the issues over the next year. She addressed questions about accountability for homeschoolers. She stressed that testing did not indicate a child's success or whether she was successful as a teacher. She emphasized that her dyslexic daughter would never do well on a test, but it did not mean she was not learning. She believed it was necessary to change the thinking on how to hold schools accountable. She thanked the committee.

[5:23:55 PM](#)

JACINTHA MEZZETI, SELF, EAGLE RIVER (via teleconference), supported HB 400, version R. She stated that the bill canceled itself in July 2025, which she supported. She liked that the bill would prevent rushed and potentially inadequate legislation and any unexpected consequences would be provisional. The bill required the State Board of

Education to address the constitutional question, which she believed was appropriate. She emphasized that the bill preserved many time-tested educational correspondence program practices. She did not support SB 266 because it was not temporary and tried to answer questions larger than the constitutional challenge at hand. She thought the language of SB 266 seemed ignorant that the correspondence program brought educational dollars and educational equity to all Alaskans including Alaskans in Native and rural villages whose students had been underserved prior to the implementation of the programs. She thanked the committee.

[5:27:12 PM](#)

FAELYN SIMPSON, SELF, EAGLE RIVER (via teleconference), is a homeschool parent of three children with special needs. She supported HB 400, version R. She supported that it did not make many changes to the allotment carryover, testing, or changes in spending, and that it would sunset in July 2025. She did not believe there needed to be any rush to get permanent legislation in place. She believed SB 266 had a number of problems. She did not support the no carryover and that 10 percent of the funds could be spent on art, math, and PE. She stated her kids were very active and her family likely used around 50 percent of the funds for art and PE classes. She shared information about the costs for some of the classes, which were very expensive. She listed the costs of some of the classes. She did not support the permanence of the Senate bill. She noted that most homeschool families were one income families. She did not want the allotments to change drastically.

[5:31:07 PM](#)

SHAD SCHOPPERT, SELF, ANCHORAGE (via teleconference), spoke in favor of HB 400, version R. He and his wife had been homeschooling their children for nine years through the Anchorage School District, formerly Family Partnership Charter School. He had been on the advisory committee for Family Partnership. He stated that the bill provided a path for correspondence school kids across the state to continue their programs. The bill allowed parents to continue to define what was best for their children's education and did not attempt to restrict correspondence school families. The bill allowed families to opt in or out of testing and enabled families to reserve funds for more extensive courses. The bill treated correspondence schools the same

as brick and mortar schools with respect to reporting requirements and allowed for freedom of choice within the ILP. The bill did not micromanage how correspondence families spent the small amount of funds they received. He continued to review the benefits of the bill. He believed there were several misconceptions about correspondence programs. He stated that educational materials had to be returned. Families did not merely receive a check to use however they wanted; they had to jump through significant hoops and reimbursement requirements. He stated that some may challenge correspondence families because they used their funds for unique or special things that catered to their children's specific needs. He challenged that if money were no issue, he thought every brick and mortar school would do the same thing. He thought statute should be broad like HB 400, version R. He urged the committee to support the bill.

[5:35:08 PM](#)

ASHLEY BAUMAN, SELF, SOLDOTNA (via teleconference), is a homeschool parent of three children. She was in support of HB 400 that gave a year to figure out how to make the situation work. She shared that she owned a toy store and sold educational items. She had heard a substantial amount from the homeschool community and she found it amazing to hear an outpouring of what homeschooling and the allotment meant to people and what it provided to the children of Alaska. She wanted to ensure homeschooling would be continued through the next year. She found it scary to think that if funds were taken away that homeschool families may not receive the funds again in the future. She shared information about her children. She explained that much of the allotment for one of her kids went to sports and physical activities. She stated that to completely regulate what every child did, did not provide the personalized ability to do what was right for each kid. She emphasized that homeschooling was not an easy endeavor and was likely one of the hardest things she had ever done. She reiterated her support for the bill.

[5:38:22 PM](#)

ANDREA FLYNN, SELF, SOLDOTNA (via teleconference), shared that she had homeschooled in Alaska for three years and had been a homeschooling parent for ten years. She noted that the other states her family had lived in did not have a

correspondence program or allotment. She relayed that having the funds to purchase the tailored curriculum her family needed had been a large benefit. She supported HB 400 that would provide more time to consider what the permanent future bill should entail. She did not believe it was right to punish all homeschooling families for the few people spending the funds on private education. She relayed that her family used the IDEA program, which was strictly regulated. She noted that no funds were spent on religious items. The \$400 families would be allowed to spend on art, music, and gym in the Senate bill was not sufficient for her family. She remarked that students in public school had freedom to take art, music, and PE. She relayed that her daughter was getting to the age of needing to take her driver's exam and was dyslexic and needed tutoring. Her daughter was hoping to take the Jump Start program when she was a junior and her family had been trying to save some of the rollover allotment for the purpose. She reiterated her support for HB 400.

[5:40:37 PM](#)

ANDREA BOESHART, SELF, SOLDOTNA (via teleconference), shared that she is a second generation homeschooler. She supported HB 400, which she believed seemed to best address the issue at hand. She thought there was overreach in the Senate bill. She supported the allotment rollover in the House bill, which had been a great benefit to her family. She shared detail about her daughter's education. The funds had enabled her daughter to take UAA college credits and violin classes. She stated the amount allowed by SB 266 was not sufficient for elective classes. She liked that the House bill repealed itself within a year and did not try to fix what was not broken.

[5:42:49 PM](#)

ALICIA JENSEN, SELF, STERLING (via teleconference), is a homeschool parent with a 5th grader enrolled in the IDEA program. She supported HB 400, version R. She stated that with the sense of urgency it made the most sense for the coming year and it repealed itself in a year. Additionally, the bill would safeguard constitutional spending. The bill would allow the legislature and court time to deal with the repercussions of the ruling. She believed the Senate bill was a broad overreach that was not related to the court ruling and it did not expire. She stated they could not

conflate the court ruling regarding correspondence programs and allotment spending with the public school budget. She shared that homeschool parents were catering to the methodologies that worked for their kids. She noted that AK STAR testing used completely different language than the curriculum she used at home. She stated that DEED needed to focus on fixing the brick and mortar school system and it did not need to be weighed down with holding homeschool families accountable when they already had very good systems in place that did so.

[5:46:32 PM](#)

KIMBERLY WELCH, SELF, WASILLA (via teleconference), shared that she is a homeschool mom of four children. She spoke in support of HB 400, version R, which she believed made the most sense for homeschoolers. She found Senate Bill 266 to be appalling and a slap in the face for any homeschool family. She had several children with learning disabilities who did not do well on tests. She emphasized that the allotment provided in SB 266 for music and gym was too low. She was blessed with a musically gifted child, and she could not imagine taking the opportunity away. She shared information about her children's education. She stated that the Senate bill came across as greedy and money hungry. She supported that HB 400 could be revised and revisited. She hoped the committee would look at the future of Alaskans and the big picture and would opt to pass HB 400 and not the Senate bill.

[5:50:09 PM](#)

AUDREY MADSEN, SELF, WASILLA (via teleconference), is a homeschool parent of three kids and was seeking a degree in education. She agreed that HB 400, version R was the better situation for homeschool families. She supported the expiration date of the bill. She shared that her youngest child had been in a public school special education classes, but unfortunately her family had been faced with letting his knowledge drop or homeschooling him to provide the education he needed. She stated her son had not been able to get the services he needed in public school. She shared information about her son. She shared that her son had grown immensely in the past year she had been homeschooling. She provided information about her other kids. She relayed that homeschoolers could adjust curriculum to a student's level. For example, it was

possible to have one child doing 3rd or 4th grade math and 5th or 6th grade language arts. She stressed the benefits of homeschooling. She relayed that in terms of extracurriculars, the allotment only went so far. She highlighted that the rollover could make a difference of a few extra courses. She discussed parity with brick and mortar schools. She thanked the committee.

[5:53:52 PM](#)

HANNAH MURKIN, SELF, ANCHORAGE (via teleconference), is a homeschool parent. She explained that when a family purchased correspondence curriculum supplies, things that were consumable were not given back to the program. She detailed that families could keep things like textbooks if they planned to use them for another child or they could be returned to the program. She discussed testing and was glad it was not a part of HB 400. She shared that her child had gone to a brick and mortar school in kindergarten, and the testing had stressed her son out so much that he was not really able to participate in standardized testing. She elaborated that her son was in 4th grade and she had him do the math testing at home, but it had been very stressful for him because the test was too long. She shared that he had he done well and had scored above average, but it was too long. She supported HB 400, version R. She thanked the committee.

[5:57:18 PM](#)

Co-Chair Foster CLOSED public testimony. He provided the address for written testimony.

Representative Stapp MOVED to REPORT HB 400 out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note.

Representative Ortiz and Representative Josephson OBJECTED.

Representative Josephson spoke to his objection. He stated there were many sources of concern. He turned to page 2, subsection (d), lines 12 to 13, which indicated that the board would decide what the state constitution meant. He elaborated that the board would contact the attorney general's office and the attorney general's office would say the judge was wrong and the attorney general's office would tell the board what was right. He did not think that

was accurate. He did not think what the AG thought was right was accurate and he did not think the supreme court would deem it to be accurate either. He did not think the subsection worked. He did not know of any objections to the law that had been passed by the legislature prior to 2014. He wanted to make sure it complied with Article 7, Section 1. He stated that his interpretation of the bill was that it required some testing; however, none of the testimony had been in favor of testing. He added that testifiers thought SB 266 required testing, but it had an option for a portfolio. He stated that he and his staff had been working as fast as possible to prepare amendments. He explained that moving the bill during the current meeting did not fit in the example of what the chair mentioned two days earlier. He requested time to consider amendments.

Co-Chair Foster wanted to come back to determine what to do with the bill and possibly hear another piece of legislation.

[6:02:35 PM](#)
RECESSED

[7:25:09 PM](#)
RECONVENED

Co-Chair Foster relayed that the committee had left off with a motion to move HB 400 from committee followed by an objection.

Representative Ortiz requested that Representative Stapp withdraw the motion and for the bill to be set aside in order to move forward with other bills on the agenda out of respect for people's time.

Representative Tomaszewski thought that out of respect for the people present and the time sensitivity related to the lateness in session that any amendments that would have been brought in committee would likely be brought again on the House floor. He thought they should report the bill out if it was the will of the committee.

Representative Galvin thought it was the previous day when Co-Chair Foster had stated there may be some bills where the will of the committee would be to move the bill without any amendments, but there were other bills the committee would allow for process. She had at least one conceptual

amendment. She requested an opportunity for the process with HB 400. She remarked that it was an important topic for many Alaskans.

[7:27:41 PM](#)

Representative Coulombe reminded members that Representative Ruffridge and his staff had been present for many days and nights waiting for their turn to hear their bill. She apologized to others waiting, but the bill sponsor had been waiting for a long time as well.

Representative Stapp stated it was his intention to move the bill from committee. He thought other members had amendments ready. He had no problem withdrawing his motion to move the bill to allow time for amendments. He would then make another motion to move the bill from committee after amendments were completed. He would rather not postpone due to the time sensitivity.

Representative Stapp WITHDREW the motion to move the bill for the purpose of conceptual amendments.

Co-Chair Foster stated the committee would begin with amendments from Representative Josephson as soon as they were distributed.

[7:29:08 PM](#)

AT EASE

[7:31:56 PM](#)

RECONVENED

Representative Josephson MOVED conceptual Amendment 1 (copy on file):

Page 2, lines 12-13:
Delete all material.

Page 2, lines 12-13:
Insert:

"(d) The Department shall write regulations regarding correspondence programs and student allotments consistent with an appellate decision on the Matter of Alexander, et al. v. State of Alaska (on appeal from 3AN-23-04309CI)"

Representative Stapp OBJECTED.

Representative Josephson explained the amendment. It was his understanding that although there was some objection by the administration early on, on June 25th there would be oral arguments on the subjects raised in the matter of Alexander v. State of Alaska. He stated that he had confirmed his understanding with the Alaska Court System. He believed the fact the [Alaska] supreme court was taking the topic up quickly indicated that the court viewed the topic to have such public importance that it intended to rule swiftly. He would rather not have a special session because it would be costly and time consuming. The amendment would delete lines 12 and 13 from the bill. The impact would be that the legislature would not ask the State Board of Education to ask the attorney general to come up with regulations consistent with Article 7, Section 1. He noted it could take a couple of months for the court to write an opinion. He was told that as soon as the 28th or 29th of June, the [state supreme] court may affirm or partially affirm the prior ruling made by Judge [Adolph] Zeman. He asked why the legislature would want the Department of Education and Early Development (DEED) to write regulations based on its interpretation of Article 7, Section 1 when the supreme court was going to give a fresh pronouncement on a topic it had not issued an opinion on since the Sheldon Jackson decision in 1979. He supported asking DEED to write regulation consistent with the future court decision.

[7:35:17 PM](#)

Representative Stapp spoke in opposition to the amendment. He stated there were 22,000 homeschool families that were looking to the legislature. He noted it was per the judge's ruling that the legislature had some sort of statement. He thought the best thing the legislature could do would be to get the process started for the State Board of Education to begin the regulatory framework. He reasoned that in the event there was a subsequent ruling from the supreme court (with a time uncertain), the board would have already begun the process. He elaborated that if the regulatory framework was dependent on a process that the maker of the amendment noted may not be until Labor Day, he did not believe it was fair to homeschool families to wait that long.

Representative Galvin asked Representative Josephson if the amendment would mean that homeschool would stop until the process was done.

Representative Josephson responded that the only thing the amendment would change was lines 12 through 13. He stated his understanding that the stay was currently in effect. He believed Representative Galvin was asking if the amendment would lift the stay. He wondered whether the legislature could overcome a stay on the same topic by writing a law when there was an existing case and the courts assumed jurisdiction. He did not know the answer.

[7:37:15 PM](#)

Representative Hannan asked if the amendment would preclude homeschooling decisions going forward before the regulations were written. She did not see it that way. She detailed that the bill spelled out correspondence provisions and specified that the board would write regulations. She highlighted that the board process of writing regulation would not be done by June or August because there was a process DEED would undergo including public notice regulations. She did not think the current provisions or the amendment would result in a secure set of regulations by Labor Day.

Representative Hannan viewed the bill as giving enough governance to go forward with some limited aspects. She stated that points one through four gave some direction about how to run correspondence. She noted it did not address all of the elements existing under the current correspondence law, but she interpreted the language to mean they could move forward with the four things needed. She thought that as the bill was drafted that having DEED write regulations based on the constitution did not change anything. She noted that if upheld, the court decision would throw it all out. Presumably, the regulations in place were written in line with the constitution. She noted that the court had found them not to be [in line with the constitution], and whether the supreme court would agree was to be determined. She reasoned that if the supreme court agreed with Judge Zeman's decision, it would be easy because "they've already got them if they throw it out." However, if the supreme court gave more guidance and direction, it would narrow what had to be done because HB 400 lay out some general guiding principles for the

correspondence program to go forward. She was in support of the conceptual amendment.

[7:40:10 PM](#)

Representative Ruffridge understood the conceptual amendment offered by Representative Josephson; however, he believed it would essentially throw into question the ability of the State Board of Education and the Department of Law to draft regulations consistent with the state constitution. He was not certain it was a fair assessment. There were currently a number of current regulations that were linked back to AS 300 and AS 310. He elaborated that with statutes being put into question or struck down, there needed to be a statutory or legal framework to tie the regulations to. He thought that the idea that there needed to be a massive regulations project to rewrite new regulations seemed broad. He believed the existing regulations were clear and detailed, but they needed to be tied back to a law that allowed them to exist. He did not think the language of the amendment did that in a clear enough way. He stated the amendment tied it to something that was a bit of a moving target. He opposed the amendment.

Co-Chair Foster asked Representative Josephson to provide wrap up on the amendment.

Representative Josephson stated that one of the problems with the bill was asking DEED to write regulations - which took time to write at a minimum due to the notice period - on a law that was currently being challenged. The only guidance he knew of was the Sheldon Jackson decision from 45 years back. He believed the amendment may help avoid a special session. He stated that the Board of Education had been ordered to write something legally consistent with the most recent decision issued by the court which was Alexander v. State of Alaska. Otherwise, there would be a regulation written short of a review of the decision. He did not know whether the regulation would be changed again to be consistent with the new law. The amendment left open the question of what the ruling would look like. He argued that if the conceptual amendment passed, it should be lawful, and a special session should not be needed.

[7:43:50 PM](#)

Representative Stapp MAINTAINED the OBJECTION to conceptual Amendment 1.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

IN FAVOR: Hannan, Ortiz, Josephson, Galvin

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

Co-Chair Edgmon was absent from the vote.

The MOTION to adopt conceptual Amendment 1 FAILED (4/6).

[7:44:39 PM](#)

Co-Chair Johnson asked for the bill's effective date.

Representative Ruffridge responded that there was not currently an effective date in the bill. He believed it was a subject that needed to be taken up.

[7:45:09 PM](#)

Representative Josephson MOVED conceptual Amendment 2 (copy on file):

Page 2, line 11 following "plan" insert:

"A parent or guardian may not purchase services and materials from a private or religious organization with a student allotment."

Representative Stapp OBJECTED.

Representative Josephson read the amendment language above. He explained that the specific statement was one of the things missing from the bill. He noted the language was not that different from a bill that became law around 2014 sponsored by former Senator Mike Dunleavy. He stated it was a more direct statement of the law as it was best understood. He elaborated that without the sentence in the bill, they were back where they started, with an illegal bill. He explained that the language had been missed when regulations had been written from the 2014 bill. He stated there was no direction to DEED to monitor compliance. He noted there was also another issue about the bill not being

effective for 90 days and there was likely to be a decision before that time.

Representative Stapp adamantly opposed the amendment. He clarified that the state constitution specified that no funding shall be used for the direct benefit of a private or religious educational institution, whereas the amendment specified that a parent or guardian may not purchase services and materials from a private or religious organization with a student allotment. He interpreted the conceptual amendment to mean that a person could not use their allotment for any services purchased from a private or religious organization. He pointed out that most homeschool families used their allotments to purchase books, and services (e.g., gymnastics, individual learning plans), materials (e.g., laptops) from private vendors. He thought the amendment spoke to the crux of the issue. He did not believe the state specified that school districts should be unable to use their BSA funding for services from private organizations. He did not know why the legislature would want to put something in statute that was far more prescriptive than the state's constitution.

[7:48:24 PM](#)

Representative Ortiz MOVED conceptual Amendment 1 to conceptual Amendment 2. The conceptual amendment would take a direct quotation from the constitution that had been cited by Representative Stapp.

Representative Stapp OBJECTED because the language was already in the constitution. He did not think there was any reason to also define it in statute.

Co-Chair Foster asked for verification that Representative Ortiz had made an official motion.

Representative Ortiz agreed. The amendment would substitute the language currently in conceptual Amendment 2 with the constitutional language cited by Representative Stapp.

Representative Ruffridge explained that his intent in drafting the underlying bill (on page 2, lines 12 through 13) was to adopt the language of the constitution as the basis for the drafting of regulations. He thought that directly inserting language from the constitution into the bill was unnecessary.

7:50:57 PM

AT EASE

7:52:07 PM

RECONVENED

Representative Josephson referenced Representative Ruffridge's description of his purpose for subsection (d) of the bill. He stated that the way appeals typically worked was that the greater burden was on the petitioner, which was the State of Alaska in the current case. He detailed that the state was currently losing the case and it wanted to flip the result to say that Judge Zeman's ruling was wrong. He noted that currently the judge was right. He referenced Representative Ruffridge's statement that his intent in subsection (d) was to have DEED issue regulations consistent with the constitution. He pointed out that DEED was part and parcel of the state, which was in the losing position of the lawsuit. He remarked that DEED was independent and could disagree with Attorney General Treg Taylor, but he found it highly unlikely. He asked why the legislature would want DEED to write something when it was in the losing posture in the case.

Representative Ruffridge responded that he wanted to be cautious. He clarified that the bill did not ask DEED to write the regulations. Typically, the regulations would be written by the State Board of Education, which was a little different. He elaborated that the individuals on the board were appointed by the governor and worked as volunteer citizens of the state, typically with some experience in education. He surmised the board members' experience was likely more extensive than many of the members of the legislature. He thought they were best suited to continue to draft regulations. He would send the regulations to the committee that dealt with correspondence programs in the state. He elaborated that the board had written and adopted the regulations for decades and had cleaned them up here and there and made simple changes; however, for the most part, the regulations had functioned relatively unchanged for a while. He did not believe a large regulations project was needed. He believed it would be a simple adjustment in regulation to specify that a person could not use an allotment provided for correspondence study to pay tuition at a private school. He stated that the language was not currently in regulation or statute, which was the problem

highlighted in the court case. There was a need to state that individualized learning plans should exist and should be funded because they were part of the public school system.

Co-Chair Foster asked Representative Ortiz to provide wrap up on conceptual Amendment 1 to conceptual Amendment 2.

Representative Ortiz explained that he offered the amendment in good faith in response to comments from Representative Stapp that he believed the original amendment was too prescriptive. He noted that Representative Stapp had cited the specific part of the [state] constitution. He would also be nervous if the language was too prescriptive or more prescriptive than the constitution. He stated that Representative Stapp had indicated a preference for the language. He stated that including the language in statute would provide more guidance and it would remind everyone dealing with the issue that language needed to comply with the constitution. He saw no harm in that.

[7:56:54 PM](#)

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

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

The MOTION to adopt conceptual Amendment 1 to conceptual Amendment 2 FAILED (5/6).

[7:58:03 PM](#)

Representative Josephson provided wrap up on conceptual Amendment 2. He stated that former Senator Dunleavy's bill passed in 2014 was enrolled as FCCS HB 278 and created AS 14.03.320. He noted that the section did use the words "private or religious organization." He believed the language in the amendment was consistent with judge's decision that was being appealed.

Representative Stapp MAINTAINED the OBJECTION.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

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

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

[7:59:29 PM](#)

Representative Galvin MOVED conceptual Amendment 3 (copy on file):

Increase the BSA by \$680

Representative Stapp OBJECTED.

Representative Galvin explained that she had heard a lot of testimony in the meeting on the importance of stability and maintaining a good sense of what would happen in the future. She believed there was nothing more important than having predictable, adequate, stable funding. She highlighted that the legislature had increased the BSA funding by \$600 in the base budget. She stated that arts, PE, and music should be available to homeschool students and neighborhood school students as well. She understood that many districts had already cut those items. She described the amendment as a "lift all votes amendment."

Representative Stapp did not view the amendment to be in good faith or as germane to the subject. He expressed irritation it had been offered. He MOVED to TABLE conceptual Amendment 3.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion.

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

The MOTION PASSED (6/5). There being NO further OBJECTION, conceptual Amendment 3 was TABLED.

Representative Stapp MOVED to REPORT CSHB 400(FIN) out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note.

Representative Ortiz interjected that he had a conceptual amendment, but he would not offer it.

8:02:08 PM

AT EASE

8:02:31 PM

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Foster noted that Co-Chair Johnson had a conceptual amendment.

Co-Chair Johnson MOVED to ADOPT conceptual Amendment 4 to add an effective date to the bill of July 1, 2024 (on page 2, line 20).

Co-Chair Foster asked for verification the amendment would set an effective date of July 1, 2024.

Co-Chair Johnson agreed.

Co-Chair Foster noted that the language to allow Legislative Legal Services to make technical and conforming changes to the bill could also be included in a motion to move the bill from committee.

There being NO OBJECTION, conceptual Amendment 4 was ADOPTED.

8:03:54 PM

Representative Stapp MOVED to REPORT CSHB 400(FIN) out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note.

Representative Josephson OBJECTED. He relayed that prior to session he had known little about allotments and correspondence courses. He now knew more and understood their value. He stated that currently allotments were suspended, but they would return. He noted that he had not done the suspending. He added that he was in the minority and his power to fix the suspension was restricted. He stated that the decision had been issued by the superior court four weeks back and session was five days from the end. He remarked that the legislature had recently pretty handily rejected a senior member of the board. It was his sense that the board would view the issue outside the law. He believed the board would philosophically follow what the attorney general told them to follow. He stressed that it

was not likely what the supreme court would order in about two months. He was concerned that the legislature would ask the board to write the regulations and the supreme court would determine it was the wrong direction.

Representative Josephson commended Co-Chair Foster for being unflappable and fair. He provided comments about the process. He explained that when he was given an amendment deadline on one piece of legislation it created hope that he would be given an amendment deadline on another piece of legislation because it was the culture. He noted that he had not been afforded that in the current situation, which he found to be disappointing.

Representative Josephson MAINTAINED the OBJECTION.

Co-Chair Edgmon apologized to the committee "for coming in to this a little bit late." He understood the fundamentals, the gravity, and the nature of the issue. He referenced Representative Josephson's point and asked about the downside of taking a little more time to consider the issue. He stated that House Finance Committee was the last committee prior to going to the House floor, which he referred to as the wild West. He considered whether there was more contemplation that should take place over what was in the bill. He understood that Representative Ruffridge knew the issue well and had spent a lot of time on it. He thought there was a bit of an asterisk to the issue because the higher court was poised to take action at some point. He wondered what would happen if the legislature did not get it right and something it put into law did not comport with what the higher court decided. He noted the legislature did not have any way to change that course in the next five days. He felt rushed in the current situation. He remarked that sometimes in the building a person worked off of intuition and he highlighted that the legislature currently did not have all of the facts at hand. He stated that a person could respond that the issue was cut and dry and "this is what we need to do." He questioned whether it was cut and dry. He currently thought he would be a no vote on moving the bill from committee.

Co-Chair Foster called for an at ease. [Note: the meeting never reconvened.]

8:08:36 PM
AT EASE

#

ADJOURNMENT

8:12:58 PM

The meeting was adjourned at 8:12 p.m.