

HOUSE FINANCE COMMITTEE
February 4, 2025
1:34 p.m.

1:34:01 PM

CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair Josephson called the House Finance Committee meeting to order at 1:34 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Neal Foster, Co-Chair
Representative Andy Josephson, Co-Chair
Representative Calvin Schrage, Co-Chair
Representative Jamie Allard
Representative Jeremy Bynum
Representative Alyse Galvin
Representative Sara Hannan
Representative Nellie Unangiq Jimmie
Representative Will Stapp
Representative Frank Tomaszewski

MEMBERS ABSENT

Representative DeLena Johnson

ALSO PRESENT

Lacey Sanders, Director, Office of Management and Budget;
Hannah Lager, Administrative Services Director, Department
of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development.

PRESENT VIA TELECONFERENCE

Dr. Cory Ortiz, Director, Alaska Vocational Technical
Center, Department of Labor and Workforce Development; Dom
Pannone, Administrative Services Director, Department of
Transportation and Public Facilities; Cori Mills, Deputy
Attorney General, Department of Law.

SUMMARY

OVERVIEW: FY 25 GOVERNOR'S SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET

HB 53 APPROP: OPERATING BUDGET; CAP; SUPP

HB 53 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

HB 55 APPROP: MENTAL HEALTH BUDGET

HB 55 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

HB 56 APPROP: SUPPLEMENTAL; FUND CAP

HB 56 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

Co-Chair Josephson reviewed the meeting agenda.

^OVERVIEW: FY 25 GOVERNOR'S SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET

#hb53

#hb55

#hb56

HOUSE BILL NO. 53

"An Act making appropriations for the operating and loan program expenses of state government and for certain programs; capitalizing funds; amending 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. 55

"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."

HOUSE BILL NO. 56

"An Act making supplemental appropriations; making appropriations to capitalize funds; and providing for an effective date."

[1:35:11 PM](#)

LACEY SANDERS, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, introduced herself and the PowerPoint presentation "Overview of the FY2025 Supplemental Budget" dated February 4, 2025 (copy on file). She explained that she would be presenting an overview of the FY 25 supplemental budget requests that had been transmitted on behalf of the governor the previous day. She referenced AS 37.07.0701, which mandated that supplemental requests be submitted to the legislature for consideration by the fifteenth day of session, which in the current session was February 4, 2025. She had provided an accompanying spreadsheet [titled FY2025 Supplemental Bill Summary](copy on file) which members could review in more detail for specific items if there were questions.

Ms. Sanders advanced to slide 2, which provided an updated version of the FY 25 budget. The supplemental budget incorporated the supplemental requests that had been included in the governor's budget, released on December 12, 2024, as well as the requests submitted for consideration as of the February 4 deadline. She indicated that the total amount of supplementals was \$448 million under agency operations, of which \$83.2 million was from general funds. Under statewide operations, the total for supplementals was \$15.1 million, of which \$14.3 million was unrestricted general funds (UGF). The supplemental appropriations under capital totaled \$71.5 million and did not include UGF. The grand total for the supplemental requests was \$543.7 million, with \$97.5 million coming from UGF. The overall deficit of \$171 million for FY 25 was reflected at the bottom of the slide, which was proposed to be drawn from the Constitutional Budget Reserve (CBR).

[1:38:25 PM](#)

Representative Hannan asked for an estimate of how much of the current supplemental request was one-time funding, as opposed to items that would be added to the FY 26 base for the departments as incremental increases.

Ms. Sanders responded that she did not have the specific number in front of her, but that she would note which items corresponded with the governor's FY 26 budget request as she moved through the presentation.

Ms. Sanders proceeded to slide 3, which provided an overview of the operating supplemental budget requests. She noted that the information associated with the December 12 supplemental requests had been included but she would focus on the February 4 supplementals. Under the Department of Corrections (DOC), there was a total request for \$4.1 million for two items that were both also included in the governor's FY 26 budget request. The first item was \$3.9 million for supervisory standby pay, which had been omitted from the previous budget. The second item was \$195,000 to fully fund the Dillingham Correctional Center's (DCC) operations. During the previous legislative session in 2024, the amount restored for DCC was incorrect, and the request would make the total correct amount available.

Ms. Sanders continued that within the Department of Education and Early Development (DEED), there were two items aimed at addressing the increased number of students receiving the Alaska Performance Scholarship (APS) as well as the increased dollar values resulting from the passage of HB 148 [relating to tax credits for the Head Start Program and APS] in the previous legislative session. She relayed that the fiscal notes had estimated the impact of the legislation, but the Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education (ACPE) had refined the numbers based on actual student experience. The request would increase both APS and corresponding Alaska Education Grants (AEG).

[1:41:16 PM](#)

Representative Stapp asked how the increase in scholarships would correlate with the draw on the Higher Education Investment Fund (HIEF). He acknowledged that it was likely a positive development that more students were utilizing the scholarships, but he wanted clarification on how the increase would affect the draw from the fund.

Ms. Sanders responded that there was a limit on the amount that could be drawn from HIEF. The total would remain under the statutory limit and the allowable draw would not be exceeded with the additional funding for the items within DEED.

Representative Galvin understood that the \$4.1 million in funding for DOC was to correct an error from the past and would also cover future needs. She asked how many

supervisory positions were affected by the funding correction.

Ms. Sanders responded that she could follow up with the information.

Representative Galvin remarked that she wanted to know the information because she thought it was a high number that was supplementing current pay. She commented that it would be helpful to know if it was only impacting supervisors.

Ms. Sanders replied that she would follow up.

Representative Hannan noted that the same question about the \$4.1 million in funding had been raised in the DOC finance subcommittee. She explained that the issue was different from overtime pay and involved supervisory standby pay. There was a supervisor on every shift at every institution. The situation was akin to being on call, but it applied to supervisors in the union. She confirmed that the answer was that every shift at every institution had someone in a supervisory role responsible for authorizing actions.

[1:44:19 PM](#)

Ms. Sanders moved down the list on slide 2 to the Department of Health (DOH). There was a request within DOH that dealt with changes to the Medicaid projections, which were finalized on December 15, 2024, after the release of the December 12 budget. The supplemental request aligned the projected costs for DOH with its actual expenses and included \$14.2 million in UGF to match \$214 million in federal receipts.

Co-Chair Josephson asked whether there were additional Medicaid-related supplementals for FY 26.

Ms. Sanders responded that there was not presently a corresponding increase to the change within DOH, but any such changes would be addressed through the amendment process.

Ms. Sanders continued to the Department of Law (DOL) and highlighted a \$4 million request to support ongoing litigation expenses associated with the A Better Childhood lawsuit. She explained that over 1.1 million pages of

discovery had been produced to date, and further discovery and depositions would occur in the coming months leading up to the trial scheduled for May of 2025. She noted that testifiers were available to answer questions from the committee specific to the lawsuit.

Co-Chair Josephson commented that he was concerned about the sensitivity of discussing ongoing litigation in a public setting and asked whether some issues might be more appropriate for an executive session. He acknowledged the difficulty of balancing transparency with protecting sensitive legal information. He wanted to defend the state but noted that the spreadsheet provided by Ms. Sanders also listed a lawsuit involving the Office of Children's Services (OCS), and he was unsure if it was connected to the A Better Childhood lawsuit. He suggested that it was important for the legislature to understand the merits of the case.

Ms. Sanders responded that there were concerns about publicly discussing ongoing litigation. She clarified that the two cases were not connected. The second case involving OCS was completely separate and could be discussed later under special appropriations for judgments and claims. She would defer to Assistant Attorney General Cori Mills for further details.

[1:47:44 PM](#)

Representative Hannan asked if Ms. Sanders had intended to skip over the Department of Labor and Workforce Development (DLWD) section on the slide.

Ms. Sanders responded that she had not planned to cover every single item and that the presentation was intended to be a summary. She explained the committee could go over the provided spreadsheet after the presentation, which contained all the specific items for discussion. She clarified that the \$888,000 request for DLWD was for the expansion of the industrial electrical program. The expansion would double the size and capacity of the program at the Alaska Vocational Technical Education Center (AVTEC) and the funds would be used to advertise the program, set up instructional materials, and prepare the classroom for the instructors to begin teaching.

Representative Hannan understood that the narrative in the spreadsheet mentioned that the program would begin in the fall of 2025. She asked why the entire amount was funded through a supplemental request.

Ms. Sanders responded that the funding would allow for the program to be set up ahead of the start date in the fall. There would also be an increase in the FY 26 budget for the program, which would take effect after July 1 of 2025. She suggested that Director Cory Ortiz provide more context for the funding request.

[1:50:39 PM](#)

DR. CORY ORTIZ, DIRECTOR, ALASKA VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL CENTER, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT (via teleconference), responded that the request involved many components, such as programmable logic controllers and physical lab equipment. The bulk of the \$888,000 request was a one-time cost to purchase and receive the necessary equipment for the program. He explained that it took time to procure the equipment and set it up properly in the classroom. The funds would be used to ensure the program was ready for its planned fall 2025 launch. The equipment was essential for the curriculum and setting it up in a meaningful way for the lab space was time-consuming. He reiterated that the funds would ensure that everything was in place for the fall and for the second course offering as planned.

Representative Hannan asked for clarification whether the \$888,000 allocation was a capital expenditure for materials and equipment and whether it would be an ongoing cost beyond FY 26. She wanted to confirm that the equipment would be in place for the fall of 2025 and that the supplemental funding would expand the program's capacity.

Mr. Ortiz confirmed that the \$888,000 primarily covered capital expenditures for purchasing equipment and materials. He clarified that the expense was not ongoing and the equipment would be in place for the fall of 2025. There were additional costs related to hiring an instructor. He offered to follow up with a detailed breakdown of the costs.

Representative Galvin asked about the anticipated number of students in the expanded program.

Mr. Ortiz replied that the current program could serve about 15 students per year and the supplemental funding would allow the program to accommodate approximately 30 students.

[1:53:52 PM](#)

Ms. Sanders continued to the University of Alaska (UA). She explained that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) had worked with the university to clarify how non-federal grants and receipts were reflected in the budget. The university had historically grouped non-federal grants under the designated general fund (DGF), but the grouping had been revised for more accurate reporting. The university would also see an increase in funding authorization to reflect the actual non-federal awards that were expected.

Ms. Sanders continued to the changes under the Debt Service category within the Department of Revenue (DOR). She relayed that DOR had refunded several old debt projects which would result in a lower interest rate and ongoing savings for the state moving forward. The next item was the special appropriations for judgments, claims, and settlements, totaling \$2.8 million. If there were additional items, the items would be brought forward for legislative consideration. There was a \$3 million appropriation under fund capitalizations, which was a re-appropriation from an unused capital project for earthquake relief costs and would be deposited into the Disaster Relief Fund (DRF). The Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT) no longer anticipated using the funds for the original earthquake-related expenses and the money would instead help address the low balance in DRF.

Co-Chair Josephson asked if the budget total would change if the funding was transferred into DRF.

Ms. Sanders responded in the negative. She explained that the \$3 million reappropriation for DRF was part of an effort to increase the fund balance, which had been low. The money originally came from an old project related to federally ineligible disaster relief costs. She explained that the reappropriation was necessary because the project had been categorized in a way that allowed the unused money

to be transferred without duplicating spending, as it had already been accounted for in previous budgets.

[1:57:51 PM](#)

Representative Stapp asked for more details on the source of the \$3 million reappropriation. The budget indicated that source was related to federally ineligible costs, which implied that it was money that the state tried to spend on items that the federal government deemed ineligible. He wondered how the funds would show up in the budget's fund codes.

Ms. Sanders explained that the original source of the \$3 million was UGF and it was reappropriated to avoid duplicating spending. She explained that the Legislative Finance Division (LFD) and OMB had a fund code that was used to track reappropriations. The funding had been in the system for some time, and it was reappropriated to another category to avoid duplicating spending.

Representative Stapp understood that the appropriation began in FY 20. He asked how an individual could ascertain that the \$3 million had been in existence for the past four budget cycles.

Ms. Sanders replied that OMB tracked the funds by publishing a capital appropriation status report every year. The report was publicly available and listed all open capital projects and showed unobligated funds that had not been set up yet.

Representative Stapp asked for confirmation that if he were to pull up the report on his computer, the funds would be listed as unobligated.

Ms. Sanders responded in the affirmative.

[2:00:18 PM](#)

Ms. Sanders continued on slide 4. She highlighted a funding request under Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development (DCCED) for \$65 million for the Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (AOGCC), which included a substantial grant application to the U.S. Department of Interior. The grant would help plug orphaned wells and mitigate future risks and was expected to bring in around

\$40 million. She added that AOGCC also expected a formula grant to support similar efforts that would total around \$25 million. Within DOT, there was a request for \$6.5 million for the Alaska Marine Highway System (AMHS), which would go toward annual maintenance and repairs for four vessels. Some of the repair work included steel repairs, welding repairs, and engine overhauls. The reappropriation of \$3 million from DOT to DRF was also illustrated on the slide.

[2:02:34 PM](#)

Ms. Sanders directed attention to the FY2025 Supplemental Bill Summary spreadsheet for further discussion on the items. She noted that she had already covered lines 3 and 4 related to DOC and 5 and 6 related to APS, but she was open to addressing any other questions regarding the previously covered items. She invited members to review the spreadsheet and ask any questions about page 1 before moving on to the next section.

Ms. Sanders continued to page 2 of the spreadsheet. She indicated that the items under Medicaid services included an increase in projections on line 10, and the expansion of the industrial electrical program under DLWD on line 11. She highlighted line 19 regarding the university's budget adjustments to reflect the accurate amount needed for non-federal grants and receipts, which had been discussed previously.

Representative Hannan asked if the northern region rural airport maintenance contract increase on line 18 was both a supplemental request and part of the FY 26 base budget. She what "other amount" referenced.

Ms. Sanders responded that both lines 16 and 18 were related to airport maintenance contractor increases and were funded through airport receipts generated by the airport industry. The receipts would cover the costs associated with the contractual agreements for maintenance services.

Representative Hannan asked how the state was capturing all commercial users of the rural airports, particularly private pilots. She asked whether private pilots were charged for using the airports or if the fees were only collected from commercial operators with regular contracts.

Ms. Sanders responded that she would defer the question to DOT.

2:06:28 PM

DOM PANNONE, ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC FACILITIES (via teleconference), confirmed that the state often contracted with local individuals to maintain small rural airports. The funding for the maintenance increases came from rural airport leasing receipts, and the state used the available funds across its 235 airports. The system allowed the state to redistribute resources between airports as needed to cover maintenance costs. He explained that rural airport leasing receipts came primarily from leasing space at the airport to private citizens or companies, allowing private citizens to keep their planes on the property. Additionally, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) required the spaces to be leased at market rates and the leasing receipts contributed to the funding of the rural airport system. He clarified that the funding would be used as part of a specific system for the rural airports, which the state managed as a whole.

Ms. Sanders moved to page 3 of the spreadsheet and explained that all of the items through page 5 pertained to the university system. She noted that the same issue regarding non-federal grants and receipts was spread across the entire university system.

Representative Galvin asked for more information about line 27 on page 4. She noted that there were discrepancies in the totals. She thought that the amounts listed for the research vessel, utility recharge operations, new accounting, and recharge activities added up to \$60 million, not \$65 million. She asked how the additional \$5 million was allocated.

Ms. Sanders responded that the \$5 million difference represented a buffer to ensure there was sufficient receipt authority to cover any additional items that might not have been captured.

Representative Galvin understood that the buffer provided flexibility.

Ms. Sanders responded in the affirmative.

[2:09:34 PM](#)

Ms. Sanders moved to page 5. She had already addressed line 37 and 38, which were related to AOGCC and the orphan wells. She added that there were two IT systems for the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) and the Alaska Industrial Development Export Authority (AIDEA) on line 34. Similarly, there was a request for a new IT system for AOGCC on line 36. The systems were part of the accounting software upgrades for the entities. She also highlighted line 41, which was related to AMHS's vessel overhaul.

Representative Hannan noted that there were no dollar values listed in any of the categories on line 30. She wondered if something was missing.

Ms. Sanders replied that line 30 referred to the Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery (CSLR) relief funds allocated to the state. She clarified that \$10 million had been allocated to the court system, but the funding had mistakenly been classified as UGF when OMB and LFD categorized the funding. The correction was to change the classification back to the appropriate UGF fund code for tracking purposes. The line showed zero dollars in the spreadsheet because it was a technical correction.

Representative Stapp asked whether the AIDEA accounting system upgrade would come with a feature to prevent bad investments.

Ms. Sanders responded that decisions regarding investments made by the boards were beyond her expertise.

Representative Galvin asked about line 36 regarding the anticipated software purchase. She understood that there had already been numerous software purchases in recent years. She requested more information on the reason for the purchase.

Ms. Sanders asked Director Hannah Lager to provide further details.

[2:12:59 PM](#)

HANNAH LAGER, ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, responded that there was an opportunity for AOGCC to leverage third-party funds from the Groundwater Protection Council to replace an outdated system. The upgrade would move the system to the cloud and offer electronic filing opportunities. However, AOGCC needed to show it could participate in the system to access these funds. She relayed that AOGCC could leverage \$1.7 million in third-party funds, but it also needed to invest state funds.

Representative Galvin understood that the \$1.7 million in other funds combined with the \$4.277 million in state funds would total around \$6 million. She asked if her understanding was correct.

Ms. Lager responded in the affirmative. The third-party funding did not need to be reflected because the funding would be spent on behalf of the state. The state fund portion would be collected over multiple years by AOGCC and the funds would cover the regulatory costs associated with AOGCC's activities to minimize the impact on the industry.

Representative Galvin asked if the new equipment would require additional IT personnel and whether there would be further costs for maintenance and updates.

Ms. Lager responded that additional IT staff was not anticipated to be necessary. She noted that AOGCC already had IT staff in place and significant efforts had been made to ensure the AOGCC had high-speed internet and was moving towards cloud-based activities. She clarified that the upgrade would complement ongoing efforts.

Co-chair Schrage asked how restrictive the DGF funds were. He wondered if the funds would lapse into the general fund if not used for the project.

Ms. Lager replied that the funds were fairly restrictive and were part of AOGCC's regulatory cost charge, which AOGCC collected through statute to cover operations. If the funds were not spent, they would roll forward into the next year, but could only be used for AOGCC's operations.

[2:15:22 PM](#)

Ms. Sanders moved on to page 6 of the spreadsheet. She explained that lines 47, 48, and 49 were related to COVID-19 funding and would extend the lapse dates for appropriations made to the state. The extension would allow the funding to be used in accordance with the expanded allowances of federal rules. She continued that line 50 was \$4 million allocated for ongoing litigation brought by A Better Childhood.

Representative Galvin asked whether there had been any analysis on the return on investment (ROI) for the funds being spent on legal services to defend the state in the lawsuit.

Ms. Sanders deferred the question to Assistant Attorney General Cori Mills to provide more context on the case.

[2:17:00 PM](#)

CORI MILLS, DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF LAW, (via teleconference), suggested that she could provide a brief synopsis of the publicly available information regarding the lawsuit. She would also address the question about the ROI on legal expenses. She relayed that Alaska was not the only state facing such a lawsuit and she estimated that around half of the states had been involved in similar cases. She shared that the cases were extremely costly, and the state was required to produce over a million documents in discovery and participate in numerous depositions. In her experience, such litigation was rare and particularly expensive due to its nature as a systemic case, as opposed to standard court cases.

Ms. Mills described the case as a structural reform case as the plaintiffs sought a complete overhaul of Alaska's child welfare system through the court system. The plaintiffs aimed to have a court dictate what actions the legislature and governor would need to take to reform the system, which made the case highly complex. There was a similar lawsuit in Oregon where the state spent \$18 million on attorneys before settling the case at the brink of trial. The plaintiffs were awarded \$10 million in attorney fees.

Ms. Mills noted that the state was on an aggressive timetable with trials scheduled for May of 2025, and DOL was working hard to keep the process on track. She emphasized that the state's goal was to represent Alaska's

interests and maintain legislative authority over the child welfare system. She addressed Representative Galvin's question about ROI for legal services and explained that DOL generated significant revenue for the state particularly through the collection of taxes and royalties, as well as consumer protection efforts, which often brought in hundreds of millions of dollars. She pointed out that the department handled approximately 5,000 cases annually, with a mix of wins, settlements, and losses. Overall, the department brought in more money to the state than it cost the state to operate.

Co-Chair Josephson asked if there might be an opportunity to recoup some of the legal fees.

Ms. Mills responded that the department was evaluating the possibility. She explained that in general, Civil Rule 82 allowed for the recovery of legal fees in certain cases. However, there were specific rules regarding what the state could collect in such cases.

Co-Chair Josephson asked how the legislature could learn more about the merits or demerits of the case.

Ms. Mills responded that she would be happy to meet individually with legislators or provide briefings on the case in an executive session. She indicated that DOL was planning to set up meetings with the legislature to provide more detailed information about the case.

[2:22:24 PM](#)

Representative Hannan asked if additional supplemental funds might be needed for the case. She had read a narrative for the case that referenced the need for "interlocutory relief from the appellate court," which might require a supplemental request for funding in FY 25, even after the decision in May of 2025. She asked if there could be another supplemental next year for the case, depending on the court's decision.

Ms. Sanders responded that the item had been proposed in the budget as a multi-year allocation covering 2025 through 2027. She clarified that the amount requested for 2025 was not expected to exceed \$4 million, but the funding request was designed to provide flexibility in the situation that there were delays or issues extending past May of 2025. She

added that DOL would not know if more money would be needed until after the trial in May, but the flexibility was built into the current request.

Representative Galvin noted that line 51 was related to another lawsuit in which the state was involved. She highlighted that the request was for \$2.7 million and asked for more information about the lawsuit. She asked if this case was also a systemic, expensive lawsuit similar to A Better Childhood case.

Co-Chair Josephson noted that line 51 referred to the Brett Lane lawsuit. He asked if the two cases were related.

Ms. Mills responded that the Brett Lane case was an unrelated matter and a complicated case. She explained that the lawsuit stemmed from the resignation of a state employee from OCS in 2017 who later sued for wrongful discharge and retaliatory discharge. The employee had been assaulted by a client of OCS, which led to the resignation and subsequent lawsuit. The case went through a jury trial in 2020 and the jury awarded the employee a sum, but the decision was appealed to the Alaska Supreme Court. The court found that the jury instructions were incorrect and that the amount awarded might have been inappropriate, as it could have been double-counting workers' compensation benefits. The case was remanded to the trial court for a new trial on damages. The original court judgment was for \$2.6 million, but it did not account for workers' compensation benefits. A global settlement was reached that settled both the workers' compensation and the trial claims for \$1.8 million, and the remaining amount was to cover interest accrued over time. She emphasized that it was a significant case, but it was different from the A Better Childhood case in terms of its nature and complexity.

[2:27:57 PM](#)

Ms. Sanders moved to page 7 and noted that Ms. Mills already addressed line 51. She explained that lines 52 through 57 referred to the refunding process for state debt. She pointed out that debts from 2010, 2015, and 2016 had been refinanced at a lower rate, resulting in savings for the state. The details showed decreases in the amounts for the refunded debts, with new debt listed under lines 56 and 57. She thought DOR had made significant efforts to save money for the state through the process.

Ms. Sanders continued to page 8 and explained that line 58 was the corresponding fund capitalization to the debt refunding on line 57. She noted that there was a corresponding decrement on line 62. She relayed that line 61 referenced an addition to the budget that ensured that the capital income fund balance would not be swept into the CBR and had been appropriated for deferred maintenance needs. Similar language had been carried forward into the current year's supplemental budget.

Co-Chair Josephson understood the numbers seemed large, but UGF was significantly lower.

Ms. Sanders responded in the affirmative.

HB 53 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

HB 55 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

HB 56 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

[2:30:39 PM](#)

Co-Chair Josephson reviewed the agenda for the following day's meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

[2:31:02 PM](#)

The meeting was adjourned at 2:31 p.m.