

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

March 3, 2025

9:00 a.m.

9:00:57 AM

CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair Hoffman called the Senate Finance Committee meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Senator Lyman Hoffman, Co-Chair  
Senator Bert Stedman, Co-Chair  
Senator Mike Cronk  
Senator James Kaufman  
Senator Jesse Kiehl  
Senator Kelly Merrick

MEMBERS ABSENT

Senator Donny Olson, Co-Chair

ALSO PRESENT

John Boyle, Commissioner, Department of Natural Resources;  
Brent Goodrum, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Natural Resources;  
Liz Harpold, Staff, Senator Donny Olson; Ted Helvoight, President, Evergreen Economics.

PRESENT VIA TELECONFERENCE

Dylan Blankenship, Self, Point Mackenzie; Bernie Karl, Farmer, Chena Hot Springs; Scott Mugrage, President, Alaska Farm Bureau, Delta Junction; Rachel Lord, Alaska Food Policy Council, Homer; Amy Seitz, Alaska Farm Bureau, Soldotna; Marshall Trent, Self, Wasilla.

SUMMARY

SSCR 1 DISAPPROVE EO 136

SSCR 1 was REPORTED out of committee with one previously published zero fiscal note: FN 1(SRES).

EO 136 ESTABLISH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

EO 136 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

PRESENTATION: FY 45 MEDICAID ENROLLMENT and SPENDING IN ALASKA REPORT (MESA) - DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Co-Chair Hoffman discussed the agenda.

#eo136

EXECUTIVE ORDER 136 - ESTABLISH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

[9:02:10 AM](#)

JOHN BOYLE, COMMISSIONER, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, introduced himself. He relayed that he would discuss EO 136 and its rationale. He explained that the executive order would splice the existing Division of Agriculture from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). The division was led by Director Bryan Scoresby, with a team of roughly 37 people, nearly all of whom were based out of Palmer. The division would form the nucleus of what would be the new Department of Agriculture. A commissioner position and other items would be added for functionality. He explained that the division's current budget would be transferred to the department, on top of which there would be some incremental costs to get set up.

Commissioner Boyle addressed the question of why the change was proposed. He described that when Governor Dunleavy came into office, there was a period of time when the new administration was coming to terms with the size and scope of the agencies. The period transitioned into the beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic. He conveyed that the Covid-19 pandemic had underscored the importance of food security for the state. He mentioned phone calls with the governors of Washington and Oregon to discuss potential shut down of ports. He mentioned discussion of sealed Canadian borders with no opportunity for trucking. He described that as the governor had contemplated the consequences of a possible supply chain disruption, he had understood the importance of making investments in food security.

Commissioner Boyle recounted that the governor had considered the best approach and had created an Office of Food Security, which was tasked with assessing the state's

food systems. He noted that when the governor had interviewed him as commissioner, he had communicated the intent to take agriculture out of DNR to give it a more prominent voice in the cabinet. The change would be an important step to ensure the state maintained its food security and increase agricultural opportunities as a top priority.

[9:06:44 AM](#)

Commissioner Boyle continued to address the genesis of the executive order. He thought that agriculture was an issue that did not rise to the table. He thought the discussion was timely. He mentioned meeting with members in both bodies and being struck by hearing the different foci and priorities. He mentioned education as a large piece of work for the current session. He thought the committee was well aware that there was a fiscally constrained environment and thought there was a tendency to focus on the most pertinent issues while setting topics like agriculture aside. He thought the topics of food security and increasing economic opportunities in the state were worthy of attention and consideration. He pondered what could be done to grow the state's economic condition, create new jobs, make more productive use of the state's land and water, and enhance food security. He encouraged members to keep an open mind.

Commissioner Boyle discussed opportunities for agriculture. He characterized the state as "relatively food insecure." He cited that when Alaska was a territory, it produced almost 50 percent of the amount of food consumed. The self-reliance had decreased, and he estimated that around 5 percent of the state's dietary needs were provided by local sources. He thought there was a passionate group of farmers and mariculturists that were utilizing the land, sea, and technology to grow food and sundries. He thought the products were very good. He mentioned locally produced carrots in Palmer. He mentioned milk produced by Alaska Range Dairy. He mentioned the Juneau business Juneau Greens that produced greens and had a superior product.

[9:11:02 AM](#)

Commissioner Boyle thought people were committed to the cause of agriculture. He thought with strategic vision from the state, there was an opportunity to advance the endeavor. He mentioned working with federal partners,

universities, the Farm Bureau, and local soil and water conservation districts. He mused that there were macro-factors that made the state uniquely positioned to capitalize on the opportunities with agriculture. He mentioned a lengthened growing season and described warm temperatures in Anchorage and more frost-free days. He thought growing seasons were lengthening across the state. He considered that adding four days a week onto either end of the growing season could make a considerable difference in what was feasible to be grown. He mentioned a farmer in Nenana that was growing sweet corn, which he considered to be a large change.

Commissioner Boyle mentioned the state's large land base, compared to other states with agricultural land being repurposed. He cited that Alaska was the only state in the country that had the opportunity to create additional agricultural land.

[9:14:03 AM](#)

Commissioner Boyle mentioned agri-tourism and exports. He mentioned peony farms in the state. He reiterated that the state had incredible opportunities and competitive advantages in certain areas. He relayed that the department had worked with the governor's office to create a proposal that was fiscally responsible that utilized as many existing resources as possible. He believed that by taking advantage of the opportunity while there was a supportive governor and commissioner, the state would see great things happening in the state's agricultural sector in the future.

Co-Chair Hoffman relayed that he represented an area in Western Alaska that was close to the size of the state of Washington, which had about 30,000 residents. He described that the district was roadless, with communities that may not have plane service for a week at a time. He mentioned Adak. He thought if there was any district in the state that was aware of food security, his district was a good example. He thought the cost of living was a higher priority for his constituents. He pondered spending 60 percent of a person's income on heating. He agreed that food security was an issue. He mentioned other issues such as education. He emphasized that a continued balanced budget was the issue at hand. He thought the public and members realized that the state was in a situation of needing to address the budget.

[9:18:41 AM](#)

BRENT GOODRUM, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, discussed a presentation entitled "Executive Order 136 - Establishing the Department of Agriculture" (copy on file).

Mr. Goodrum looked at slide 2, "Alaska Agriculture: Status Report":

- Robust Alaska agriculture is a long-held vision
- Hardy Alaskans are farming
  - 2022 national census: 1,173 Alaska farms and ranches produced about \$39.7 million in crop value and \$51.2 million in animal production
- So much more potential - with dedicated, focused, expert support
- Why grow agriculture?
  - Greater food security and independence for Alaskans
  - Further develop an important economic sector (jobs, value chain benefits)

Mr. Goodrum commented that the governor's overarching goals for the executive order were to continue to grow the state's agricultural base, improve the state's food security, and further develop the state's agricultural economic sector. He pointed out that agriculture was featured on the state seal. He recounted that the territorial government had established a Department of Agriculture in 1945, before being wrapped into DNR around the time of statehood. He referenced tenuous supply lines and thought the state's economy needed to be diversified.

[9:21:05 AM](#)

Mr. Goodrum spoke to slide 3, "Executive Order 136":

- Establishes the Alaska Department of Agriculture
- Transitions in full the Division of Agriculture from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to the new department
  - Statutory responsibilities, functions, do not change
- Provides transitional measures for seamless reorganization

- Effective July 1, 2025

Mr. Goodrum relayed that no new programs or measures would be added to the new proposed department.

Mr. Goodrum referenced slide 4, "Vision":

- Establishes the Alaska Department of Agriculture
- Transitions in full the Division of Agriculture from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to the new department
  - Statutory responsibilities, functions, do not change
- Provides transitional measures for seamless reorganization
- Effective July 1, 2025

Mr. Goodrum turned to slide 5, "Improved results for Alaskans":

- Governor's overarching goal: increase focus on agriculture and food security with a dedicated department and leadership
- Focus will help develop a robust, durable state agricultural policy, including a strategic plan with an implementation roadmap
- Continuation of the Governor's budget and legislative policy actions following the COVID-19 pandemic to enhance food security in Alaska
- Aligns with top recommendations of task forces and stakeholders
- New department is first step to provide solid foundation for future growth

Mr. Goodrum mentioned the governor's 2002 Food Security and Independence Task Force; and the legislature's Alaska Food Strategy Task Force [created by HB 298 in 2022].

Mr. Goodrum mentioned the opportunity for more consistent and proactive interaction with federal partners and the state's Congressional delegation, which he thought would lead to better resources for the state. He noted that the U.S. Department of Agriculture was a major contributor to the agricultural sector. He thought many in the agricultural sector had wanted a seat at the table. He contended that the new Department of Agriculture would afford greater legislative focus and attention on the

department's resources and metrics, as well as its mission and progress.

[9:24:56 AM](#)

Mr. Goodrum considered slide 6, "Today's Department of Natural Resources":

- 1,054 employees (767 PFT, 215 PPT, 72 NP) across seven divisions, two offices
- Led by commissioner supported by two deputies
- Statewide offices, programs and sites
- FY2025 Management Plan budget (all funds): \$173,399.3
- DNR returns \$21 to the state treasury for every UGF dollar appropriated

Mr. Goodrum displayed slide 7, "Today's Division of Agriculture":

- Division director
- Programs separated into Agriculture Development and Plant Materials Center sections
- Employees: 37 total (32 PFT and 5 PPT)
- FY2025 Management Plan: \$7,176.2 all funds
- Headquarters in Palmer

Mr. Goodrum noted that the Division of Agriculture's Director was Bryan Scoresby. He cited that agriculture's returns would not necessarily come to the state's treasury; but would diversify the state's economy, bring more healthy food, and enhance food security.

Mr. Goodrum highlighted slide 8, "Today's Division of Agriculture":

- Inspections, certifications
- Farm, production loans through Agricultural Revolving Loan Fund
- Alaska Grown and other promotion (state, national, international)
- Agricultural land sales / leases support
- Administers federal grants to Alaskans
- Future Farmers of America
- Seed storage and production, varietal trials
- Seed cleaning services rendered
- Revegetation and erosion control consulting

- Industrial hemp regulation
- Invasive plant, pest management

Mr. Goodrum highlighted that the division annually inspected about \$100 million in agricultural products. The Board of Agriculture and Conservation issued loans and had about a \$21.5 million equity with greater than 60 loans in play. The division administered about \$10 million in grants. There were about 450 students participating in Future Farmers of America.

Mr. Goodrum looked at slide 9, "Tomorrow's Department of Agriculture":

- Responsible but simple leadership, organizational structure
- Primed for build-out over time with increased programming, responsibilities
- Employees: 50 total (45 permanent full-time and five permanent part-time)
- FY2026 increment: \$2,734.4 unrestricted general fund
- Headquarters in Palmer or Anchorage

Mr. Goodrum spoke to the flow chart on slide 9. He considered that with added responsibilities over time, the structure could adapt to accommodate.

[9:29:07 AM](#)

Mr. Goodrum addressed slide 10, "Department Structure," which showed a table that depicted the new department as presented to the House and Senate Resource Committees and supported by a request of \$2.7 million in Unrestricted General Funds (UGF) in the governor's amended budget submitted to the legislature two weeks previously. He noted that based on many conversations with legislators and in respect to the state's fiscal situation, the administration had revisited all options to resource the new proposed department and would be submitting an amendment to the \$2.7 million request. The amendment would reflect what was developed as a "cost neutral" department.

Mr. Goodrum continued that instead of creating 13 new positions, the amendment proposed to reclassify three positions within the current division and transfer two positions and funding from within DNR. Additionally, the

new department would absorb any costs related to the reclassifications.

Co-Chair Hoffman asked if there was a time frame for submission of the amendment.

Mr. Goodrum relayed that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) was working on the amendment and it would be forthcoming. He relayed that the administration was very mindful of the legislature's timeline.

Mr. Goodrum advanced to slide 11, "Reclassifications," and noted that the specific reclassifications listed on the slide would also not occur.

Mr. Goodrum looked at slide 12, "Costs Comparison," which showed a table with a cost comparison of the Division of Agriculture's current FY 25 management plan with the FY 26 governor's budget. He reiterated that there would be no additional UGF request or 13 new positions to support the executive order, which was a significant change from what was presented in the resources committees. The slide also showed was also a FY 26 request of \$2.2 million in federal receipt authority for microgrants for food security. He noted that there would be two full-time positions transferred from DNR.

Mr. Goodrum showed slide 13, "Timeline," which showed a graphical flow chart associated with the executive order. On January 1, 2025, the EO was introduced. The legislature had 60 days to disapprove the order, and if not disapproved by March 22, the implementation of the EO would begin and on July 1, 2025, a Department of Agriculture would be established.

Mr. Goodrum referenced slide 14, "Transition work includes," which showed a list of activities associated with transition planning. He noted that the list was not exhaustive.

Mr. Goodrum offered to provide a Sectional Analysis.

Co-Chair Hoffman answered "no."

9:33:03 AM  
AT EASE

9:33:56 AM  
RECONVENED

Co-Chair Hoffman asked if the members had any questions for the commissioner.

Senator Cronk noted that he had not seen anything that pertained to forestry. He asked Commissioner Boyle to comment.

Commissioner Boyle relayed that it was not contemplated that the Division of Forestry and Fire Protection would move over to the proposed department. He reasoned that the state continued to focus on building out its forestry division and ensuring it was responsible to the needs of the industry. He mentioned that wildland firefighting management, forestry decisions, and other land management decisions associated with forestry would remain in DNR and be well-attended.

9:35:34 AM

Senator Kiehl asked the commissioner to address how aquatic farming would be rolled into the new department. He relayed that he had not noticed a mention of mariculture.

Commissioner Boyle conveyed that mariculture was regulated by myriad agencies, and DNR was involved in leasing of state tidelands or near-shore areas. He noted that Department of Environmental Conservation played a role, as did the Department of Fish and Game. The current structure of the proposed department would not include the functions. He noted that it had been repeatedly discussed in the food task forces that mariculture was important. He thought the intent was to get the framework built for the new department before considering other functions that existed across different departments. He mentioned the state veterinarian as an example.

Commissioner Boyle continued that there may be functions of other departments that could be spliced into the new department, if there was consensus that centralizing some of the functions made sense. He mentioned herbicides, herd health, and mariculture. He thought it was contemplated that the new commissioner would have the opportunity to strategically look at the work and consider what functionality could be usefully transferred to the new

department. He summarized that mariculture would stay in DNR, but he could envision it moving to the new department at some point in the future.

9:39:01 AM

Senator Kiehl appreciated hearing the vision for the executive order. He thought it sounded like the plan was still forming. He asked the commissioner to discuss the anticipated spending for the mechanical parts of potentially separating into two departments. He noted that the Department of Family and Community Services was still several years from finishing its split. He noted that there had been up front costs and currently there were full-time positions that continued to work on splitting the departments.

Commissioner Boyle believed that the costs would be extremely minimal. The plan was to completely splice out the Division of Agriculture. He noted that the division was currently physically housed in two locations in Palmer. He relayed that there would not be costs associated with moving people or setting up new offices. He generalized that there would be no costs associated with a lot of the logistical challenges of setting up a new department. The equipment and existing internet technology (IT) would stay the same. Some of the new positions that were contemplated would involve cost. He considered that the administration would be shifting PCNs around to make the change as budget neutral as possible. He thought there would be a period of transition, assuming that the legislature did not disapprove the EO. He did not see the change as something that would continue indefinitely.

Commissioner Boyle pondered that once a new commissioner was hired, the individual would need time and space to take a strategic hard look at what the state was doing with agriculture to come up with a fulsome plan to fit in with the state budget and be able to articulate a plan to the legislature.

9:43:27 AM

Senator Kiehl appreciated Commissioner Boyle's response. He thought that along with many of his colleagues, he thought the state needed to grow and produce more of its own food. He did not know that the state had a plan yet and thought

the difficulty of an executive order versus a bill was that it required action rather than having time for planning.

Co-Chair Stedman followed up to Senator Kiehl's comments and asked why the proposed change was not submitted as a bill to go through the normal process when the state was struggling with a multi-million-dollar deficit. He asked how to rectify the situation with a balanced budget in the given time frame.

Commissioner Boyle noted that the Alaska Constitution empowered the governor to make such changes in the structure of the administration through executive orders. He appreciated that while the legislature would prefer to have a bill, and that bills coincided with the process of formulating budgets and ultimately receiving consensus. He thought the governor wanted to ensure the legislature understood the importance of the proposal, rather than having it bandied about or put on a backburner as the legislature took up other considerations. He reflected that it was the waning two years of the administration and the governor wanted to have the discussion now to potentially start to effectuate the new department as early as the end of the month.

[9:46:28 AM](#)

Co-Chair Hoffman reminded the commissioner and the public that the constitution also required the legislature to pass a balanced budget. He thought a piece of legislation would have been a better way to proceed and reflected upon questions that Senator Kiehl had posed. He thought governors had tremendous power, more so than in other states, and for the legislature to ignore the power and his priorities would be a mistake.

Commissioner Boyle thanked the committee and expressed appreciation for the questions. He knew that the questions came from a position of thoughtfulness. He referenced Deputy Commissioner Goodrum's comment regarding the administration hearing the legislature's concern with the budget. He thought when OMB was done with its budget review, the administration would not be looking for significant funds to start the new proposed department. He mentioned the inevitable expansion of agencies' budgets, thought that having a commissioner to be accountable to the legislature was an important element to ensure that the

state's agricultural policies were well vetted and its financial resources were well stewarded.

[9:50:49 AM](#)

Commissioner Boyle reflected on Co-Chair Hoffman's comment regarding the cost of energy as related to the sustainability of Alaska's communities. He referenced living in rural Alaska and spending considerable funds on heating and produce. He agreed that for agriculture to succeed in the state, energy costs would need to be addressed. He expressed optimism and believed there was an opportunity to make progress on Alaska's Liquid Natural Gas (AK LNG) Project. He mentioned coal, wind, solar, and more conventional energy sources; and thought the state would resolve its energy challenges.

Commissioner mentioned the example of Juneau Greens, which was enabled through relatively affordable energy through hydropower. He thought similar solutions in other parts of the state would enable more produce to get to other parts of the state. He saw the topics of energy and agriculture to be related. He thought the state would make progress in lowering the cost of energy.

[9:54:45 AM](#)

Commissioner Boyle mentioned Senator Cronk and noted that Tok used biomass and was able to produce over 4,000 pounds of fresh produce for the school using waste heat and emissions. He considered multiple Interior communities such as Galena and Nenana, where there were opportunities to install biomass and become more food secure. He reiterated that there were interrelated issues. He thought as the state worked towards energy solutions, there would be more agriculture opportunities.

Co-Chair Hoffman emphasized the need to work together. He thought everyone was aware that the relationship between the legislature and the executive branch had wavered since the previous year. He wanted to work with the administration on food security and energy. He commented on the two years remaining to accomplish work. He stressed that the work could not happen if the legislature did not have a working relationship with the governor's office. He relayed that the committee would proceed with the current resolution and was eager to receive the modified fiscal

note. He stated that most importantly, the lines of communication needed to be kept open to try and establish a better working relationship between the committee and the governor to work on common issues.

EO 136 was HEARD and HELD in committee for further consideration.

[9:57:07 AM](#)

AT EASE

[9:57:42 AM](#)

RECONVENED

#sscr1

SENATE SPECIAL CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 1

Disapproving Executive Order No. 136.

[9:58:06 AM](#)

LIZ HARPOLD, STAFF, SENATOR DONNY OLSON, addressed SSCR 1. She explained that SSCR 1 was a resolution to disapprove EO 136, the governor's proposal to create a Department of Agriculture. The resolution noted the authority of the governor to create a department through executive order and also outlined how the legislature had 60 days to disapprove an executive order in resolution taken up in joint session. She made a procedural note that hearing and moving the resolution in committee as not a reflection of any member's intent to vote for or against the resolution in joint session at a later time.

[9:59:13 AM](#)

Co-Chair Hoffman OPENED public testimony.

[9:59:48 AM](#)

AT EASE

[10:00:16 AM](#)

RECONVENED

DYLAN BLANKENSHIP, SELF, POINT MACKENZIE (via teleconference), testified in opposition to SSCR 1. He grew hay to feed livestock in his region. He mentioned the 2022 United States Census, which indicated that Alaska was only

one of five states that gained farms as it was losing them. He mentioned many farms for sale in his area. He cited that the average age of an Alaskan farmer was 58 years old. He mentioned the Agricultural Revolving Loan Fund, through which he had purchased his farm. He was concerned about the viability of funds and his future financing opportunities. He discussed food security and the support he had been given by the Division of Agriculture. He was concerned about the future of farming in the state and the lack of support for farmers.

[10:03:10 AM](#)

BERNIE KARL, FARMER, CHENA HOT SPRINGS (via teleconference), spoke in opposition to SSCR 1. He believed that the only two ways to create wealth was through growing or mining. He thought Alaska had the ability to grow and even export food. He discussed food production in the Netherlands. He referenced Co-Chair Hoffman's comments about rural Alaska. He discussed the need for greenhouses in every community to take advantage of power. He discussed the use of power and greenhouses in Chena Hot Springs. He referenced greenhouses in Bethel and mentioned Alaska's long growing season. He emphasized that agriculture was the future. He thought the state's founding fathers knew the importance of agriculture. He had been in the state for 50 years.

[10:06:48 AM](#)

SCOTT MUGRAGE, PRESIDENT, ALASKA FARM BUREAU, DELTA JUNCTION (via teleconference), spoke in opposition to the resolution. He was a farmer and rancher and was President of the Alaska Farm Bureau. He relayed that the Alaska Farm Bureau strongly supported EO 136. He acknowledged the concerns related to growth in government. He thought the industry had huge potential. He referenced recommendations from the task forces and emphasized the need for consistent support for agriculture through different administrations.

[10:08:52 AM](#)

RACHEL LORD, ALASKA FOOD POLICY COUNCIL, HOMER (via teleconference), testified in opposition to SSCR 1. She shared that the Alaska Food Policy Council strongly supported the establishment of the Department of Agriculture. She expressed support for the Division of

Agriculture and Commissioner Boyle. She continued that her organization worked closely with many stakeholders across the state and thought for the development of stronger more sustained agricultural sector there needed to be high-level focus and collaboration. She reiterated Mr. Mudge's remarks regarding the task force recommendations.

[10:10:48 AM](#)

AT EASE

[10:10:57 AM](#)

RECONVNEED

AMY SEITZ, ALASKA FARM BUREAU, SOLDOTNA (via teleconference), spoke in opposition to SSCR 1. She relayed she was a third-generation farmer that lived on the property her grandparents started in 1948. She conveyed that the Alaska Farm Bureau was in strong support of EO 136. She wanted agriculture to have stronger voice in the state. She contended that agriculture was not a priority of DNR, and that having a cabinet level seat would bring more focus to what was needed and for building relationships for markets. She considered timing and pondered that the state currently had momentum and potential in agriculture. She cited increased numbers of farms and local products. She mentioned the peony industry and the rise of agri-tourism. She thought the new department would increase food security and build a strong agriculture industry.

[10:14:56 AM](#)

MARSHALL TRENT, SELF, WASILLA (via teleconference), testified against SSCR 1. He advocated for the new department and the strategic development of agriculture in the state. He considered that a deliberate state-led approach was needed, with coordinated policies and resources. He discussed the slim margins in agriculture and discussed agricultural loans. He discussed loan limitations. He referenced Mr. Blankenship's remarks. He emphasized the need for a long-term strategic approach. He mentioned federal loan guarantees. He requested urgent action and permanent investment capital.

[10:18:43 AM](#)

Co-Chair Hoffman CLOSED public testimony.

Co-Chair Stedman MOVED to report SSCR 1 out of Committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal note. He noted that the action did not reflect an intent by any member to vote for or against the special concurrent resolution disapproving Executive Order 136 in joint session. There being NO OBJECTION, it was so ordered.

Co-Chair Hoffman reiterated that there was work to be done with the current administration. He thought questions had arisen regarding the implementation of EO 136. He relayed that the committee would go forward and continue dialog with the administration.

SSCR 1 was REPORTED out of committee with one previously published zero fiscal note: FN 1(SRES).

[10:20:20 AM](#)

AT EASE

[10:21:32 AM](#)

RECONVENED

^PRESENTATION: FY 45 MEDICAID ENROLLMENT and SPENDING IN ALASKA REPORT (MESA) - DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

[10:22:09 AM](#)

TED HELVOIGHT, PRESIDENT, EVERGREEN ECONOMICS, discussed a presentation entitled "MESA FY2025 - FY2045 Long-Term Forecast of Medicaid Enrollment and Spending in Alaska March 3, 2025" (copy on file).

Mr. Helvoight looked at slide 2, "Long-Term Medicaid Forecast ('MESA')":

- Requested by the Alaska Legislature in 2005
- First forecast completed in 2006
- 20-year projection updated annually
- Assumes current Medicaid structure remains in place
- Provides a baseline for analysis of proposed initiatives
- Provides insights into trends in AK population, Medicaid enrollment, utilization, reimbursement rates, and spending

Co-Chair Hoffman handed the gavel to Co-Chair Stedman.

10:24:14 AM

AT EASE

10:27:50 AM

RECONVENED

Co-Chair Stedman relayed that there had been an issue with the presentation, and the committee would consider the topic at Wednesday's meeting.

Co-Chair Stedman discussed the agenda for the upcoming meeting.

#

ADJOURNMENT

10:28:59 AM

The meeting was adjourned at 10:28 a.m.