

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office

Appropriations Committee February 11, 2026

Rough Draft

**CLEMENTS:** Good afternoon. You don't have to "all rise," even though the Chief is here. Welcome to the Appropriations Committee. My name is Rob Clements. I'm from Elmwood, and represent Legislative District 2, which is Cass County and eastern Lancaster County. I serve as Chair of this committee. We'll start off by having members do self-introductions, starting with my far right.

**SPIVEY:** Good afternoon. I'm Senator Ashlei Spivey, District 13: northeast and northwest Omaha.

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Machaela Cavanaugh, District 6: west, west-central Omaha, Douglas County.

**ARMENDARIZ:** Christy Armendariz, District 18: northwest Omaha and Bennington.

**DOVER:** Robert Dover, District 19: Madison County, the south half of Pierce County.

**DORN:** Myron Dorn, District 30: Gage County and part of Lancaster.

**STROMMEN:** Paul Strommen, District 47: nine counties, the panhandle.

**PROKOP:** Jason Prokop, Legislative District 27: west Lincoln and Lancaster County.

**CLEMENTS:** Assisting the committee today is Cori Bierbaum, our committee clerk, to my right. To my left is our fiscal analyst Kenny Boggs. Our page today is Lexi Bodlak. If you're planning on testifying, please fill out a green testifier sheet located at the entrance for each bill or agency you wish to testify on, and hand it to the page when you come up to testify. Online position comments must have been submitted on the Legislature's website by 8:00 a.m. the day of the hearing to be included in the record. If you have submitted a comment online, we ask that you not testify in person today. If you will not be testifying but want to go on-record as having a position on a bill or agency being heard today, there are yellow sign-in sheets at the entrance outside; these sign-in sheets will become exhibits in the permanent record after today's hearing. Committee members may come and go during the hearing; this has nothing to do with the importance of what's being heard, as senators may have bills

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Appropriations Committee February 11, 2026  
Rough Draft

to introduce in other committees. To better facilitate this hearing, I ask that you abide by the following procedure. Please silence your cell phones. When hearing bills, the order of testimony will be introducer, proponents, opponents, neutral, and closing. When we hear testimony regarding agencies, we will first hear from a representative of the agency. Then, we will hear testimony from anyone who wishes to speak regarding the agency's budget. When you come up to testify, please say and spell your first and last name to ensure we get an accurate record. We request that you limit your testimony to 3 minutes or less. When you begin your testimony, the light on the table will be green. When the yellow light comes on, you have one minute remaining. When the red light comes on, it indicates you need to stop. Questions from the committee may follow. Agency representatives do not have the time limit. Verbal [INAUDIBLE]--verbal outbursts or applause are not permitted during the hearing, and may be cause for you to be asked to leave. Written material may be distributed to the committee members as exhibits only while testimony is being offered; hand them to the page for distribution when you come up to testify. We cannot accept oversized exhibits, CDs, or electronic exhibits. If you have written testimony but do not have 12 copies, please let the page know now, so they can make copies for you. With that, we begin today's hearing with Agency 5, Nebraska Supreme Court.

[AGENCY HEARINGS]

**CLEMENTS:** Thank you, Senator. We'll open the hearing for LB752. Welcome, Senator Spivey.

**SPIVEY:** Thank you, Chair Clements, and esteemed members of the Appropriations Committee. I know it's been a long day, so hopefully we can land this plane with LB752. A lot of the conversation that we just had around re-entry services, the cost of corrections, how do we think about our correction system, is why I am, am bringing LB752, and urge your serious consideration. LB752 deals with the earmarking of funds that were originally a part of the WEC budget to go to the Reentry and Rehabilitation Act. And so, as we heard the director talk earlier, WEC, or Work Ethic Camp, was a step before community corrections. So, men would go there; it's a camp-style facility to get better programming, to have the step before they go back home so they can be more successful, and ideally not return back to prison. And so, when WEC, or Work Ethic Camp, became an ICE detention facility, those men were integrated back into the

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Appropriations Committee February 11, 2026  
Rough Draft

larger system. I, I am concerned about the programming that is still happening; it's not clear that it's still happening in the same way, and we know that if we invest taxpayer dollars into re-entry and programming, it is a better use of our money, and it keeps people home and helps them become productive citizens. So, there is a deficit request from the agency around taking that budget and lowering their appropriation. What I am asking for is \$5 million to go to the Re-entry Act. I do think-- and you'll hear some neutral testimony around the re-entry kind of commission and task force that was put together, what they're seeing, and the gaps. This work is highly important, and it's underfunded. And folks have complex needs; if you go into prison, we're seeing, at 18, and you're trying to come home at 32, that's a long time to be inside of an institution, so what does it mean to make sure that your mental health is taken care of? You have a strong plan around housing, you get the family support and that healing and that, and that restorative justice happens with the folks that are best going to support you to get a meaningful job and have a meaningful life outside of being incarcerated. I talk a lot-- well, talk a lot, I've only been here a year-and-a-half, but-- on the mic last year, I talked a lot about my dad being incarcerated. So, he went into prison-- I think I was about six months-- and spent majority of his life inside than he did out; he has now since passed away. And as-- like, growing up, I didn't really understand incarceration. Like, we would talk on the phone, it was very foreign to me. And as an adult, before he passed away, I still didn't quite get it. Like, I did not really understand the toll that incarceration takes on communities and families. And then, getting into the social sector work, from working in direct service, from, from my job with my nonprofit, and then really being a senator and going inside and spending time with people, you see the pipeline, you see the child welfare to prison pipeline. And that was my dad. He was in child welfare; he navigated extreme trauma and abuse, and that created a direct path to him being incarcerated. And when he got out as an adult, and he was trying to situate himself back into community, the same supports that I'm advocating for in this bill did not exist for him. He was in prison in Oklahoma, so, a very different system, but the, the safety social nets around having a meaningful job-- he went into the prison in, in, in the '80s, so when you come back out in the early 2000s, life has left you behind. What does that mean for you? How do you integrate? How do have the, the technology skills to even get a job? Like, there's all of these things and components. And then, again, the family reintegration that I think-- we, we have to better position people to be successful.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Appropriations Committee February 11, 2026  
Rough Draft

If we don't want to spend taxpayer dollars and keep building new prisons and spending, you know, \$40,000 a year to incarcerate someone, and we can have these targeted interventions that allow for someone to see life outside of incarceration, I think it's worth it. And so, what I'm asking for LB752 is to earmark the money from the WEC Work Ethic Camp that was a step before community corrections to the Re-entry Act to be used for those items. And again, you'll hear from some testifiers around where our re-entry is, and some folks that are on the ground doing that direct service work. And so, with that, I would be happy to answer any questions that the committee may have.

**CLEMENTS:** Senator Dover.

**DOVER:** Two questions. One is, this money, does it go to existing re-entry and reintegration programming?

**SPIVEY:** Yes, and so we currently do have some earmarks within the Corrections budget for re-entry. So, instead of it-- which is through the General Fund. So, I would-- so, I would say that. And so, instead of just putting this back into the General Fund, it would be earmarked into that re-entry bucket at that \$5 million mark. And then, whatever the remaining balance-- I think it's \$5.2 million-- from the Corrections deficit request would then go back to General Fund.

**DOVER:** And where would this money be used at?

**SPIVEY:** In the re-entry program. So, there is--

**DOVER:** Any specific [INAUDIBLE].

**SPIVEY:** Yeah, so, inside of statute, there is language-- and I can pull that for you and get it-- if my LA who's sitting behind me can do that while we are sitting here and can email it out to committee-- there is, inside of statute, language around what it can be used for. And so, those items are what the \$5 million can be used for, and it's always at the discretion of the agency within those parameters. So, it's housing, it's job training, it's the behavioral health, it's all the things that we kind of talked about. The agency decides the different buckets within that, but it has guardrails for how it can be used.

**DOVER:** So, that's anyone coming out of prison?

**SPIVEY:** Yes. So, it would be our state prison system.

**DOVER:** OK, thank you. And then, how many people-- my last question is, and how many people would that serve for \$5 million dollars?

**SPIVEY:** I think it depends on how Corrections uses it, honestly, and that was my question around LB50. So, we know with the Supreme Court's ruling that there's going to be a number of new people coming home, a large amount, and so I think I need to better understand the calculations for that and how they are looking at sentencing; parole plays a part into that, so, I had an LR around the Board of Parole and how they're making their decisions. And, so, I think, it is variable because those things are still not clear on how the agency is serving folks that have the potential to come home. And so, I'm hoping we can get those answers, but I do know that they are currently underfunded. There was a pilot around transitional housing that the body approved before I came into the Legislature that has not really kicked off, so there's things that this money can be used for that the agency needs to be doing to ensure that folks are successful.

**DOVER:** Great. Thank you.

**SPIVEY:** Yeah. Thank you for your questions.

**CLEMENTS:** Senator Prokop?

**PROKOP:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just kind of piggybacking off something Senator Dover mentioned. So, is there a-- do you have a sense as to where those-- of where the dollars would go, specifically site-wise? Because as-- I think it was-- I was trying to ask the Director about, and don't know that I necessarily got a straight answer, is, you know, the McCook facility was known for those specific services. Like, that is what they did, that was their specialty. And so, to just pick that up and lift that up and transfer that with people and not sure exactly where all those people went, I mean, there's not a-- I mean, I would assume there's additional costs, if those folks are spread out across different facilities based on facility classification, nature of time left, all those things. Do you have any sense for how that would get divided up, or?

**SPIVEY:** Yeah, so the money, ideally, would be from anyone coming home from any facility, and then on the re-entry side, I think to your comment, Senator Prokop, what I am concerned about and what I hope earmarking these funds are for-- like, WEC is a very specific type of programming, and I don't know how many folks have been in NSP or have gone recently, it is terrible, and you cannot just emulate a camp style into a more secure prison system. It's a very different variable, folks with different sentencing, where I think folks are housed even allow for like therapeutic-- like, it, it is very different. And so, my hope is by earmarking these dollars and saying you have to use it for this reason, it ensures that the agency has better intention and diligence of that programming so that folks are not coming back into our carceral system. I would be happy-- and, and if folks have thoughts, absolutely entertain an amendment that specifically earmarks within the guardrails of better use, because I think to your point, Senator Prokop, it's been really hard to get a, a, a clear, direct answer on-- from the, the, the director on things that they need to be accountable to that we have in statute, honestly. And, and again, it, it-- it's, it's integral. If our correction system is supposed to be corrective and rehabilitative, then we have to make sure that the programming is happening, we're evaluating that programming, we're working with community partners. And so, I think, you know, this is my attempt to say I know the importance, I've seen it firsthand, and how do we ensure that that can happen? And then, would absolutely entertain amendments, or if folks have ideas around strengthening that, to ensure that it can be implemented in the way that it's intended.

**PROKOP:** I, I think the reporting piece side of that's really important, so I appreciate you mentioned that's something.

**SPIVEY:** Yeah, absolutely.

**CLEMENTS:** Other questions? Seeing none, we welcome proponents.

**SPIVEY:** You're not going to ask me if I'm going to stay?

**CLEMENTS:** Oh, are you going to stay?

**SPIVEY:** Of course. I wouldn't miss it for the world.

**CLEMENTS:** I assumed that. Good afternoon, good evening.

**JASMINE HARRIS:** Good evening. See, my paper says good afternoon, huh? Wishful thinking. Good evening, Chair Clements and members of the Appropriations Committee. My name is Jasmine Harris, J-a-s-m-i-n-e H-a-r-r-i-s. I am the-- new title-- Vice President of Development and External Relations for RISE. I request that this testimony be included as part of the record that shows we are in report of LB752. RISE is the largest nonprofit organization in Nebraska focused solely on habilitative programming in prisons and re-entry support, and we walk all those steps in between that, as we mentioned, family integration, unification, business entrepreneurship-- we run the gamut. Our mission is to break generational cycles of incarceration. We want to thank Senator Spivey for her thoughtful approach to what can be a contentious conversation that involves funding priorities. RISE partners with the Nebraska Department of Corrections to offer programming in facilities, and we're also one of those recipients of the Vocational Life Skills Grant. Our support of this bill is not intended to take away from how grateful we are to be able to serve people on the inside and to receive the grant, but to show why adding more funding to re-entry programming is so critical to meet the need in our state. If we look at the approved budget for NDCS for '26-'27 and look at that average daily prison population that was reported on their website for 2025, it costs over \$65,000 per year to incarcerate an individual here in Nebraska. Again, it fluctuates depending on the facility, as you heard. This number has and continues to increase over time. In that same thought, the funding allocated to the VLS grant has remained virtually unchanged since fiscal year '25-'16 [SIC]. The number of people released from Nebraska prisons each year sits at about 2,000 individuals, with the current recidivism rate at about 28%. This rate has slightly decreased over the years, which aligns with the introduction of the VLS reentry funding. When we look at the impact that re-entry organizations have had in our state, the saying "doing a lot with a little" is what comes to mind. There was a bigger return on investment to offer re-entry services and supports, which lowers recidivism rates, therefore lowering the cost to the taxpayers of Nebraska to incarcerate. RISE had an economic study completed on our organization and the programs and services we provide; while comparing the recidivism rate of our release program graduates and the employment rate within 90 days of release to individuals that did not graduate our program, one of the biggest takeaways was that our graduates saved taxpayers \$3.2 million in 2025 due to low unemployment insurance and incarceration costs. Re-entry programs are a critical piece to ensuring successful reintegration into communities for people leaving incarceration.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Appropriations Committee February 11, 2026  
Rough Draft

Although there has been success shown with the essential services and supports provided by these organizations, we cannot do it alone. Philanthropy dollars only go so far. Buy-in with funding from the government is necessary. For these reasons, RISE supports LB752, and asks that committee members vote this out to General File. And I'll be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

**CLEMENTS:** Any questions?

**JASMINE HARRIS:** Awesome.

**CLEMENTS:** Seeing none, thank you for your testimony.

**JASMINE HARRIS:** This was so great. [INAUDIBLE].

**CLEMENTS:** Next proponent. Good afternoon.

**JASON WITMER:** Good evening Chair Clements--

**CLEMENTS:** Good evening.

**JASON WITMER:** --and Committee. It's me again, Jason Witmer, J-a-s-o-n W-i-t-m-e-r. I'm with ACLU here in support of LB752. LB752 is not simply a budget adjustment, but a decision about, about what Nebraska chooses to value in its correctional system. Historically, before becoming a federal immigration center, the McCook facility operated as Work Ethic Camp, where the focus was on reform and rehabilitation. Individuals worked in McCook, the city-- the town of McCook community, on public projects, performed community service, and built constructive relationships with local residents. The rehabilitative approach extended beyond labor to public art exhibits, such as they had done with the McCook Art Bank, which I believe there was an article on. Those efforts humanized individuals preparing to return home and strengthen the community ties, all of which support long-term public safety. LB752's education investment should be viewed as a continuation of that rehabilitative philosophy. Nebraska already has a framework in place: NDCS and SCC, Southeast Community College, already have a partnership for college-level education inside Nebraska prisons. The programs offered credentialed coursework aligned with workforce needs. What limits participation: not interests or infrastructure, but sometimes dollars for tuition, books, et cetera. Evidence support education investment is strong. A federal-funded meta,

meta-analysis conducted by RAND Corporation for the U.S. Department of Justice found that individuals who participated in correctional education programs are significantly less likely to return to prison, meaning less likely to do-- of recidivism, public safety, and more likely to secure employment after release. This is among the most rigorous research available in correctional policy. Nebraska's own judicial branch has documented that incarceration is one of the most expensive interventions that the state uses. While approaches that reduce reoffending deliver safer communities at lower costs, education is not leniency; it's a proven public safety strategy. LB752 preserves the-- that logic. Allowing funds originally tied to reform and rehabilitation to be diluted or redirected away from that purpose undermines the very outcome that facilities like the Work Ethic Camp were designed to achieve, which is reform and safer communities. I will also say for the record that when I come, ACLU comes and speaks about reform and investing in those who are incarcerated, it's for that very purpose. There's evidence based-- as well as people in the community that have shown that when we have invested in them, when we have provided opportunities, when we do these things that we think is soft on crime, it's actually public safety efforts. With that, I would say support and put forth LB752. Thank you.

**CLEMENTS:** Are there questions? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony. Next proponent for LB752, please. Good "afternevening."

**CONNOR HERBERT:** Good evening, yes. Thank you, Chair Clements and members of the Appropriations Committee for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Connor Herbert, C-o-n-n-o-r H-e-r-b-e-r-t, and I serve as a staffer with the Nebraska Commission on African American Affairs. The commission was established in 2020 to advise the Legislature and the governor on legislative and executive proposals that may positively or negatively affect our respective constituency. In that role, the commission appreciates the bill brought by Senator Spivey to direct proceeds associated with the former Work Ethic Camp and the current Department of Homeland Security McCook Detention Center towards re-entry and reintegration programming for committed offenders. The commission supports approaches grounded in evidence-based practices that reduce recidivism, improve re-entry outcomes, and strengthen families and neighborhoods. In our view, long-term public safety-- and I think in the view of many people-- is best achieved through a balance of

accountability and restoration, ensuring individuals leaving custody are better prepared to live productive law, law-abiding lives. With respect to the proposal here, the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services advances this work through its vocational and life skills programming, which is designed to equip individuals with the knowledge, skills, and personal development necessary for independent living. As has previously been testified, they do this by part-- through partnership with organizations across the state, including education and workforce training through GED completion, college coursework, and certifications in high-demand fields, such as the skilled trades, information technology, and health care. Participants also receive instruction in financial literacy, communication, decision-making, and other cognitive and life skills. Further, behavioral health services, including substance use treatment and mental health support, address underlying challenges that often contribute to system involvement. Employment preparation and family-focused programming further support successful reintegration. And of course, all of these are dependent on the program that people are enrolled in at their specific facility. So, in our view, investing proceeds in these proven strategies strengthens communities, supports returning citizens, and promotes safer neighborhoods across Nebraska. Thank you. Any questions?

**CLEMENTS:** Thank you. Are there questions? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony.

**CONNOR HERBERT:** Yes, thank you.

**CLEMENTS:** Are there additional proponents for LB752? Seeing none, anyone in opposition? Seeing none, anyone in the neutral capacity?

**DOUG KOEBERNICK:** Good evening. Good evening, Senator Clements, and members of the Appropriations Committee. My name is Doug Koebernick, D-o-u-g K-o-e-b-e-r-n-i-c-k, and I work for the Legislature as the Inspector General of Corrections. I'm here in a neutral capacity just to give you some more information. You've gotten some information about, like, what goes on with the re-entry efforts that are run by the Department of Corrections through the Vocational Life Skills Grant program, so I won't go into too much of that. I am having a handout provided to you that's an excerpt from the latest vocational life skills program report that is done by the department and the UNO Center

for Justice Research. I have-- it's actually much thicker, so I didn't want to kill a lot of trees, but-- and I can email that to, to the committee as well, because it does have a lot of information in there about who receives these funds right now, how they're being used, how many people are utilizing them. It, it involves people that are both inside the correctional facilities and outside, and it can apply to people who've been paroled, people on probation, people who jammed their sentence and just walked out of the door. But there's a lot of things that go on both inside and outside, and so this excerpt will give you a list of some of the, the grantees-- or, all the grantees that received those funds, and, and a, and a pretty good idea of how they're being used. They can be used for transitional housing services; they can be used for education. Senator Dover would probably like this: Metro Community College is teaching a class down at Tecumseh on construction, and right now, they're, they're going to be building some frames, learning how to build framing and other things. And the framing that they're going to be doing is going to come to Lincoln to be used for a tiny house village that's from-- being done by the-- by Bridges to Hope. And then there-- the-- there's contractors out in the community that are going to hire people who are on work release to go and help build those tiny homes. So that's, that's-- we've talked about housing in the past, so that's one of the things that it's used. But there's a wide variety of uses for this, and it can be used for life skills programs, education, on and on. And-- but I'll let you look at that, and I'll send you a whole link too. But then, the other thing I would just want to say is, I am on the Reentry Continuity Advisory Board that the Legislature created a few years ago, and we've been meeting for over a year, and, and we have the director on there, the head of probation, the Parole Board chair, and community members, and we've been working at identifying what is all needed out there for re-entry, and it's definitely clear that there is more needs as far as re-entry, because if we can get people prepared and, and ready to get out there and be productive citizens and have good housing, good employment and, and good environments, they're going to-- they won't be going back to prison; that'll save us a lot of money, but also help everybody in the long run, so. There you go. I'll answer any questions you may have.

**CLEMENTS:** Are there questions? Senator Cavanaugh.

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Thank you. Thanks for being here. The committee that you just mentioned, or the board, is that the re-entry committee?

**DOUG KOEBERNICK:** Yeah, the Reentry Continuity Advisory Board. Senator McKinney or Senator Wayne-- I can't remember which-- who had the bill, but that was-- yeah.

**M. CAVANAUGH:** And, and what did-- can you explain a little bit more about what they do?

**DOUG KOEBERNICK:** Yeah. It was basically-- our office had looked at the issues surrounding transitional housing, where we had a lot of transitional houses that were having a lot of problems with just low standards and nobody having oversight, and there was inconsistency, and we were really concerned about what was going on in there. So, there was a few bills introduced to look at that issue, and then what happened was the Judiciary Committee took that and decided to make this larger effort as far as looking-- more than just transitional housing, but looking at re-entry overall-- and created that Reentry Continuity Advisory Board. So, we spent last year receiving information and presentations from the department, from parole, from probation, from others, some outside entities that had done re-entry work and research, and so now-- we just met yesterday up at UNO, and we're setting the stage for where that board wants to go, as far as what kind of efforts they want to make. And I know that the conversation yesterday was really talking about, OK, what are we going to do this year to provide more information to policymakers, as far what's, what's needed out there and everything. But it's obvious from all the presentations we had last year that there is definitely a need.

**M. CAVANAUGH:** Thank you.

**DOUG KOEBERNICK:** Mm-hmm.

**CLEMENTS:** Other questions? Senator Dover.

**DOVER:** I was just scanning your hand out here, and it referenced LB907 in 2014, and guess I just pulled it up by phone quick, and said-- basically, invested \$14.4 million in inmate mental health and re-entry services, approved 40-- 46-0. Can you just talk a little bit about that?

**DOUG KOEBERNICK:** Yeah. It was-- Senator Brad Ashford was the one who had that bill, and, and, and got it passed, and it really-- what had been identified in the kind of the couple years before that-- and he was the chair of the Judiciary Committee at the time-- a lot of re-entry issues and concerns were brought to him. And they were also looking at the time, like, OK, we have this overcrowded prison system, what can we do to decrease recidivism? What can we do to keep people from getting into the system in the first place? And so, Senator Ashford worked with-- I don't even know how many different people. He was really good at reaching out to lots of different folks. But he decided, with a lot of input, that they should create this program because there was-- there weren't any funds or programs really dedicated solely toward that re-entry effort, and so this was the first attempt to do that. And I would say, after 11 years or so, that it's been really successful. And I've spent a lot time, as the Inspector General, learning about re-entry, because it's such an important part of the corrections system, and have visited all, I think, almost all the providers that are, that are found in that document, and they do really good work, and I've talked to a lot of individuals who have received the benefits of that program. And I would say this, too, just as a personal thing: I, I worked and finished my masters last year, and my, my final project, my year-long project, was on re-entry, and I looked at all those things that go into it, and Nebraska's program actually is one that other states should definitely replicate.

**DOVER:** Just one follow-up question. So, they must have had money back then, because really, \$14.4 million is quite a bit of money to be able to get a bill passed at 46-0.

**DOUG KOEBERNICK:** Yeah. Well, you know, we do that up and down thing, and I think that was kind of an up time. So, there were some funds out there, and, and it's held pretty steady since then. I think Senator McDonnell had been able to get a few extra dollars put in there, and Senator McKinney, a few years ago, had a little extra put in there as well. And I, I think that might have gone away now, but-- yeah. Kenny's nodding.

**DOVER:** You know [INAUDIBLE] is there a current balance, do you know? Or a certain [INAUDIBLE] that's currently there?

**DOUG KOEBERNICK:** I'm not sure, but I think your fiscal analyst might have that.

Transcript Prepared by Clerk of the Legislature Transcribers Office  
Appropriations Committee February 11, 2026  
Rough Draft

**CLEMENTS:** We'll check with our analyst. Other questions? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony.

**DOUG KOEBERNICK:** All right. Thank you, Senator.

**CLEMENTS:** Anyone else here in the neutral capacity? Seeing none. Senator Spivey, you may close.

**SPIVEY:** Thank you, Chair, and, and thank you, committee members. I know it's been a lot of long nights, so I appreciate your just attention and, and consideration with LB752. The one thing that I will add, Senator Dover, to your point of, like, having money: I get it; we are in a, a tight spot this year, and there's going to be a lot of decisions that have to be made, and that's why I'm only asking for a portion of that earmark to be re-appropriated. So, there will still be some money that the committee can take action on that would put money back into the General Fund, but I do think the original intention of Work Ethic Camp, what we know to be true around re-entry, deserves for additional funding because it's underfunded and it will save taxpayers, in the long run, money. And so, I know that we have-- you all have a lot to, to weigh as we make those decisions, and I really appreciate your consideration for LB752. So, thank you.

**CLEMENTS:** Are there any questions? Seeing none, that's-- thank you for that. We have position comments for the record with LB752: proponents, 9; opponents, 0; neutral, 0. That will conclude LB752 hearing, and concludes our business for today.