



LEGISLATIVE MANAGEMENT

Thursday, June 11, 2026
Harvest Room, State Capitol
Bismarck, North Dakota

Senator David Hogue, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 8:02 a.m.

Members present: Senators David Hogue, Brad Bekkedahl, Kyle Davison,* Kathy Hogan,* Jerry Klein, Janne Myrdal, Ronald Sorvaag*; Representatives Mike Berg, Glenn Bosch, Kathy Frelich, LaurieBeth Hager, Dori Hauck,* Zachary Ista,* Mike Lefor, Jonathan Warrey*

Members absent: Senator Josh Boschee; Representative Robin Weisz

Others present: Lynelle Johnson, Department of Public Instruction
Emily Thompson, Liz Fordahl, Dustin A. Richard, Legislative Council

**Attended remotely*

LEGISLATIVE MANAGEMENT VACANCY

Chairman Hogue noted there is a vacancy on the Legislative Management due to the resignation of former Representative Jared C. Hagert from the Legislative Assembly, which must be filled by the remaining members of the Legislative Management with another House member from the majority party.

It was moved by Representative Bosch, seconded by Representative Hauck, and carried on a voice vote that Representative Mike Berg be selected to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of former Representative Jared C. Hagert.

FISCAL IMPACT OF INITIATED CONSTITUTIONAL MEASURE

Chairman Hogue noted the Legislative Management is required by law to coordinate the determination of the estimated fiscal impact of initiated measures. He noted there will be one initiated measure on the general election ballot in November - an initiated constitutional amendment that relates to the funding of school breakfasts and lunches.

Chairman Hogue called on Ms. Liz Fordahl, Counsel, Legislative Council, who reviewed a memorandum entitled [2026 General Election Ballot Measure](#).

Chairman Hogue called on Ms. Lynelle Johnson, Director, Child Nutrition and Food Distribution Programs, Department of Public Instruction, who distributed a fiscal impact statement ([appendix](#)) for the initiated constitutional measure relating to funding of school breakfasts and lunches.

In response to questions from committee members, Ms. Johnson noted:

- Because schools will want the money from the federal programs, there will be an incentive to participate in the federal reimbursement, and the measure requires schools to participate in federal programs.
- Schools receive some federal reimbursement regardless of the meals being free, reduced price, or full price.

- The fiscal impact statement does not address whether schools will incur any additional staff-related costs.
- The fiscal impact could be higher depending upon participation of schools not participating in the Community Eligibility Provision.
- Although application rates in other states have varied, there are lessons that can be learned from experiences in those states.
- The federal government has a hard policy against forcing potentially eligible families to complete applications for free and reduced-price meals.
- The state does not have access to family income information to know the number of families who qualify for free and reduced-price meals but who do not participate.

It was moved by Senator Sorvaag, seconded by Representative Bosch, and carried on a roll call vote that the committee accept the fiscal impact statement for the initiated constitutional amendment measure relating to free school breakfasts and lunches, which provides an estimated fiscal impact of \$124 million to \$134 million for the cost of free meals and \$300,000 in administrative costs, and request the Legislative Council to forward the fiscal impact statement to the Secretary of State. Senators Hogue, Bekkedahl, Davison, Hogan, Klein, Myrdal, and Sorvaag and Representatives Berg, Bosch, Frelich, Hager, Hauck, Ista, Lefor, and Warrey voted "aye." No negative votes were cast.

REDISTRICTING LITIGATION

Chairman Hogue called on Mr. Dustin A. Richard, Counsel, Legislative Council, for an update on redistricting litigation. Mr. Richard noted:

- In November 2023, the federal district court ruled the redistricting plan adopted by the Legislative Assembly violated the federal Voting Rights Act with respect to Districts 9 and 15.
- In May 2025, the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled private plaintiffs may not maintain a private cause of action to enforce Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, but that ruling was paused due to an anticipated appeal to the United States Supreme Court.
- On May 18, 2026, the Supreme Court vacated the ruling of the Court of Appeals and sent the case back to the Court of Appeals in light of the Supreme Court's ruling in another redistricting case in April.
- The result of the Supreme Court action is the federal district court ruling remains in effect.
- The Legislative Council staff will continue to follow the federal docket to monitor the next steps in the case.

No further business appearing, Chairman Hogue adjourned the meeting at 9:17 a.m.

John Bjornson
Director

ATTACH:1