

so I'll sit and listen. If there's more discussion, I'd like to hear it so I can get a clear picture. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Vrtiska. Senator Maurstad.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could ask Senator Abboud a question. Senator Abboud, I want to clear up a couple of things that have been said. First of all, the reason why she filed her claim with the state instead of going into court, is that's what our state law under the State Tort Claims Act requires her to do. Isn't that correct?

SENATOR ABOUD: Well, it's one of the remedies that's available to her, Senator Maurstad. She could. It is one of the remedies available to her...

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Okay.

SENATOR ABOUD: ..that was probably the least expensive approach on getting her claim paid.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: But if she has a claim against the state she has to file a notice of that claim first with the state. Isn't that correct?

SENATOR ABOUD: That's correct.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Okay. If she has a claim against someone else, she can pursue a different avenue, of course, but her feeling is the claim is with the state. The first step is to file the notice as she did. Secondly...thank you, Senator. I just want to point out that the issue and the reason why this is before us and it's...and it's...I think this has been stated before but just to emphasize it again, is because she, of course, is alleging that after she gave the state DAS notice to quit withdrawing the funds, the state continued to do so. At the same time, the state continued to reimburse the NAPE for those funds. So the reason why it's a General Fund transaction is we don't have those funds to transfer from one to another to pay her. But, of course, if the state does pay this claim and the state feels as though it has some recourse against NAPE to collect this amount of money, the state will be able to determine that and will then be able to, if they think it's appropriate or if they have a good case, recover the amount of