

MINUTES

MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
51st LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

SELECT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION FUNDING

Call to Order: By Chairman Ray Peck, on March 7, 1989, at 2:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: All members were present.

Members Excused: None

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Madalyn Quinlan, Andrea Merrill, Dave Cogley,
Jeanne Flynn

DISPOSITION OF HB 575, HB 623, HB 637, SB 203

Motion:

Rep. Glaser so moved to:

1. Table HB 623 (Thomas) and HB 637 (Phillips.)
2. Include retirement in the general fund with the funding to be determined by the Select Committee.
3. Caps be in the bill with a phase-in program to be designed by this committee.
4. Revenue in the amount of 100 mills to be included, 60 mills for elementary and 40 mills for high schools.
5. Use a gray bill for further discussion and development.
6. Section 29, subsection 8 and of SB 203 3rd reading copy are to remain stricken (CPI inflation factor). Section 30, subsection 9.)

Discussion:

Rep. Glaser clarified that number 6 referred to the inflation factor that was in SB 203, as introduced and removed by the Senate. Having it remain out of the gray bill would mean that it would take a positive motion to put it back in the bill.

Rep. Harrington stated that an inflation factor for the schedules is a very important part of any bill.

Rep. Kadas stated that he supports the motion. He also said that cost of living increases are going to have to be considered.

Rep. Gilbert stated that he supports all of the motions except for number four.

Rep. Schye asked Rep. Glaser what kind of cap he had in mind?

Rep. Glaser said it should include a phase-in period with some way to keep the high-spending districts down. Rep. Kadas also added that the committee agreed that caps would be a part of any solution.

Rep. Eudaily supported the motion. He said that these motions give the Select Committee a good basis to work from.

Amendments, Discussion, and Votes:

The Motion passed 6-2 with Rep. Peck voting aye, Rep. Eudaily voting aye, Rep. Gilbert voting aye, Rep. Glaser voting aye, Rep. Grinde voting aye, Rep. Kadas voting aye, Rep. Schye voting aye, and Rep. Gilbert voting nay, Rep. Harrington voting nay.

Discussion:

Rep. Peck stated that the committee will go through the summary of SB 203 as the Senate Education Committee intended to amend it prior to the Governor's amendments now in place. (See Exhibits 1 and 2.)

Rep. Eudaily asked Dave Cogley what was the basis of the schedules that are in the bill? Mr. Cogley stated that the bill was based on fiscal 1987 expenditures but there was discussion in the Senate Education Committee about using fiscal 1988 expenditures as the basis for calculating the adjustment of the schedules. There was general agreement that they should use the fiscal 1988 actual cost.

Rep. Eudaily asked Mr. Cogley if the major part of the Senate Committee amendments would go into effect the second year, FY 91?

Mr. Cogley stated yes, the plan moved the effective date to July 1, 1990. It did nothing for schedule increases in the first year of the biennium.

Rep. Kadas suggested that the committee use FY 88 expenditure levels.

Rep. Peck stated that there is FY 88 expenditure information that has been run in OPI. The Senate Education Committee agreed to that, but did not adopt it formally. (See Exhibit 3.) The CPI inflation index provided for the schedules to automatically increase each year after FY 91. That would have to be added based on the adoption of item no. 6 in the motion by Rep. Glaser.

Rep. Kadas stated that the committee agreed that they should figure out a level of funding to recommend. The committee should start with FY 88 expenditures and figure out the remaining provisions from there.

Motion:

Rep. Grinde moved to adopt the FY 1988 actual expenditures as the base for any further development of an equalization plan.

Discussion:

Rep. Glaser stated that these numbers were audited by the Legislative Auditors Office and then returned to OPI. Those numbers have a great deal of integrity.

Rep. Peck asked Greg Groepper that if OPI sent the numbers down to the Legislative Auditors Office, they worked on them and then sent them back and was there agreement on those figures? Mr. Groepper stated that is correct.

Rep. Glaser stated that there are three school districts that somewhere along the line need to be added in.

Amendments, Discussion and Votes:

Motion was carried unanimously 8-0, all members voting aye.

Discussion: Adult Education

Rep. Peck stated that adult education should remain outside of the general fund because that funding might get lost in the shuffle.

Rep. Kadas stated that he agreed with Rep. Peck. It is reasonable that districts have that flexibility to continue adult education as it is now.

Mr. Cogley stated that adult education is not in SB 203 (gray). He said that it remains a separate fund, the same as it is now. The bill does not combine it in the general fund.

Discussion: Transportation

Rep. Kadas asked if the plan should address putting transportation into the general fund? Transportation is recognized as an area that needs to be equalized, but we can't equalize it in the same way we are equalizing everything else. OPI should study the issue and recommend a solution by FY 91. We would appropriate for FY 91 and leave it to OPI and the Board of Public Education as to how to deal with it. The committee could give them some guidelines to use such as student density factors, but they would come up with the actual formula by FY 91.

Rep. Peck asked Rep. Kadas if he was suggesting that the study would be done this first year to put in place a distribution system for the second year for transportation? Rep. Kadas said yes.

Rep. Eudaily stated that the committee would want to be sure that OPI follows the equalization pattern that the committee is trying to establish through this bill and keep the equalization factors paramount in the distribution of transportation funds.

Rep. Peck asked if it was an improper delegation of legislative authority to allow another branch to develop and implement a funding plan for transportation?

Mr. Groepper stated that the legislature could delegate that study and ask OPI to report to the Board for approval.

Rep. Schye stated that he would much rather have a legislative committee do the study and make the recommendation, rather than delegate it.

Rep. Peck asked Rep. Ramirez to comment on this subject since he is an attorney.

Rep. Ramirez stated that we will have to do research.

Rep. Kadas stated the legislature should appropriate the dollars to OPI in FY 91 and in this bill we should incorporate transportation as part of the general fund for the school districts. OPI will figure out a mechanism to distribute the dollars. The number of dollars that we appropriate will go into the general fund of the schools and the schools could use the dollars however they want.

Rep. Ramirez stated that the committee could allocate some money for transportation, take transportation out of the general fund at this time, study it and do some more equalization in the next session.

Rep. Gilbert stated that he agrees with Rep. Schye as far as the study is concerned. He would prefer it stay in the legislature.

Rep. Kadas stated that the only way the committee could do it, unless we figure out a formula of our own, is to reimburse on the basis of actual cost in districts. He stated that the costs in districts are not very reflective of the kinds of transportation responsibilities these districts have.

Rep. Eudaily stated that we could make the decision whether we think it should be in the general fund so we can work it into the other expenditures that need to be equalized, but spend more time thinking of the best way to distribute the money.

Rep. Kadas stated that we should put transportation into the general fund. Whether it is distributed through the schedules, or current costs, or whatever.

Rep. Ramirez questioned if the committee would want to do this at this point. The problem is that you don't know how many dollars the state should contribute towards transportation. You don't know how much money should be put in there, and you don't know how to allocate it. Until you know that, you

really shouldn't put that in the general fund because it complicates the equalization percentage the committee is going to have to work on. If you put it in the general fund, it will mess up that formula.

Rep. Peck stated that he agrees with Rep. Ramirez. He said that transportation is variable. School districts are running sports travel busses under the transportation budget. It is a very difficult item to pin down.

Mr. Groepper stated that it is compounded by the fact that we need to get the districts to report in a clear manner.

Rep. Peck asked Mr. Groepper if he thinks this would be an appropriate area to study and maybe change the reporting requirements? Mr. Groepper responded by saying he thinks of reporting requirements is an area that we hope the committee would address to give us some sense of direction on what kind of information you would like to see back from a district. In two years when you came back here, we could have a data base that would allow you to base any future questions you might have as well as insure that you could analyze the effectiveness of what you do this session.

Motion:

Rep. Kadas moved that transportation expenditures be funded at 85% of FY 88 expenditures and that funding be distributed on ANB that are more than three miles from a school or a density factor.

Discussion:

Mr. Groepper stated that OPI could get numbers on transportation costs for the next meeting.

Motion Withdrawn.

Rep. Kadas withdrew his motion.

Discussion: Retirement

Rep. Schye asked how we are going to reimburse the schools for retirement by an increase in schedules or reimbursement for actual costs? Rep. Peck stated that the committee does need to address that. All we have said is that retirement is in the general fund.

Rep. Schye stated that the education community said that putting retirement in to the schedules will affect instructional money because they won't get the same amount of money for retirement that they are getting now and yet those costs are unavoidable.

Rep. Gilbert stated that if we fully fund actual costs, then we are not equalizing and that could create some problems. He would prefer that the committee come up with a percentage of what the district and the state should pay so each school is reimbursed equally.

- Rep. Schye asked if the 100 mills in the motion included retirement mills? Rep. Kadas stated that this is up to the committee.
- Rep. Peck asked Rep. Gilbert if you don't pay the retirement cost, you create disequalization because it falls on the local tax resources to fund it.
- Rep. Gilbert stated that conversely if you pay full costs and you have to appropriate money to do that, taxpayers are going to be paying for their retirement plus someone else's because you have got to equalize these mills.
- Rep. Schye said if retirement isn't funded equally, then it goes back on the local district's taxpayers. With this bill, you can't go back on the local district taxpayer, you have to take it out of your general fund schedules money.

Motion:

- Rep. Schye moved that he would like to use SB 203 as it was introduced. That version would retain the local levy for retirement and equalize 90% of the costs with a 22 mill state levy and the lottery goes to equalization.

Discussion:

- Rep. Eudaily stated that he is against the motion. It had a lot of consideration in the Senate and they decided to go another way with it. It seems that it has to be in the general fund because, it is tied to salaries.
- Rep. Kadas asked Mr. Cogley, what provision were made for increasing retirement costs in future years? Mr. Cogley stated that there were no provisions for that.
- Rep. Kadas asked Mr. Cogley if the bill requires OPI to cover 90% of the cost from year to year with 90% the first year. So if the costs go up, OPI has the authority to increase the total statewide millage in order to pay for it. Mr. Cogley stated that OPI would set the mill levy required each year and that would be based on retirement costs for the previous year.

Amendments, Discussion and Votes:

- The motion failed 4-3 Rep. Peck voting aye, Rep. Harrington voting aye, Rep. Schye voting aye, Rep. Gilbert voting nay, Rep. Glaser voting nay, Rep. Grinde voting nay, and Rep. Grinde voting nay and Rep. Kadas was present, but did not vote.

Discussion:

- Rep. Kadas stated that there is one other way of looking at retirement. The districts that are paying more in salaries than the average are the ones that are going to get hurt by funding entirely through the schedules. Those districts pay a higher average salary for two fundamental reasons. The

first is because they have experienced teachers and that is something that we want to encourage. The second reason is that the trustees, voters and the unions think that a higher wage is beneficial to the teachers which is a subjective decision that is made locally. One way of dealing with this issue is to fund retirement in the schedules, but weight the schedules for teacher experience.

Rep. Peck stated that was in Sen. Regan's bill, SB 198, and is in the LFA report of November 11, 1988 for HJR 16.

Rep. Eudaily asked Madalyn Quinlan about the actual procedure a district would go through to determine teacher experience. Ms. Quinlan stated that the schedules were set as a certain amount per pupil and then after the foundation amount has been determined for each district, you go back and look at the experience of the teachers overall in the district. Districts that have 65% of their teachers with two or three years of experience receive the foundation amount. If a majority of teachers have between three and seven years experience then the factor of 16% is added on the foundation payment and if 65% or more their teachers have seven or more years of experience then 27% is added on the foundation amount.

Rep. Kadas asked Ms. Quinlan how the LFA determined 16% and 27% for those levels of experience? Ms. Quinlan stated that the LFA study was based on the cost of meeting the proposed accreditation standards and those factors were determined on the basis of funding fewer teachers than are actually out there.

Rep. Kadas stated that he would not make a motion at this time.

Discussion: Comprehensive Insurance

Rep. Eudaily asked Mr. Cogley if the "gray bill" covered the total cost of FY 88 comprehensive insurance? Mr. Cogley said yes, but again, the figures that are in the schedules are FY 87 figures. If we use FY 88, that would be the full cost.

Rep. Eudaily stated that he has some problems with that. Some districts are heavily insured, some districts are under insured. If we are going to cover it all and distribute funding on a foundation program basis he isn't sure where the committee is headed.

Rep. Peck stated that it causes concern, because some districts pay for insurance out of their general fund rather than the comprehensive insurance budget. What kind of costs are we talking about? Mr. Cogley stated that the figure that was used is around \$11 million.

Rep. Kadas stated that he thinks the committee should leave it in the general fund. By leaving it in, it builds an incentive

for the trustees to find the most cost-effective insurance program that is available.

- Rep. Peck stated that under the gray bill, it is provided for in the foundation program schedules and it would take a positive motion to change that.
- Rep. Glaser stated that in the FY 88 amount is \$10,524,000 in the budgets for comprehensive insurance.
- Rep. Eudaily asked if the insurance on school buses is carried in the transportation fund or in of the comprehensive insurance fund? Mr. Groepper stated that it depends on how the school districts paid for their bus transportation. If they contracted out, it is part of the contract cost and doesn't show up in the comprehensive insurance.
- Rep Eudaily asked if they own their own bus, which fund do they put it? Mr. Groepper stated that they should be putting it into the comprehensive insurance fund, but a lot of districts contract out.
- Rep. Peck stated that comprehensive insurance will be included in the general fund and paid for through the foundation program schedules.

Discussion: Tuition

- Rep. Glaser stated that the Yellowstone Treatment Center relies totally on tuition and special education funding to survive.
- Rep. Kadas asked Mr. Cogley how attendance agreements, instead of tuition, were addressed in the gray bill. Mr. Cogley stated that the only change would be tuition payments will be taken out. The only reason for leaving the agreements there at all was that districts might still want to control the attendance.
- Rep. Kadas asked Mr. Cogley how the agreements work, what authority does a district have to send or receive students? Mr. Cogley stated that he is not real familiar with how the tuition agreements work now. There is no change in the discretion or the obligations that districts have to receive children. Those obligations are the same as now.
- Rep. Peck stated that currently if a youngster wants to go out of his district to attend school there is application for attendance outside of a district. The board approves that tuition agreement and, in some cases, it is mandatory that the sending district pays the tuition. In other cases, it is up to the family to pay if they want that child to attend that district.
- Rep. Kadas asked Rep. Peck if the receiving school then receives credit for that ANB? Rep. Peck stated yes, they receive credit.

Rep. Peck asked if there was much concern about eliminating tuition? Rep. Kadas stated that it revolves mostly on the level of equalization we finally get to. If we don't get to a very high level of equalization there will be a real incentive to keep tuition.

Rep. Peck asked Mr. Cogley if the gray bill is effective for FY 91? Mr. Cogley stated that the overall effective date of the bill is July 1, 1990. The schedule increases are for schedules that would be in effect for FY 1991.

Discussion: Expenditure Caps

Rep. Peck stated that the cap in the gray bill is effective in fiscal 1996 instead of fiscal 1995. So that in effect gives you five years instead of four.

Mr. Cogley stated that the cap was changed because the effective date of the bill was delayed for one year. Originally there was a five year phase-in period.

Rep. Schye stated that if you have caps, you almost have to have the inflation factor or your caps are cut down even further than they are. He also stated that when SB 203 originally came out, it required the budget to be capped at 117% by fiscal 1995, but that bill also had the CPI language in there.

Rep. Eudaily asked in reference to the 117% cap could Mr. Melby explain how they got the 117%? Mr. Melby stated that a 117% cap was based on the fact that the foundation program would be funded at 100% of 1988 actual expenditures. The cap is based on a foundation program which would insure that the state funded no less than 85% of each school district's general fund budget. Each school district if they voted the levy up to 117%, the voted levy would be no more than 15%. There will always be a minimum of 85%/15% split on the state and local share.

Rep. Kadas asked Mr. Cogley if there was any reference to PL 874 money in the gray bill? Mr. Cogley stated that there was no mention of it in the bill. He said there is an impact on it depending on what caps are being used. The cap may exclude the use of PL 874 money. The bill does need to address PL 874 just to make sure that we don't adversely impact the ability of districts that receive that money.

Rep. Peck asked Mr. Cogley if districts could use PL 874 money above the cap? Mr. Cogley stated that they could not use it above the cap in the "gray bill". He also thinks there should be an amendment.

Motion:

Rep. Kadas moved that whatever cap the committee uses should not effect PL 874 moneys using language from SB 203, 3rd reading

copy (page 69) as the model.

Amendments, Discussion and Votes:

Rep. Glaser stated that the committee should take a careful look at the million dollars a year that is going into Great Falls, because that is not because they have Indian students it is because of the military base there and the taxpayers benefit from that and not any one else.

Rep. Gilbert asked Rep. Peck if he would explain his reason why he objects to this motion. Rep. Peck stated that some of the highest spending districts in the state are PL 874 districts. It is a significant amount of money and if you don't include that in the equalization to the extent you can, then you are creating disequalization.

The motion failed 4-4 with Rep. Peck voting nay, Rep. Eudaily voting nay, Rep. Gilbert voting nay, Rep. Grinde voting nay, Rep. Glaser voting aye, Rep. Harrington voting aye, Rep. Kadas voting aye, Rep. Schye voting aye.

Discussion:

Rep. Glaser suggested that certain school size categories may need adjustment. He requested OPI to provide FY 88 data with expenditures by size category.

Discussion 180 Day Limit:

Rep. Peck asked Mr. Cogley if in the gray bill there is a limit to 180-days. Mr. Cogley stated that there is two ways to accomplish equalization of the number of days to be funded. One is to put a flat limit on days that can be conducted. The other is to limit the funding that is available to 180 days.

Motion:

Rep. Kadas moved that the committee amend the gray bill to limit the year to 180 days only for funding purposes, but allow districts to conduct more days if they wish.

Discussion:

Rep. Schye asked if they were talking about how many days the student is actually there? Rep. Peck responded yes.

Rep. Schye asked how many districts go over the 180 PI days. Sen. Nathe stated 72 districts.

Rep. Schye asked what is the furthest the districts go over the PI days? Sen. Nathe stated that Great Falls goes about 185 PI days.

Amendments, Discussion and Votes:

The motion passed unanimously. All members voted aye.

Motion:

Rep. Kadas moved that the committee go from the ANB method of

counting students for funding purposes to an ADA factor (enrollment count) six times a year on the first Monday of each month (October to March).

Discussion:

Rep. Eudaily asked Ms. Merrill how to account for PIR under an enrollment count? Ms. Merrill stated that in the bills that changed ADA there was no way of funding for PIR days. You could add funding equal to 1/180 for every PIR day.

Motion Withdrawn.

Rep. Kadas withdrew the motion.

Discussion Debt Service:

Rep. Eudaily asked if building reserve funds and debt service would be set up in a separate fund and no attempts made to put money in to it for a few years.

Rep. Glaser stated that the Governor has made a commitment to provide \$10 million for funding for debt service. Mr. Cogley stated that the appropriation was not in the bill.

Motion:

Rep. Kadas moved that the committee include an interim study on building and debt service costs, with an appropriation of \$10,000 for such a study.

Discussion:

Rep. Eudaily stated that he didn't think that the committee was ready to vote on this because the committee also has to study transportation.

Rep. Kadas stated that transportation could be studied, but transportation should be dealt with to a large extent this session.

Motion Withdrawn.

Rep. Kadas withdrew the motion pending more information on suggestion by Rep. Ramirez that funding could be accomplished by his HB 735.

Motion:

Rep. Kadas moved that the first equalization aid payment be at least 20% and the following payments be at least 7% each month.

Discussion

Rep. Eudaily asked Ms. Quinlan if there is a cash flow problem there? Ms. Quinlan stated that if the public school equalization account could only rely on its own funding it would be a problem, but they can borrow from the state general fund in order to make those payments.

Amendments, Discussion and Votes:

Motion passed unanimously with all members voting aye.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment At: 5:00 p.m.



REP. Ray Peck, Chairman

RP/jf

5304.min

NOTES ON PUBLIC SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION

For House Select Education Committee

By Andrea Merrill, Staff Researcher

Montana Legislative Council

March 1989

Types of Public School Transportation

The two types of public school transportation are school bus transportation and individual transportation.

The principal means of public school transportation is the school bus. Individual transportation consists of: paying the parent or guardian to drive the pupil(s) to school or to bus stops; reimbursing the parent or guardian for the pupil's room and board; or providing supervised correspondence or home study.

Eligibility Requirements

As provided in 20-10-101(2), MCA, in order to be eligible for state and county reimbursement for transportation, a public school pupil must be:

- (1) A resident of Montana;
- (2) Between the ages of 5 and 21;
- (3) Residing at least 3 miles, over the shortest practical route, from the nearest operating public

elementary school or high school, whichever is applicable; and

- (4) Deemed by law to reside with a parent or guardian who maintains legal residence within the boundaries of the district furnishing the transportation regardless of where the student actually lives when attending school.

Districts may also provide transportation to students who are not eligible for state and county reimbursement. These "ineligible" transportees include students who reside less than 3 miles from school and students who attend private schools. Districts may transport ineligible transportees on buses carrying eligible transportees as long as the ineligible transportee will not displace an eligible transportee because of lack of seating capacity. Similarly, the law permits districts to operate buses for the sole purpose of providing transportation for ineligible transportees. A district may charge the ineligible transportee for his share of the cost of operating a bus.

Public School Transportation Reimbursement Rates

Public school transportation funding is, in large part, the product of reimbursement schedules set by the Legislature. The reimbursement schedule for bus transportation allows a flat rate per bus mile (\$.80) for buses with rated capacities of not less than 12 or more than 45 seats. Buses with rated capacities exceeding 45 are reimbursed the basic rate per bus mile, plus an additional amount (\$.02) for each seat over 45.

The total reimbursement per bus mile is multiplied by the number of bus miles to determine total reimbursement.

A parent or guardian providing individual transportation is reimbursed at a rate of \$.20 per mile. In cases of excessive distance, impassible roads, or other circumstances of isolation, the parent or guardian may request an increase in the reimbursement rate. The increased rate due to isolation is $1\frac{1}{2}$ times the schedule rate. The parent or guardian is compensated for one round trip per day.

The schedule amount reimbursement for buses and individual transportation for a district includes contracts.

Cost Allocation

As provided in sections 20-10-144 through 20-10-146, MCA, public school transportation funding is shared by the state, counties, and local school districts according to the following method of allocation:

- (1) The state pays one-third of the schedule amount for both elementary and high school districts;
- (2) The county pays one-third of the schedule amount for elementary districts and two-thirds of the schedule amount for high school districts; and
- (3) The school district pays one-third of the schedule amount for elementary districts and any "over-schedule" costs for both elementary and high school districts.

For special education students, the state pays two-thirds of the schedule amount, the county pays one-third, and the district pays any over-schedule costs.

Financing

The state finances its share of the schedule amount from the general fund. County reimbursement (1/3) for elementary districts is financed from the countywide 28-mill levy for elementary schools. County reimbursement (2/3) for high school districts is funded by a separate county mill levy for high school transportation.

As noted, the county share of elementary district transportation is deducted from the 28-mill levy for elementary equalization proceeds. Revenues from this source are also used to determine the amount of state equalization aid a county will receive as part of the elementary district foundation program. Increased elementary district transportation expenditures do not affect the county because the elementary schools' share of equalized state aid remains constant. Increased county elementary district transportation expenditures affect the state because these expenditures will either reduce surplus county revenue paid to the state or increase the amount of state equalization aid paid to the county for districts.

The district share for elementary districts plus any over-schedule costs for both elementary and high school districts is funded from district property taxes, and there is a disparity among districts in terms of the number of mills levied to support public school transportation.

Option for Equalization

Deduct 100% of schedule amount (allowable reimbursements according to 20-10-141 and 20-10-142, MCA,) from the 28 mills and 17 mills of county equalization, as is done now in 20-9-334 for one-third of elementary schedule amount. Districts would still pay any over-schedule amount through the district transportation levy allowed in 20-10-144. State aid would come from an equalized source (45 mills) rather than state general fund. However, more revenue would be needed for "state equalization aid" to fund the foundation schedules.

Summary of SB 203 (Gray)
(Gray bill requested by Select Committee on Education 3/4/89)
Prepared for the Select Committee on Education
by Dave Cogley
Committee staff

This gray bill proposes the following changes in the current system of public school funding. All changes are effective July 1, 1990, and would not apply until school fiscal year 1991.

- (1) Combines the retirement fund and comprehensive insurance fund with the general fund (bill sections listed in (2) and (3) below), combines the bus depreciation fund with the transportation fund (sections 37 and 69), and combines the debt service, building reserve, and leased facilities funds into a capital projects fund (sections 18, 20 through 24, 26, 37, 52 through 62, 64, 65, 69, 70). The county retirement levy and comprehensive insurance levy are eliminated, but statutory levies for other funds are not changed. This leaves 4 budgeted funds: general, transportation, capital projects, and adult education.
- (2) Eliminates the county school retirement levy and district retirement fund, and provides for retirement, social security, and unemployment insurance to be budgeted in the district's general fund (sections 2, 3, 6, 9, 33, 37, 38; repeal of 20-9-501, 20-9-531, 20-9-532). Lottery revenue is rerouted to state equalization aid (sections 49 and 71). The foundation program is revised to provide retirement equalization support in the amount of each district's actual cost (sections 66 and 67). The Superintendent of Public Instruction is directed to annually prescribe a state levy sufficient to fund all employer contributions to retirement, social security, and unemployment insurance of the districts (section 6, 40, 66), and is required to directly pay such items on behalf of the districts (section 6, 67). Initiative 105 is amended to allow this levy (section 1).
- (3) Eliminates the comprehensive insurance levy and fund maintained by districts and includes comprehensive insurance costs in the district's general fund budget (sections 10 and 27, repeal of 20-9-105).
- (4) Eliminates the tuition fund and the requirement of tuition payments and agreements for pupils from another district, including special education pupils (sections 6 through 9, 11 through 17, 19, 29 through 32, 36; repeal of 20-5-303, 20-5-305 through 20-5-307, 20-5-312, 20-5-313). Attendance agreements are still required, as a method of controlling nonresident attendance. Tuition for out of state pupils could still be required through reciprocal agreements handled by OPI (section 17).
- (5) Increases the foundation program schedule amounts for elementary and high school districts by factors of 1.6 for elementary and 1.65 for high school, which is intended to reflect

the actual total general fund expenditures of the districts of the state (voted and non-voted) in the 1987 school fiscal year plus the total expenditure for comprehensive insurance in that year (sections 42 and 43). According to OPI, the increase apparently also reflects inclusion of 1987 special education expenditures, which is not distributed through the schedules. (The bill does not revise the schedules for FY 90.) Factors have since been developed using 1988 expenditures, but adjustments based on 1988 expenditures were not formally adopted as amendments by the Senate committee. ~~A CPI inflation index is provided in the schedules to automatically increase them each year after FY 1991.~~ The bill does not address funding sources for the additional schedule amount, other than transferring lottery revenue from retirement equalization to state equalization aid.

(6) Limits the amount of any additional voted levy so that the maximum allowable general fund budget may not exceed 117% of the foundation program (maximum general fund budget without a vote) of the district (section 51). This results in 85% equalization of the districts' maximum general fund budgets. The bill provides a five year period (until school fiscal year 1996) for districts to come under the limitation.

(7) Eliminates the district permissive levy of up to 10 mills (section 9, 36, 39; repeal of 20-9-352). This results in the foundation program becoming 100% of the maximum general fund budget without a vote.

(8) Reduces the general fund cash reserve limit from 35% to 20% except for those districts not receiving state equalization aid (section 34).

(9) Establishes the school term for all schools as 180 PI days (sections 4 and 5). This prevents a district from receiving more foundation program support if it conducts extra days of school.

(10) Provides for monthly payments of state equalization aid to the districts, with a 20% first payment in July (section 45). The bill does not change the current mechanisms for county equalization and state equalization of funding under 20-9-331, 20-9-333, and 20-9-343, and districts which raise their foundation program support from the local levy will not receive state equalization payments.

The bill does not make any change in the level or method of funding special education, except that as drafted it does eliminate tuition for special education students. If full funding of special education is to be addressed, that will have to be amended in.

The bill does not address equalization of transportation, capital outlay, adult education, or use of PL 874 funds. It does not affect the method of calculating ANB, and does not change any sources of county or state revenue currently designated. It makes no change in the structure of the foundation program

schedules.

Many language changes in the bill are non-substantive. In drafting this and other school funding equalization bills an attempt was made to use consistent language and style in the areas where the same issue or goal was addressed. For instance the term "maximum general fund budget without a vote" or equivalent terminology is replaced with "foundation program" or "foundation program amount" in the bills eliminating the permissive levy. Other changes reflect clean up of provisions left over from legislative changes made in the past. For instance, references to "vocational technical center fund" are deleted because of the transfer of those centers to the board of regents by House Bill 39 (1987). Some statutes currently contain incomplete references to revenue sources designated by other statutes, and an attempt was made to provide a complete listing of such other statutes for the convenience of the code user. For instance, see section 48, amendment of 20-9-333 (2)(d).

If the committee chooses to go in the direction indicated in this gray bill, some further items to consider are:

- (1) schedule adjustments for FY 1990;
- (2) use of FY 1988 actual costs, plus whatever increase may be provided between FY 1988 and FY 1990, for purpose of FY 1991 schedule adjustments (OPI has the 1988 figures);
- (3) require any balance in retirement or insurance funds to be transferred to general fund;
- (4) exclude PL 874 funding from the general fund budget limitation;
- (5) replace the statutory appropriation for retirement equalization levy proceeds (original section 2 and 39 of the bill);
- (6) adopt a statement of intent with regard to the rulemaking required by the superintendent for administration of retirement equalization.

Current law	SB 203 (introduced)	SB 203 (gray)	SB 203 (3rd reading)
<u>11 budgeted funds, 15+ nonbudgeted funds, reserves in some</u>	Retain current funds except add comprehensive insurance to GF	4 budgeted funds: general, building, transportation, adult education	Retain current funds except add retirement to GF
<u>Mandatory county retirement levy for PERS, TRS, UI, SS, (25 mill average) district retirement fund, lottery \$ used for equalization</u>	Retain local levy and fund, but equalize 90% with state levy, lottery \$ to state equalization	Eliminate local levy, retirement in GF, 100% equalized with state levy, OPI to direct pay 100% of each district's cost	Eliminate local levy, retirement in GF, included in FP schedule
<u>Mandatory district levy for comprehensive insurance (5 mill average)</u>	Included in GF and FP schedule	Included in GF and FP schedule	No change, but study needs and method of equalization (\$5 million appropriation proposed for state support in FY 91 - separate bill)
<u>Separate tuition fund, tuition agreements required for nonresident pupils</u>	No tuition except out of state, attendance agreements required	Same as introduced, except effective July 1990	Same as introduced, except effective FY 91
<u>FP schedules not based on actual costs of operating schools</u>	FP schedules reflect 100% of actual FY 87 GF expenditures, less state sp. ed. payment? (60%-65% increase)	Same as introduced, except effective FY 91	FP schedule reflects inclusion of retirement only (18.6% increase) for FY 90, then additional 30.1 % increase for FY 91
<u>No statutory expenditure limitations (except I-105)</u>	Voted levy capped at 117% of FP by 1995 (GF 85% equalized)	Same as introduced, except cap effective 1996	Sliding cap based on past level of spending per pupil

7.	<u>10-mill permissive levy</u> (elem. and H.S.)	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate
8.	<u>State revenue sources</u> earmarked for FP	No change except state levy to fund retirement and add lottery to state equalization	Same as introduced	No change except add lottery
9.	<u>Local revenue sources</u> (federal forest, grazing, vehicle, misc. used for county equalization)	No change	No change	No change
10.	<u>PL 874</u> not counted as resource for equalization	No change	No change	No change
11.	<u>General fund reserve limit</u> of 35%; no penalty for exceeding limit	20% limit on GF reserve except districts receiving no state equalization	Same as introduced, but retain 35% limit for districts receiving no state equalization	Same as gray
12.	FP schedule structure based on school size	No change	No change	No change
13.	Minimum <u>180-day</u> school year with no maximum, no limit on days creates disequity in FP payments	No change	Limit school year to 180 days for all schools	Same as gray
14.	Payments based on <u>ANB</u> (ANB is 150,000, but actual pupils approx. 130,000)	No change	No change	No change

15. <u>Building/debt service not equalized</u>	No change	No change	Study needs and method of equalization (\$10 million appropriation proposed for state support for FY 91 - separate bill)
16. <u>Transportation program separate</u>	No change	No change	Study needs and method of equalization (\$10 million appropriation proposed for state support for FY 91 - separate bill)
17. <u>Special education part of GF and FP, actual costs not fully funded, separate accounting and OPI oversight</u>	No change, except eliminates tuition	Same as introduced	Equalizes by using average sp. ed. salaries (\$6 million increased state funding proposed for FY 90 and 91 in separate bill)
18. <u>Elementary and high school districts may be separate</u>	No change	No change	No change
19. <u>Current payment schedule is 5 times a year</u>	Monthly payments of state equalization aid, with 20% in first payment (July)	Same as introduced	Same as introduced

NANCY KEEMAN, SUPERINTENDENT

OFFICE OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, March 4, 1989

***** SCHOOL DISTRICT GENERAL FUND - SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91 *****

The Office of Public Instruction provided estimates of major public school foundation program proposals on February 28, 1989. Each proposal incorporates other funds into a new General Fund structure. Estimates of each school district's school year (SY) 1990-91 general fund needs may be estimated by reducing the foundation program funding for each proposal by the new fund revenue or by fund expenditures for SY1987-88 (FY88).

The following illustrations show the amount OVER or (UNDER) SY87-88 (FY88) general fund expenditures.

The amount OVER represents the estimated funds available to the general fund from the foundation program above fiscal 1988 general fund expenditures. The amount OVER could include inflation, increased per student expenditures in below-average districts, and reduced reliance on voted levies.

The amount (UNDER) represents the estimated funding level required from other sources (voted levies, PL874, etc.) to obtain the general fund expenditure level of SY1987-88 (FY88).

COUNTY	DISTRICT	-School Year 1988-89-	- - - - School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) - - - -	
		FNDN PROGRAM AMOUNT Schedules w/o Spec Ed (MSFBWV) No change to schedules	FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS w/o Special Ed SB203 - NATHE changes as of 2/10/89	SB203 - GOVERNOR as amended and described 2/24/89
HILL	HAVRE ELEM	2,731,081	5,342,955	4,214,020
FY88 EXPENDITURES or NEW FUNDS				
	ANB	1,703		
	Retirement		558,851	558,851
	Comprehensive Insur		69,535	\$33 per student 56,199
	Transporta (% Res)			.33 X transp. 66,413
	Adult Education			
	Capital Outlay			\$66 per student 112,398
	Available for Genl Fund Exp	\$2,731,081	\$4,714,569	\$3,420,159
	FY88 Genl Fund Exp w/o Sp Ed	3,818,867	3,818,867	3,818,867
	Avail Genl Fund OVER (UNDER) FY88	(1,087,786)	895,702	(398,709)
	% of Foundation Program	-39.8%	16.8%	-9.5%

OFFICE OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, March 4, 1989

		-School Year 1988-89- FNDN PROGRAM AMOUNT Schedules w/o Spec Ed (MGFBWW) No change to schedules	- - - - School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) - - - - FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS w/o Special Ed SB203 - NATHE changes as of 2/10/89	SB203 - GOVERNOR as amended and described 2-24/89
--	--	---	---	---

CASCADE	GREAT FALLS ELEM	13,278,076	25,747,351	20,487,885
---------	------------------	------------	------------	------------

FY88 EXPENDITURES or NEW FUNDS

ANB	8,295			
Retirement			2,517,876	2,517,876
Comprehensive Insur			454,610	\$33 per student 273,735
Transporta (& Res)				.33 X transp. 252,156
Adult Education				
Capital Outlay				\$66 per student 547,470
Available for Genl Fund Exp		\$13,278,076	\$22,774,865	\$16,896,648
FY88 Genl Fund Exp w/o Sp Ed		19,684,191	19,684,191	19,684,191
Avail Genl Fund OVER (UNDER) FY88		(6,406,115)	3,090,674	(2,787,543)
% of Foundation Program		-48.2%	12.0%	-13.6%

CASCADE	GREAT FALLS H S	7,198,716	13,971,990	11,107,518
---------	-----------------	-----------	------------	------------

FY88 EXPENDITURES or NEW FUNDS

ANB	3,612			
Retirement			1,444,843	1,444,843
Comprehensive Insur			243,045	\$33 per student 119,196
Transporta (& Res)				.33 X transp. 155,225
Adult Education				
Capital Outlay				\$66 per student 238,392
Available for Genl Fund Exp		\$7,198,716	\$12,284,102	\$9,149,862
FY88 Genl Fund Exp w/o Sp Ed		10,991,271	10,991,271	10,991,271
Avail Genl Fund OVER (UNDER) FY88		(3,792,555)	1,292,831	(1,841,409)
% of Foundation Program		-52.7%	9.3%	-16.6%

GALLATIN	BOZEMAN ELEM	4,372,867	8,532,143	6,747,273
----------	--------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

FY88 EXPENDITURES or NEW FUNDS

ANB	2,736			
Retirement			890,380	890,380
Comprehensive Insur			96,019	\$33 per student 90,288
Transporta (& Res)				.33 X transp. 177,257

OFFICE OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, March 4, 1989

COUNTY	DISTRICT	-School Year 1988-89-	---	School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991)	---
		FNDN PROGRAM AMOUNT Schedules w/o Spec Ed (MGFRWV) No change to schedules	---	FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS w/o Special Ed SB203 - NATHE changes as of 2/10/89	---
	Adult Education Capital Outlay			\$66 per student	180,576
	Available for Genl Fund Exp	\$4,372,867		\$7,545,744	\$5,408,772
	FY88 Genl Fund Exp w/o Sp Ed	6,586,347		6,586,347	6,586,347
	Avail Genl Fund OVER (UNDER) FY88	(2,213,480)		959,397	(1,177,575)
	% of Foundation Program	-50.6%		11.2%	-17.5%
GLACIER	BROWNING ELEM	2,216,015		4,445,419	3,419,280
	FY88 EXPENDITURES or NEW FUNDS				
	ANB 1,360				
	Retirement			592,522	592,522
	Comprehensive Insur			126,452	44,890
	Transporta (& Res)				.33 X transp. 91,288
	Adult Education Capital Outlay			\$66 per student	89,760
	Available for Genl Fund Exp	\$2,216,015		\$3,726,445	\$2,600,830
	FY88 Genl Fund Exp w/o Sp Ed	4,619,883		4,619,883	4,619,883
	Avail Genl Fund OVER (UNDER) FY88	(2,403,868)		(893,438)	(2,019,053)
	% of Foundation Program	-108.5%		-20.1%	-59.0%
LEWIS & CLARK HELENA ELEM		7,542,422		14,793,057	11,637,852
	FY89 EXPENDITURES or NEW FUNDS				
	ANB 4,682				
	Retirement			1,561,869	1,561,869
	Comprehensive Insur			226,229	154,506
	Transporta (& Res)				.33 X transp. 129,972
	Adult Education Capital Outlay			\$66 per student	309,012
	Available for Genl Fund Exp	\$7,542,422		\$13,004,959	\$9,482,493
	FY89 Genl Fund Exp w/o Sp Ed	11,814,681		11,814,681	11,814,581
	Avail Genl Fund OVER (UNDER) FY88	(4,272,259)		1,190,278	(2,332,189)
	% of Foundation Program	-56.6%		8.0%	-20.0%

OFFICE OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, March 4, 1989

		-School Year 1988-89- FNDN PROGRAM AMOUNT Schedules w/o Spec Ed (MGFBWV) No change to schedules	----- School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) ----- FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS w/o Special Ed SB203 - NATHE changes as of 2/10/89	----- SB203 - GOVERNOR as amended and described 2/24/89
--	--	---	---	--

LEWIS & CLARK HELENA HIGH SCHOOL		5,530,575	10,726,976	8,533,600
----------------------------------	--	-----------	------------	-----------

FY88 EXPENDITURES or NEW FUNDS

ANB	2,775			
Retirement			1,102,714	1,102,714
Comprehensive Insur			122,988	\$33 per student 91,575
Transporta (& Res)				.33 X transp. 129,929
Adult Education				
Capital Outlay				\$66 per student 183,150
-----		-----	-----	-----
Available for Genl Fund Exp	\$5,530,575	\$9,501,274		\$7,026,232
-----		-----	-----	-----
FY88 Genl Fund Exp w/o Sp Ed	9,111,810	9,111,810		9,111,810
-----		-----	-----	-----
Avail Genl Fund OVER (UNDER) FY88	(3,581,235)	389,464		(2,085,578)
% of Foundation Program	-64.8%	3.6%		-24.4%

LINCOLN MCCORMICK ELEM		52,732	91,994	81,634
------------------------	--	--------	--------	--------

FY88 EXPENDITURES or NEW FUNDS

ANB	34			
Retirement			5,578	5,578
Comprehensive Insur			3,203	\$33 per student 1,122
Transporta (& Res)				.33 X transp. 3,014
Adult Education				
Capital Outlay				\$66 per student 2,244
-----		-----	-----	-----
Available for Genl Fund Exp	\$52,732	\$83,213		\$69,676
-----		-----	-----	-----
FY88 Genl Fund Exp w/o Sp Ed	55,371	55,371		55,371
-----		-----	-----	-----
Avail Genl Fund OVER (UNDER) FY88	(2,639)	27,842		14,305
% of Foundation Program	-5.0%	30.3%		17.5%

MISSOULA MISSOULA H S		7,184,189	13,994,580	11,085,104
-----------------------	--	-----------	------------	------------

FY88 EXPENDITURES or NEW FUNDS

ANB	3,561			
Retirement			1,492,712	1,492,712
Comprehensive Insur			231,909	\$33 per student 117,513
Transporta (& Res)				.33 X transp. 237,562

OFFICE OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, March 4, 1989

COUNTY	DISTRICT	-School Year 1988-89-	- - - - School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) - - - -
		FNDN PROGRAM AMOUNT Schedules w/ Spec Ed (MSFBWV) No change to schedules	FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS w/ Special Ed SB203 - NATHE changes as of 2/10/89
			SB203 - GOVERNOR as amended and described 2/24/89
	Adult Education		
	Capital Outlay		\$66 per student 235,026
	Available for Genl Fund Exp	\$7,184,189	\$12,269,959 \$9,002,291
	FY88 Genl Fund Exp w/ Sp Ed	11,904,490	11,904,490 11,904,490
	Avail Genl Fund OVER (UNDER) FY88	(4,720,301)	365,469 (2,902,199)
	% of Foundation Program	-65.7%	2.6% -26.2%
PHILLIPS	MALTA H S	512,057	978,315 790,057
	FY88 EXPENDITURES or NEW FUNDS		
	ANB 221		
	Retirement		87,239 87,238
	Comprehensive Insur		19,756 \$33 per student 7,293
	Transporta (& Res)		.33 X transp. 18,963
	Adult Education		
	Capital Outlay		\$66 per student 14,586
	Available for Genl Fund Exp	\$512,057	\$871,321 \$662,017
	FY88 Genl Fund Exp w/ Sp Ed	884,895	884,895 884,895
	Avail Genl Fund OVER (UNDER) FY88	(372,838)	(13,574) (222,878)
	% of Foundation Program	-72.8%	-1.4% -28.2%
SILVER BOW	BUTTE ELEM	6,030,037	11,954,104 9,304,262
	FY88 EXPENDITURES or NEW FUNDS		
	ANB 3,769		
	Retirement		1,420,485 1,420,485
	Comprehensive Insur		155,186 \$33 per student 124,377
	Transporta (& Res)		.33 X transp. 133,856
	Adult Education		
	Capital Outlay		\$66 per student 248,754
	Available for Genl Fund Exp	\$6,030,037	\$10,378,433 \$7,376,790
	FY88 Genl Fund Exp w/ Sp Ed	10,200,101	10,200,101 10,200,101
	Avail Genl Fund OVER (UNDER) FY88	(4,170,064)	178,332 (2,823,311)
	% of Foundation Program	-69.2%	1.5% -30.3%

OFFICE OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, March 4, 1989

COUNTY	DISTRICT	-School Year 1988-89-	- - - - School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) - - - -	
		FNDN PROGRAM AMOUNT Schedules w/o Spec Ed (MGBFHWV) No change to schedules	FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS w/o Special Ed SB203 - NATHE changes as of 2/10/89	SB203 - GOVERNOR as amended and described 2/24/89
YELLOWSTONE	BILLINGS ELEM	16,256,409	32,100,785	25,083,411
FY88 EXPENDITURES or NEW FUNDS				
ANB	10,146			
Retirement			3,641,868	3,641,868
Comprehensive Insur			555,205	334,819
Transporta (& Res)				.33 X transp. 489,966
Adult Education				
Capital Outlay				\$66 per student 669,636
Available for Genl Fund Exp		\$16,256,409	\$27,903,712	\$19,947,123
FY88 Genl Fund Exp w/o Sp Ed		26,348,674	26,348,674	26,348,674
Avail Genl Fund OVER (UNDER) FY88		(10,092,265)	1,555,038	(6,401,551)
% of Foundation Program		-62.1%	4.8%	-25.5%

Foundation program funds available for district general fund expenditures are shown below for each proposal. The figures were obtained using the illustrated methods.

The amount OVER represents estimated funds available in addition to the 1987-88 general fund expenditure level. The OVER amount could include inflation, increased per student expenditures in below-average expenditures districts, and reduced reliance on voted levies.

The amount (UNDER) represents the estimated funding required from other sources (voted levies, PLB74, etc.) to obtain the general fund expenditure level of SY1987-88 (FY88).

- - - - School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) - - - -

AVAILABLE GENERAL FUND OVER (UNDER) FY 88 GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES
Based on estimates of funding Foundation Program proposals, February 28, 1989

COUNTY	DISTRICT	- Current FNDN PROGRAM -		- - - - FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS - - - -			
		(MGFBWV)	% of Schedules Unchanged	SB203 - NATHE	% of FND PRGB as of 2/10/89	SB203 - GOVERNOR	% of FND PRGB as of 2/24/89
BEAVERHEAD	BRANT ELEM	(4,691)	-9%	24,067	27%	7,183	9%
	DILLON ELEM	(533,560)	-34%	589,041	20%	(111,389)	-5%
	BEAVERHEAD CO HS	(502,014)	-59%	104,432	6%	(347,690)	-26%
	WISE RIVER ELEM	(10,657)	-20%	19,168	21%	6,655	8%
	LIMA ELEM	(20,816)	-12%	98,349	30%	31,013	11%
	LIMA H S	(5,499)	-3%	112,495	34%	60,368	22%
	WISDOM ELEM	(31,801)	-57%	586	1%	(15,121)	-19%
	POLARIS ELEM	(1,539)	-8%	11,338	32%	6,269	20%
	JACKSON ELEM	(5,502)	-12%	19,416	24%	11,375	16%
REICHL ELEM	1,164	3%	27,156	34%	15,235	22%	
BIG HORN	SQUIRREL CRK ELEM	(12,953)	-62%	(2,506)	-7%	(8,175)	-25%
	FRYOR ELEM	(407,775)	-259%	(336,394)	-106%	(400,783)	-165%
	COMMUNITY ELEM	(10,761)	-23%	15,918	19%	3,193	4%
	HARDIN ELEM	(1,539,102)	-88%	(309,695)	-9%	(1,168,742)	-43%
	HARDIN H S	(832,742)	-92%	(203,280)	-12%	(595,926)	-43%
	BIG BEND ELEM	59	0%	11,936	35%	8,681	28%
	LODGE GRASS ELEM	(970,500)	-160%	(567,239)	-47%	(865,076)	-92%
	LODGE GRASS H S	(674,359)	-176%	(423,690)	-57%	(605,394)	-103%
	MYOLA ELEM	(491,980)	-311%	(392,380)	-120%	(474,057)	-194%
	PLENTY COUPS HS	(633,247)	-273%	(461,281)	-97%	(590,716)	-165%
BLAINE	CHINOOK ELEM	(300,606)	-56%	83,478	8%	(170,041)	-21%
	CHINOOK H S	(244,455)	-54%	70,470	8%	(110,926)	-16%
	HARLEM ELE	(806,088)	-122%	(353,289)	-27%	(692,776)	-68%
	HARLEM H S	(467,949)	-126%	(210,271)	-29%	(369,760)	-64%
	CLEVELAND ELEM	1,139	3%	27,877	38%	9,290	14%
	ZURICH ELEM	20,852	17%	95,120	45%	60,075	32%
	LLOYD ELEM	1,283	6%	14,641	40%	9,161	28%
	CJW ISLAND TRAIL	1,355	7%	14,206	41%	9,925	32%
	TURNER ELEM	(88,947)	-52%	27,831	8%	(67,171)	-25%
	TURNER H S	(113,535)	-75%	(12,943)	-5%	(73,841)	-32%
	HAYS-LODGE POLE E	(622,254)	-200%	(392,508)	-60%	(579,264)	-121%
	BEAR PAW ELEM	5,664	9%	44,713	41%	29,535	30%
	N HARLEM COLONY E	(14)	0%	11,863	33%	6,713	22%
	HAYS-LODGE POLE H	(427,977)	-179%	(251,064)	-52%	(395,240)	-107%

- - - - School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) - - - -
 AVAILABLE GENERAL FUND OVER (UNDER) FY 88 GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES
 Based on estimates of funding Foundation Program proposals, February 28, 1989

COUNTY	DISTRICT	- Current FNDN PROGRAM -		- - - - FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS - - - -			
		(M6F6WV) Schedules Unchanged	% of FND PR06	SB203 - NATHE as of 2/10/89	% of FND PR06	SB203 -- GOVERNOR as of 2/24/89	% of FND PR06
BROADWATER	TOWNSEND ELEM	(46,361)	-6%	517,357	35%	199,123	16%
	CROW CREEK EL	0		0		0	
	TOSTON ELEM	(8,746)	-40%	1,515	4%	(1,927)	-6%
	BROADWATER CO HS	(125,336)	-23%	259,077	25%	61,364	7%
CARBON	RED LODGE ELEM	(204,264)	-34%	226,944	20%	(32,715)	-4%
	RED LODGE H S	(208,447)	-56%	52,410	7%	(103,828)	-18%
	BRIDGER ELEM	(198,882)	-64%	26,567	4%	(125,209)	-26%
	BRIDGER H S	(212,522)	-79%	(26,995)	-5%	(134,083)	-32%
	JOLIET ELEM	(63,362)	-14%	259,709	31%	69,292	10%
	JOLIET H S	(145,996)	-53%	47,350	9%	(69,290)	-16%
	JACKSON ELEM	4,660	10%	31,998	41%	20,158	29%
	LUTHER ELEM	9,484	21%	36,516	47%	25,349	38%
	ROBERTS ELEM	(41,238)	-22%	93,698	26%	11,860	4%
	ROBERTS H S	9,611	5%	156,278	41%	86,103	27%
	BOYD ELEM	(1,385)	-3%	24,707	32%	15,549	23%
	FROMBERG ELEM	(37,346)	-15%	145,170	30%	40,462	11%
	FROMBERG H S	(69,610)	-29%	99,830	22%	15,750	4%
	EDGAR ELEM	(28,396)	-61%	(5,005)	-6%	(13,453)	-19%
	BELFRY ELEM	(185,826)	-81%	(20,434)	-5%	(124,232)	-35%
BELFFY H S	(129,625)	-66%	2,502	1%	(66,621)	-22%	
CARTER	HAMMOND-BOX ELDER	1,964	5%	27,520	38%	18,176	28%
	JOHNSTON ELEM	1,459	7%	13,734	39%	9,275	30%
	ALBION ELEM	624	3%	13,173	37%	8,181	25%
	PINE HILL-PLAINVW	5,635	13%	31,745	44%	21,815	34%
	EYALAKA ELEM	(142,594)	-72%	(2,680)	-1%	(98,125)	-32%
	RIDGE ELEM	4	0%	11,982	34%	7,593	24%
	ALZADA ELEM	789	4%	12,791	34%	8,703	26%
	CARTER CO H S	(131,015)	-51%	41,053	8%	(72,548)	-18%
CASCADE	GREAT FALLS EL	(6,406,115)	-48%	3,090,674	12%	(2,787,543)	-14%
	GREAT FALLS H S	(3,792,555)	-53%	1,292,831	9%	(1,841,409)	-17%
	CASCADE ELEM	(139,294)	-39%	119,714	17%	(61,329)	-11%
	CASCADE H S	(156,844)	-39%	125,100	16%	(70,317)	-11%
	CENTERVILLE EL	(40,277)	-10%	255,589	33%	86,381	14%
	CENTERVILLE H S	(62,703)	-22%	138,345	26%	18,643	4%
	BELT ELEM	(160,133)	-39%	121,182	15%	(50,772)	-8%
	BELT H S	(166,625)	-55%	33,023	6%	(90,532)	-19%
	SIMMS H S	(203,702)	-47%	91,410	11%	(96,751)	-15%
	VAUGHN ELEM	(39,853)	-12%	189,316	30%	53,819	11%
	ULM ELEM	(15,237)	-7%	129,618	32%	55,127	17%
	SUN RIVER VALLEY	(124,029)	-24%	235,010	24%	131,272	17%
	Sun River Ele						
	Fort Shaw - Simm						
DEEP CREEK ELEM	2,933	9%	23,336	40%	15,681	30%	
CHOUTEAU	FT BENTON ELEM	(442,799)	-77%	(34,380)	-3%	(238,789)	-27%
	FT BENTON H S	(467,208)	-120%	(210,606)	-29%	(375,229)	-62%

- - - - School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) - - - -
 AVAILABLE GENERAL FUND OVER (UNDER) FY 88 GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES
 Based on estimates of funding Foundation Program proposals, February 28, 1989

COUNTY	DISTRICT	- Current FNDN PROGRAM -		- - - - FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS - - - -			
		(MGBFNV) Schedules Unchanged	% of FND PRG	SB203 - NATHE as of 2/10/89	% of FND PRG	SB203 - GOVERNOR as of 2/24/89	% of FND PRG
	LOMA ELEM	(27,336)	-136%	(16,699)	-48%	(19,127)	-61%
	BIG SANDY ELEM	(215,018)	-57%	47,527	6%	(143,569)	-25%
	BIG SANDY H S	(226,599)	-73%	(16,284)	-3%	(145,970)	-30%
	WARRICK ELEM	(867)	-4%	10,799	31%	8,075	26%
	HIGHWOOD ELEM	(150,851)	-75%	(12,718)	-3%	(108,865)	-35%
	HIGHWOOD H S	(106,550)	-67%	(870)	0%	(59,212)	-24%
	GERALDINE ELEM	(175,811)	-84%	(26,161)	-6%	(137,713)	-43%
	GERALDINE H S	(163,827)	-75%	(12,571)	-3%	(108,163)	-32%
	CARTER ELEM	(11,182)	-55%	461	1%	(8,085)	-26%
	KNEES ELEM	(10,975)	-47%	2,600	6%	(3,890)	-11%
	BENTON LAKE EL	(13,002)	-60%	(2,114)	-6%	(5,275)	-16%
CLUSTER	MILES CITY ELEM	(1,030,504)	-48%	490,938	12%	(433,616)	-13%
	KIRCHER ELEM	4,683	4%	73,540	37%	39,741	23%
	GARLAND ELEM	4,369	19%	17,996	46%	12,617	36%
	TRAIL CREEK EL	828	4%	12,092	35%	9,324	30%
	HKT-BASIN SPR CRK	3,089	8%	27,576	39%	16,173	26%
	COTTONWOOD EL	(731)	-2%	25,915	35%	14,748	23%
	WHITNEY CRK EL	2,373	12%	14,569	42%	9,755	31%
	MOON CREEK EL	(659)	-3%	11,399	33%	7,272	23%
	KINSEY ELEM	4,092	4%	58,855	35%	28,101	19%
	TWIN BUTTES EL	1,845	9%	13,897	39%	9,204	30%
	S Y ELEM	537	2%	14,097	36%	8,980	26%
	S H-FOSTER CRK EL	736	4%	11,768	34%	8,535	27%
	CLUSTER CO H S	(712,309)	-49%	310,563	11%	(280,123)	-12%
DANIELS	SCOBEY ELEM	(204,334)	-51%	71,804	9%	(110,050)	-18%
	SCOBEY H S	(256,191)	-91%	(68,967)	-12%	(205,660)	-47%
	PEERLESS ELEM	(88,166)	-67%	7,410	3%	(66,229)	-33%
	PEERLESS H S	(31,318)	-23%	62,615	24%	6,013	3%
	FLAXVILLE ELEM	(71,248)	-51%	25,569	9%	(35,763)	-17%
	FLAXVILLE H S	(52,268)	-41%	31,491	13%	(12,898)	-7%
DAWSON	GLENDALE ELEM	(749,578)	-38%	646,150	17%	(224,251)	-7%
	DAWSON CO H S	(1,051,944)	-92%	(268,761)	-12%	(770,046)	-43%
	UPPER CRACKERBOX/	(393)	-2%	10,096	28%	5,068	16%
	BLOOMFIELD ELEM	(3,205)	-7%	24,572	30%	13,759	19%
	LINDSAY ELEM	1,411	3%	29,346	36%	17,836	25%
	Union Elem						
	RICHEY ELEM	189,294	102%	331,893	101%	281,791	99%
	RICHEY H S	197,936	100%	344,446	100%	300,759	98%
	DEER CREEK ELEM	(28,334)	-52%	1,958	2%	(14,288)	-17%
DEER LODGE	ANADONDA ELEM	(633,062)	-35%	746,605	21%	(112,190)	-4%
	ANADONDA H S	(463,637)	-40%	393,360	18%	(103,901)	-6%
FALLON	BAKER ELEM	(746,232)	-110%	(280,124)	-21%	(620,604)	-59%
	BAKER H S	(854,318)	-180%	(533,253)	-56%	(764,884)	-105%
	FERTILE PRAIRIE E	(6,025)	-30%	6,852	19%	(4,327)	-14%

- - - - School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) - - - -
 AVAILABLE GENERAL FUND OVER (UNDER) FY 88 GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES
 Based on estimates of funding Foundation Program proposals, February 28, 1989

COUNTY	DISTRICT	- Current FNDN PROGRAM -		- - - - FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS - - - -			
		(MGFRWV) Schedules	% of Unchanged FND PRG	SB203 - NATHE as of 2/10/89	% of FND PRG	SB203 - GOVERNOR as of 2/24/89	% of FND PRG
	PLEVNA ELEM	(168,352)	-93%	(63,453)	-19%	(140,303)	-50%
	PLEVNA H S	(123,961)	-84%	(26,190)	-9%	(88,713)	-39%
FERGUS	LEWISTOWN ELEM	(716,443)	-44%	453,327	14%	(318,702)	-13%
	FERGUS H S	(252,983)	-25%	462,042	24%	88,153	6%
	MAIDEN ELEM	(6,008)	-29%	6,234	17%	1,684	5%
	BROOKS ELEM	(11,228)	-49%	2,196	5%	(4,508)	-13%
	DEERFIELD ELEM	1,818	5%	23,167	39%	16,349	31%
	COTTONWOOD ELEM	1,985	10%	14,284	41%	10,040	32%
	GRASS RANGE EL	(32,909)	-19%	87,401	26%	17,729	7%
	GRASS RANGE H S	(61,934)	-46%	30,218	12%	(21,966)	-10%
	YINS COLONY EL	541	3%	12,689	36%	9,019	29%
	MOORE ELEM	(92,504)	-47%	50,469	13%	(39,320)	-13%
	MOORE H S	(76,075)	-45%	39,815	12%	(24,053)	-9%
	HILGER ELEM	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	ROY ELEM	(54,483)	-55%	11,614	6%	(31,120)	-20%
	ROY H S	(66,053)	-58%	11,073	5%	(31,064)	-18%
	DENTON ELEM	(84,306)	-34%	93,022	19%	(14,589)	-4%
	DENTON H S	(94,181)	-51%	34,085	10%	(33,542)	-12%
	SPRING CRK COLONY	845	4%	12,895	37%	9,716	31%
WINIFRED ELEM	(40,301)	-20%	107,733	28%	21,024	7%	
WINIFRED H S	(88,551)	-72%	(4,379)	-2%	(52,365)	-27%	
AYERS ELEM	(1,207)	-6%	10,694	31%	7,299	23%	
FLATHEAD	DEER PARK ELEM	23,339	10%	200,972	45%	131,891	35%
	FAIR-MONT-EGAN EL	2,013	1%	132,852	35%	80,104	24%
	SWAN RIVER EL	15,650	5%	234,416	42%	129,429	28%
	KALISPELL ELEM	(1,333,732)	-36%	1,399,178	19%	(363,683)	-6%
	FLATHEAD H S	(1,973,136)	-48%	945,394	12%	(902,230)	-14%
	COLUMBIA FALLS EL	(939,017)	-40%	787,559	17%	(258,332)	-7%
	COLUMBIA FALLS H	(640,401)	-46%	321,594	12%	(265,293)	-12%
	CRESTON ELEM	(2,350)	-2%	52,964	32%	30,123	21%
	DAYUSE PRAIRIE EL	26,877	7%	288,729	43%	160,121	29%
	HELENA FLATS EL	(29,298)	-9%	217,896	34%	107,507	20%
	KILA ELEM	(60,045)	-41%	26,782	10%	(14,927)	-7%
	BATAVIA ELEM	7,736	5%	97,857	37%	61,756	27%
	PLEASANT VALLEY E	(7,747)	-22%	13,519	22%	5,420	10%
	SOMERS ELEM	(36,238)	-7%	341,031	34%	125,992	15%
	BIGFORK ELEM	(166,732)	-19%	442,530	27%	89,760	7%
	BIGFORK H S	(298,215)	-49%	132,597	11%	(109,615)	-12%
	BOORMAN ELEM	(4,281)	-5%	51,998	34%	36,015	26%
	WHITEFISH ELEM	(578,990)	-33%	710,819	21%	(62,433)	-2%
	WHITEFISH H S	(506,401)	-45%	303,118	14%	(136,658)	-8%
	EVERGREEN ELEM	(206,598)	-16%	710,372	29%	194,463	10%
MARION ELEM	(9,632)	-4%	152,032	37%	71,642	21%	
OLNEY-BISSELL ELE	(50,698)	-30%	60,191	19%	(590)	0%	
MOUNTAIN BROOK EL	(42,140)	-76%	(10,481)	-1%	(22,656)	-27%	
WEST GLACIER ELEM	(271,387)	-265%	(216,714)	-100%	(273,003)	-173%	
WEST VALLEY EL	246,605	68%	509,719	79%	397,678	71%	

- - - - School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) - - - -
 AVAILABLE GENERAL FUND OVER (UNDER) FY 88 GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES
 Based on estimates of funding Foundation Program proposals, February 28, 1989

COUNTY	DISTRICT	- Current FNDN PROGRAM -		- - - - FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS - - - -			
		(MSFRBW)	% of Schedules Unchanged FND PRDG	SB203 - NATHE as of 2/10/89 FND PRDG	% of	SB203 - GOVERNOR as of 2/24/89 FND PRDG	% of
SALLATIN	LOGAN ELEM	0	0X	0	0X	0	0X
	MANHATTAN ELEM	(56,865)	-10X	345,174	33X	98,297	12X
	MANHATTAN H S	(191,119)	-47X	93,889	12X	(70,675)	-11X
	BOZEMAN ELEM	(2,213,480)	-51X	959,397	11X	(1,177,575)	-17X
	BOZEMAN H S	(1,647,964)	-62X	245,563	5X	(1,038,826)	-25X
	WILLOW CREEK EL	(68,444)	-131X	(38,694)	-38X	(62,195)	-77X
	WILLOW CREEK HS	(36,295)	-32X	45,330	21X	4,161	2X
	SPRINGHILL EL	(2,044)	-10X	10,164	28X	5,311	17X
	COTTONWOOD EL	(214)	-1X	16,296	34X	9,555	24X
	THREE FORKS EL	(164,066)	-38X	154,246	18X	(44,318)	-7X
	THREE FORKS H S	(154,312)	-43X	95,594	14X	(34,831)	-6X
	PASS CREEK ELEM	936	4X	15,010	37X	9,672	27X
	MONFORTON EL	(58,337)	-16X	194,351	29X	59,518	11X
	SALLATIN BTWY ELE	(62,104)	-26X	102,274	23X	12,852	3X
	ANDERSON ELEM	5,503	3X	148,204	40X	76,269	25X
	LA MOTTE ELEM	11,830	10X	83,142	42X	59,672	33X
	BELGRADE ELEM	(325,455)	-19X	894,886	27X	169,721	6X
	BELGRADE H S	(315,229)	-37X	299,115	18X	(58,317)	-4X
	MALMBORG ELEM	(1,838)	-9X	9,625	26X	6,089	19X
	W YELLOWSTONE ELE	(213,806)	-76X	(27,779)	-5X	(152,462)	-35X
W YELLOWSTONE H S	(161,180)	-62X	4,772	1X	(83,016)	-21X	
OFHIR ELEM	(35,462)	-69X	(9,378)	-10X	(25,332)	-32X	
AMSTERDAM ELEM	13,278	11X	89,912	42X	60,380	31X	
GARFIELD	JORDAN ELEM	(37,908)	-13X	169,458	30X	56,283	12X
	GARFIELD CO H S	(98,101)	-35X	91,782	17X	(29,485)	-7X
	BIG DRY CREEK ELE	(1,018)	-4X	13,842	35X	7,495	21X
	VAN NORMAN ELEM	(9,581)	-48X	2,266	6X	(9,728)	-31X
	SUTHLAND-COULEE E	(1,592)	-4X	22,174	32X	15,420	15X
	PINE GROVE ELEM	(489)	-2X	12,300	35X	7,343	24X
	KESTER ELEM	4,850	24X	15,421	45X	14,075	45X
	COHASSEN ELEM	5,974	13X	36,288	45X	20,618	28X
	BENZIEE ELEM	1,115	6X	13,341	38X	8,818	28X
	BLACKFOOT ELEM	(6,072)	-30X	5,355	16X	3,385	11X
	SAND SPRINGS EL	2,142	11X	14,029	40X	10,400	33X
	ROSS ELEM	(659)	-3X	11,770	33X	7,530	24X
	CAT CREEK ELEM	2,594	13X	15,407	45X	12,303	40X
FLAT CREEK ELEM	(640)	-3X	11,240	32X	7,728	25X	
GLACIER	BROWNING ELEM	(2,403,868)	-108X	(893,438)	-20X	(2,019,053)	-59X
	BROWNING H S	(903,141)	-100X	(313,499)	-18X	(718,764)	-52X
	CUT BANK ELEM	(629,690)	-56X	160,064	7X	(368,696)	-21X
	CUT BANK H S	(635,289)	-102X	(213,766)	-17X	(490,909)	-51X
	E GLACIER PARK EL	(76,328)	-89X	(26,789)	-17X	(52,516)	-40X
	SEVILLE ELEM	7,516	15X	35,525	41X	26,434	35X
GOLDEN VALLEY	RYEGATE ELEM	(88,283)	-60X	13,515	5X	(55,628)	-25X
	RYEGATE H S	(64,480)	-50X	30,172	9X	(30,477)	-12X

- - - - School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) - - - -
 AVAILABLE GENERAL FUND OVER (UNDER) FY 89 GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES
 Based on estimates of funding Foundation Program proposals, February 28, 1989

COUNTY	DISTRICT	- Current FNDN PROGRAM -		- - - - FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS - - - -			
		(MSFBMV) Schedules	% of Unchanged FND PROG	SR203 - NATHE as of 2/10/89	% of FND PROG	SR203 - GOVERNOR as of 2/24/89	% of FND PROG
	LAVINA ELEM	(53,521)	-41%	38,496	15%	(23,772)	-12%
	LAVINA H S	(45,463)	-40%	33,845	16%	(13,100)	-7%
GRANITE	PHILIPSBURG EL	(151,799)	-42%	101,552	14%	(63,085)	-11%
	GRANITE H S	(148,721)	-53%	42,602	8%	(66,591)	-15%
	HALL ELEM	(22,798)	-46%	8,095	9%	(3,221)	-4%
	DRUMMOND ELEM	(64,113)	-30%	82,584	20%	(5,284)	-2%
	DRUMMOND H S	(25,258)	-9%	167,714	32%	71,762	17%
HILL	DAVEY ELEM	(6,157)	-31%	6,720	19%	915	3%
	BOX ELDER ELEM	(336,146)	-148%	(180,554)	-39%	(312,789)	-89%
	BOX ELDER H S	(311,667)	-124%	(141,903)	-29%	(256,677)	-66%
	HAYRE ELEM	(1,087,786)	-40%	895,702	17%	(398,708)	-9%
	HAYRE H S	(726,247)	-51%	284,935	10%	(384,441)	-18%
	COTTONWOOD ELEM	(41,197)	-43%	17,607	10%	(11,746)	-8%
	K-6 ELEM	(95,449)	-43%	62,794	15%	(27,144)	-9%
	K-6 HIGH SCHOOL	(167,906)	-124%	(79,266)	-30%	(131,166)	-63%
	BLUE SKY ELEM	(209,593)	-99%	(68,510)	-17%	(147,875)	-45%
	BLUE SKY HIGH	(207,008)	-105%	(73,233)	-20%	(145,463)	-48%
	ROCKY BOY ELEM	(747,167)	-155%	(418,922)	-42%	(704,049)	-95%
GILDFORD COLONY E	(2,574)	-11%	12,455	31%	7,592	21%	
JEFFERSON	CLANCY ELEM	(108,055)	-16%	399,514	30%	108,094	10%
	WHITEHALL ELEM	(242,592)	-43%	165,606	15%	(101,903)	-12%
	WHITEHALL H S	(176,092)	-35%	179,482	19%	(31,010)	-4%
	BASIN ELEM	(22,613)	-100%	(10,561)	-26%	(14,834)	-42%
	BOULDER ELEM	(269,977)	-63%	41,024	5%	(153,380)	-23%
	JEFFERSON H S	(183,556)	-36%	174,544	18%	(54,976)	-7%
	CARDWELL ELEM	(17,702)	-21%	35,948	24%	5,681	4%
	MONTANA CITY ELEM	(167,920)	-57%	39,787	7%	(74,952)	-17%
JUDITH BASIN	STANFORD ELEM	(130,952)	-58%	30,372	7%	(51,781)	-15%
	STANFORD H S	(121,484)	-57%	24,104	6%	(41,692)	-13%
	HOBSON ELEM	(119,809)	-59%	24,701	6%	(75,492)	-24%
	HOBSON H S	(80,790)	-35%	80,093	18%	(14,203)	-4%
	RAYNESFORD ELEM	(8,298)	-18%	16,080	20%	3,599	5%
	GEYSER ELEM	(53,054)	-34%	52,807	18%	(14,649)	-6%
	GEYSER H S	(21,577)	-12%	108,358	31%	43,145	15%
LAKE	ARLEE ELEM	(332,705)	-50%	158,677	12%	(152,755)	-15%
	ARLEE H S	(138,956)	-36%	139,556	19%	(6,997)	-1%
	ELMO ELEM	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	POLSON ELEM	(54,846)	-3%	1,170,878	37%	449,699	18%
	POLSON H S	(277,775)	-32%	332,690	20%	(36,766)	-3%
	ST IGNATIUS ELEM	(375,238)	-58%	84,949	7%	(231,055)	-23%
	ST IGNATIUS H S	(157,609)	-39%	132,184	17%	(39,635)	-6%
	VALLEY VIEW ELEM	(9,185)	-44%	2,500	7%	(1,287)	-4%
	SWAN LAKE-SALMON	(34,257)	-76%	(7,733)	-9%	(20,179)	-29%
RONAN ELEM	(377,940)	-23%	815,591	26%	55,917	2%	

- - - - School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) - - - -
 AVAILABLE GENERAL FUND OVER (UNDER) FY 88 GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES
 Based on estimates of funding Foundation Program proposals, February 28, 1989

COUNTY	DISTRICT	- Current FNDN PROGRAM -		- - - - FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS - - - -			
		(MSFBWV) Schedules	% of Unchanged FND PROG	SB203 - NATHE as of 2/10/89	% of FND PROG	SB203 - GOVERNOR as of 2/24/89	% of FND PROG
	ROMAN H S	(249,679)	-33%	279,774	19%	(53,662)	-5%
	CHARLO ELEM	(26,676)	-6%	289,230	35%	124,629	18%
	CHARLO H S	(63,051)	-31%	102,362	20%	(4,149)	-1%
	UPPER WEST SHORE	(893)	-2%	24,607	30%	13,266	18%
LEWIS & CLARK	HELENA ELEM	(4,272,259)	-57%	1,190,278	8%	(2,332,187)	-20%
	HELENA H S	(3,581,235)	-65%	389,464	4%	(2,085,579)	-24%
	KESSLER ELEM	(89,905)	-22%	157,333	21%	32,604	5%
	TRINITY ELEM	(1,648)	-3%	30,319	34%	4,718	6%
	E HELENA ELEM	(319,937)	-21%	743,841	26%	153,279	7%
	WOLF CREEK ELEM	(22,650)	-104%	(12,512)	-31%	(18,889)	-56%
	CRAIG ELEM	(10,124)	-48%	1,610	4%	(3,281)	-10%
	AUCHARD CRK ELEM	(13,969)	-47%	4,828	9%	(4,362)	-10%
	LINCOLN ELEM	48,625	16%	266,334	48%	158,262	34%
	LINCOLN HIGH SCHD	(18,397)	-8%	145,290	34%	72,078	20%
	AUGUSTA ELEM	(112,783)	-59%	16,147	4%	(71,027)	-24%
	AUGUSTA H S	(34,000)	-16%	111,380	28%	41,109	13%
LIBERTY	WHITLASH ELEM	(8,647)	-41%	4,768	13%	(859)	-3%
	J-I ELEM	(125,932)	-46%	64,733	13%	(22,314)	-5%
	J-I HIGH SCHOOL	(169,558)	-100%	(55,510)	-18%	(118,912)	-46%
	CHESTER ELEM	(130,568)	-31%	170,777	21%	(29,141)	-5%
	CHESTER H S	(285,484)	-101%	(89,331)	-15%	(232,658)	-53%
	LIBERTY ELEM SCHD	(4,269)	-18%	11,299	27%	5,325	14%
LINCOLN	TROY ELEM	(278,742)	-36%	283,495	19%	(80,409)	-7%
	TROY H S	(291,731)	-60%	52,413	6%	(165,223)	-22%
	LIBBY ELEM	(1,345,514)	-57%	355,130	8%	(805,284)	-22%
	LIBBY H S	(825,624)	-58%	191,257	7%	(425,386)	-19%
	EUREKA ELEM	(177,750)	-21%	436,022	26%	56,606	4%
	LINCOLN CO H S	(289,430)	-52%	102,365	9%	(165,896)	-19%
	FORTINE ELEM	19,851	13%	111,322	41%	74,084	31%
	MCCORMICK ELEM	(2,639)	-5%	27,842	30%	14,035	17%
	SYLVANITE ELEM	8,430	19%	36,015	46%	26,933	38%
	YAAK ELEM	9,239	20%	36,611	47%	27,766	40%
	TREGO ELEM	7,855	5%	106,689	36%	66,859	26%
	REXFORD ELEM	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
MADISON	ALDER ELEM	(3,301)	-7%	23,811	27%	9,352	12%
	SHERIDAN ELEM	(2,490)	-1%	278,013	39%	119,435	21%
	SHERIDAN H S	(67,964)	-25%	125,267	24%	11,117	3%
	TWIN BRIDGES ELEM	(146,603)	-51%	55,827	10%	(82,455)	-19%
	TWIN BRIDGES H S	(134,171)	-48%	57,174	11%	(52,784)	-12%
	HARRISON ELEM	(28,506)	-20%	71,125	26%	9,493	4%
	HARRISON H S	(1,249)	-1%	120,790	38%	60,826	23%
	ENNIS ELEM	(323,648)	-77%	(28,719)	-3%	(247,850)	-38%
	ENNIS H S	(175,734)	-51%	58,695	9%	(74,360)	-14%
MCCONE	CIRCLE ELEM	(252,047)	-53%	88,563	10%	(121,367)	-17%

- - - School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) - - -
 AVAILABLE GENERAL FUND OVER (UNDER) FY 88 GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES
 Based on estimates of funding Foundation Program proposals, February 28, 1989

COUNTY	DISTRICT	- Current FNDN PROGRAM -		- - - - FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS - - - -			
		(MBFBWV)	% of	SR203 - NATHE	% of	SR203 - GOVERNOR	% of
		Schedules	Unchanged FND PROG	as of 2/10/89	FND PROG	as of 2/24/89	FND PROG
	CIRCLE H S	(260,108)	-67%	7,711	1%	(179,522)	-30%
	PRAIRIE ELK ELEM	(2,409)	-12%	9,892	28%	3,910	13%
	BROCKWAY ELEM	(13,356)	-30%	13,657	17%	2,373	3%
	SOUTHVIEW ELEM	(5,759)	-29%	4,290	12%	(3,861)	-12%
	VIDA ELEM	(10,433)	-22%	12,012	14%	(7,996)	-11%
MEAGHER	LENNEP ELEM	(2,809)	-12%	11,448	29%	5,666	16%
	WHT SULPHUR SFSS	(216,231)	-59%	57,843	8%	(128,197)	-23%
	WHT SULPHUR SFSS	(213,189)	-75%	(9,039)	-2%	(134,868)	-31%
	RINGLING ELEM	(12,450)	-62%	288	1%	(4,806)	-15%
MINERAL	SALTESE ELEM	987	5%	10,993	31%	9,691	31%
	ALBERTON ELEM	(156,347)	-54%	41,068	7%	(88,370)	-20%
	ALBERTON H S	(49,954)	-21%	112,747	25%	17,838	5%
	SUPERIOR ELEM	(310,528)	-66%	23,955	3%	(226,795)	-31%
	SUPERIOR H S	(166,191)	-52%	55,609	9%	(79,326)	-16%
	ST REGIS ELEM	(90,675)	-37%	83,690	18%	(25,890)	-7%
	ST REGIS H S	(53,836)	-26%	90,224	23%	10,551	3%
MISSOULA	MISSOULA ELEM	(4,407,669)	-49%	2,059,877	12%	(2,192,525)	-16%
	MISSOULA H S	(4,720,301)	-66%	365,469	3%	(2,902,199)	-26%
	HELLGATE ELEM	(333,271)	-27%	543,100	23%	(15,173)	-1%
	LOLO ELEM	(304,193)	-33%	335,688	19%	(15,633)	-1%
	POTOMAC ELEM	278,418	100%	491,238	100%	419,001	98%
	BONNER ELEM	(365,938)	-59%	66,118	5%	(218,148)	-23%
	WOODMAN ELEM	(30,396)	-18%	95,515	29%	21,785	8%
	DESHET SCHOOL	(20,333)	-9%	142,608	34%	57,462	17%
	TARGET RANGE ELEM	(52,862)	-7%	510,514	35%	187,209	16%
	SUNSET ELEM	(31,093)	-128%	(18,686)	-40%	(26,335)	-70%
	CLINTON ELEM	(61,191)	-13%	275,317	31%	67,827	9%
	SWAN VALLEY ELEM	(18,990)	-9%	135,396	34%	45,054	14%
	SEELEY LAKE ELEM	(159,931)	-37%	147,333	18%	(11,218)	-2%
	FRENCHTOWN ELEM	(373,312)	-40%	310,227	17%	(159,460)	-11%
	FRENCHTOWN H S	(584,604)	-111%	(217,151)	-21%	(472,989)	-58%
MUSSELSHELL	MUSSELSHELL ELEM	(72,585)	-298%	(57,017)	-109%	(76,323)	-203%
	ROUNDUP ELEM	(219,808)	-28%	331,927	22%	(4,552)	0%
	ROUNDUP H S	(209,753)	-37%	182,074	17%	(57,010)	-7%
	MELSTONE ELEM	(62,697)	-34%	74,068	20%	(8,306)	-3%
	MELSTONE H S	(104,786)	-54%	30,701	8%	(42,048)	-14%
PARK	RICHLAND ELEM	(4,160)	-18%	10,002	25%	4,255	12%
	LIVINGSTON ELEM	(838,212)	-53%	279,043	9%	(448,105)	-18%
	PARK H S	(630,481)	-61%	77,272	4%	(400,592)	-25%
	GARDINER ELEM	(94,223)	-33%	113,753	21%	2,661	1%
	GARDINER H S	(340,544)	-121%	(148,277)	-27%	(255,523)	-55%
	COOKE CITY ELEM	0	ERR	0	ERR	0	ERR
	PINE CREEK ELEM	(1,404)	-3%	29,940	34%	17,018	22%
	CLYDE PARK ELEM	(34,748)	-16%	121,834	30%	35,589	11%

- - - - School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) - - - -
 AVAILABLE GENERAL FUND OVER (UNDER) FY 89 GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES
 Based on estimates of funding Foundation Program proposals, February 28, 1989

COUNTY	DISTRICT	- Current FNDN PROGRAM -		- - - - FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS - - - -			
		(MSFBWV) Schedules Unchanged	% of FND PROG	SB203 - NATHE as of 2/10/89	% of FND PROG	SB203 - GOVERNOR as of 2/24/89	% of FND PROG
	CLYDE PARK H S	(24,441)	-10%	152,093	32%	64,793	17%
	WILSALL ELEM	(35,348)	-17%	113,872	29%	26,349	8%
	WILSALL H S	(45,203)	-26%	73,230	23%	8,460	3%
	SPRINGDALE ELEM	119	1%	14,520	37%	8,763	25%
	ARROWHEAD ELEM	13,401	10%	94,337	39%	64,977	30%
PETROLEUM	WINNETT ELEM	(54,719)	-31%	68,032	20%	(26,093)	-10%
	WINNETT H S	(57,828)	-37%	50,511	17%	(8,534)	-3%
PHILLIPS	DODSON ELEM	(87,286)	-43%	64,370	16%	(42,705)	-14%
	DODSON H S	(92,508)	-60%	17,103	6%	(52,995)	-22%
	SECOND CRK ELEM	(2,440)	-12%	9,637	27%	4,704	15%
	LANDUSKY ELEM	(27)	0%	11,738	33%	6,857	22%
	SUN PRAIRIE ELEM	2,132	11%	14,052	39%	8,577	28%
	SACO ELEM	(148,593)	-83%	(28,870)	-8%	(117,905)	-43%
	SACO H S	(161,155)	-87%	(35,707)	-10%	(115,093)	-40%
	MALTA ELEM	(218,035)	-26%	385,063	24%	15,324	1%
	MALTA H S	(372,838)	-73%	(13,574)	-1%	(222,878)	-28%
	WHITEWATER ELEM	(146,901)	-107%	(46,211)	-17%	(127,760)	-60%
	WHITEWATER H S	(137,189)	-119%	(53,427)	-24%	(104,236)	-59%
FOWDERA	HEART BUTTE ELEM	(395,593)	-143%	(225,374)	-40%	(354,817)	-83%
	DUPUYER ELEM	(17,504)	-34%	13,743	15%	476	1%
	CONRAD ELEM	(384,963)	-44%	239,781	14%	(178,581)	-13%
	CONRAD H S	(332,142)	-61%	46,474	4%	(185,858)	-22%
	VALIER ELEM	(47,354)	-14%	191,759	30%	41,706	8%
	VALIER H S	(117,802)	-43%	70,718	14%	(48,054)	-11%
	BRADY ELEM	(107,643)	-64%	12,876	4%	(75,296)	-29%
	BRADY H S	(92,123)	-80%	(14,433)	-6%	(79,336)	-45%
	MIAMI ELEM	287	1%	27,656	34%	17,887	25%
POWDER RIVER	POWDERVILLE EL	1,235	6%	13,722	39%	9,183	30%
	BIDDLE ELEM	(7,790)	-17%	18,391	24%	9,938	14%
	BELLE CREEK EL	(88,485)	-329%	(78,250)	-156%	(83,172)	-200%
	BEAR CREEK ELEM	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	BILLUP ELEM	(2,156)	-11%	9,031	26%	5,852	19%
	BROADUS ELEM	(325,015)	-80%	(28,764)	-4%	(221,541)	-35%
	POWDER RIVER CO DIS	(353,990)	-89%	(86,595)	-11%	(315,587)	-51%
	SO STACEY ELEM	1,917	10%	13,425	39%	10,352	33%
	HORKAN CRK ELEM	3,400	15%	16,853	43%	11,949	34%
POWELL	DEER LODGE ELEM	(610,510)	-58%	137,476	7%	(398,287)	-24%
	POWELL CO H S	(327,150)	-50%	125,107	10%	(145,277)	-14%
	OVANDO ELEM	(15,139)	-29%	13,436	15%	3,600	4%
	HELMVILLE ELEM	(7,814)	-16%	15,205	18%	5,713	8%
	GARRISON ELEM	(31,879)	-141%	(21,654)	-49%	(30,816)	-88%
	ELLISTON ELEM	(10,633)	-20%	18,518	21%	12,890	16%
	AVON ELEM	(13,181)	-6%	26,373	29%	13,974	17%
	GOLD CREEK ELEM	2,152	5%	27,261	35%	15,278	22%

- - - - School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) - - - -
 AVAILABLE GENERAL FUND OVER (UNDER) FY 88 GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES
 Based on estimates of funding Foundation Program proposals, February 28, 1989

COUNTY	DISTRICT	- Current FNDN PROGRAM -		- - - - FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS - - - -			
		(M6FBWV)	% of Schedules Unchanged FND PRDG	SB203 - NATHE as of 2/10/89	% of FND PRDG	SB203 - GOVERNOR as of 2/24/89	% of FND PRGS
PFAIRIE	TERRY ELEM	(79,909)	-23%	180,818	26%	17,359	3%
	TERRY H S	(99,756)	-30%	129,739	21%	(818)	0%
	FALLON ELEM	(2,330)	-5%	22,099	27%	14,006	20%
PAVALLI	CORVALLIS ELEM	35,416	3%	829,142	41%	386,763	24%
	CORVALLIS H S	(81,726)	-13%	345,870	31%	135,145	15%
	STEVENSVILLE EL	(62,944)	-5%	869,510	36%	318,293	17%
	STEVENSVILLE HS	(135,106)	-17%	424,917	28%	121,775	10%
	HAMILTON ELEM	(191,258)	-13%	876,810	32%	283,774	13%
	HAMILTON H S	(196,541)	-20%	497,449	28%	129,702	9%
	VICTOR ELEM	(92,002)	-28%	136,096	21%	(20,779)	-4%
	VICTOR H S	(35,798)	-13%	153,175	30%	55,971	13%
	DARBY ELEM	(180,537)	-29%	265,637	22%	(16,439)	-2%
	DARBY H S	(110,676)	-23%	231,631	25%	42,749	6%
	LONE ROCK ELEM	(25,877)	-9%	135,597	26%	62,320	14%
	FLORENCE-CARLTON	(83,979)	-11%	459,794	33%	150,766	13%
FLORENCE-CARLTON	(140,417)	-35%	141,238	19%	(26,240)	-4%	
RICHLAND	SIDNEY ELEM	(661,768)	-34%	737,063	20%	(87,971)	-3%
	SIDNEY H S	(430,673)	-43%	266,959	14%	(130,370)	-8%
	SAVAGE ELEM	(107,902)	-45%	62,104	13%	(56,552)	-15%
	SAVAGE H S	(117,755)	-52%	40,304	9%	(47,193)	-14%
	BRODFSON ELEM	(25,940)	-106%	(10,372)	-23%	(25,994)	-69%
	FAIRVIEW ELEM	(234,810)	-50%	98,002	11%	(135,986)	-19%
	FAIRVIEW H S	(234,106)	-54%	60,583	7%	(127,401)	-19%
	RAU ELEM	(1,730)	-1%	69,252	31%	21,947	11%
	THREE BUTTES EL	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	LAMBERT ELEM	(134,963)	-73%	(15,868)	-5%	(82,020)	-29%
	LAMBERT H S	(117,762)	-78%	(24,992)	-9%	(72,627)	-31%
ROOSEVELT	FRONTIER ELEM	(98,213)	-35%	95,956	17%	(21,711)	-5%
	POPLAR ELEM	(1,280,702)	-121%	(538,089)	-26%	(1,090,726)	-67%
	POPLAR H S	(886,035)	-175%	(549,068)	-54%	(777,204)	-100%
	CULBERTSON ELEM	(290,373)	-73%	(21,459)	-3%	(202,382)	-33%
	CULBERTSON H S	(136,336)	-55%	25,154	5%	(58,670)	-15%
	WOLF POINT ELEM	(549,611)	-50%	225,352	11%	(241,352)	-14%
	WOLF POINT H S	(358,130)	-51%	113,549	8%	(135,173)	-12%
	BROCKTON ELEM	(230,381)	-116%	(97,791)	-24%	(192,041)	-63%
	BROCKTON H S	(237,121)	-146%	(138,074)	-42%	(202,290)	-81%
	BAINVILLE ELEM	(177,241)	-107%	(53,767)	-16%	(140,959)	-55%
	BAINVILLE H S	(121,485)	-65%	11,047	3%	(71,822)	-25%
	FROID ELEM	(153,322)	-80%	(14,510)	-4%	(102,779)	-35%
	FROID H S	(140,654)	-80%	(19,477)	-6%	(93,596)	-35%
ROSEBUD	ROCK SPRING ELEM	856	4%	12,616	36%	8,671	28%
	BIRNEY ELEM	(19,179)	-71%	(4,118)	-8%	(12,345)	-30%
	FORSYTH ELEM	(398,517)	-51%	155,496	10%	(193,818)	-16%
	FORSYTH H S	(296,336)	-57%	66,337	7%	(146,696)	-18%

- - - - School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) - - - -
 AVAILABLE GENERAL FUND OVER (UNDER) FY 88 GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES
 Based on estimates of funding Foundation Program proposals, February 28, 1989

COUNTY	DISTRICT	- Current FNDN PROGRAM -		- - - - FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS - - - -			
		(MGBFHWV) Schedules Unchanged	% of FND PROG	SB203 - NATHE as of 2/10/89	% of FND PROG	SB203 - GOVERNOR as of 2/24/89	% of FND PROG
	LAME DEER ELEM	(991,740)	-213%	(644,659)	-62%	(1,015,307)	-141%
	ROSEBUD ELEM	(71,107)	-37%	65,643	18%	(30,197)	-10%
	ROSEBUD H S	(88,614)	-49%	32,791	9%	(38,355)	-14%
	COLSTRIP ELEM	(2,012,011)	-125%	(877,935)	-27%	(1,745,903)	-70%
	COLSTRIP H S	(1,176,159)	-127%	(563,898)	-30%	(1,027,572)	-72%
	ASHLAND ELEM	(156,141)	-72%	9,792	2%	(106,481)	-32%
	INGOMAR ELEM	(65,210)	-268%	(57,033)	-128%	(64,946)	-173%
SANDERS	PLAINS ELEM	(149,004)	-30%	212,544	22%	(16,520)	-2%
	PLAINS H S	(94,516)	-22%	218,263	27%	45,558	7%
	THOMPSON FALLS EL	(308,562)	-51%	115,076	10%	(180,861)	-19%
	THOMPSON FALLS H	(98,985)	-20%	244,959	27%	60,946	8%
	TROUT CRK ELEM	(112,434)	-65%	(16,543)	-5%	(69,198)	-26%
	PARADISE ELEM	(13,865)	-14%	44,522	26%	17,546	12%
	DIXON ELEM	(60,244)	-59%	3,863	2%	(32,296)	-20%
	NOXON ELEM	(167,164)	-51%	52,070	8%	(102,343)	-20%
	NOXON H S	(124,277)	-44%	68,143	13%	(56,146)	-13%
	CAMAS PRAIRIE ELE	(990)	-4%	12,228	31%	2,452	7%
	HOT SPRINGS ELEM	(65,297)	-23%	139,408	26%	11,522	3%
	HOT SPRINGS H S	(20,819)	-8%	165,673	33%	66,781	16%
SHERIDAN	WESTBY ELEM	(193,551)	-103%	(63,317)	-17%	(160,508)	-55%
	WESTBY H S	(201,669)	-107%	(72,410)	-20%	(157,089)	-54%
	MEDICINE LK EL	(200,406)	-58%	41,343	6%	(140,861)	-27%
	MEDICINE LK H S	(234,786)	-100%	(76,754)	-17%	(188,560)	-52%
	PLENTYWOOD ELEM	(189,033)	-30%	257,367	21%	(41,318)	-4%
	PLENTYWOOD H S	(316,611)	-81%	(51,357)	-7%	(227,166)	-38%
	OUTLOOK ELEM	(138,089)	-107%	(51,190)	-20%	(112,892)	-57%
	OUTLOOK H S	(103,318)	-90%	(29,729)	-13%	(74,979)	-42%
	HIAWATHA ELEM	(58,168)	-168%	(36,643)	-55%	(55,180)	-103%
SILVER BOW	BUTTE ELEM	(4,170,064)	-69%	178,332	1%	(2,823,311)	-30%
	RAMSAY ELEM	(113,199)	-49%	55,864	12%	(47,727)	-13%
	DIVIDE ELEM	(12,395)	-28%	16,234	21%	4,634	7%
	MELROSE ELEM	(25,082)	-52%	5,492	6%	(9,362)	-13%
	BUTTE H S	(2,514,044)	-74%	(116,855)	-2%	(1,640,073)	-31%
STILLWATER	PARK CITY ELEM	(6,564)	-2%	281,273	38%	128,682	21%
	PARK CITY H S	(8,212)	-3%	211,999	36%	108,753	23%
	COLUMBUS ELEM	(134,869)	-24%	256,579	24%	1,148	0%
	COLUMBUS H S	(96,605)	-25%	170,085	23%	19,143	3%
	REEDPOINT ELEM	(60,016)	-109%	(29,233)	-29%	(55,148)	-65%
	REEDPOINT H S	(32,442)	-28%	47,498	22%	3,046	2%
	MOLT ELEM	(955)	-2%	26,309	34%	17,507	25%
	FISHTAIL ELEM	33,790	34%	95,993	56%	73,809	48%
	NYE ELEM	4,970	11%	32,635	41%	23,058	33%
	RAPELJE ELEM	(49,467)	-46%	10,712	5%	(30,046)	-18%
	RAPELJE H S	(69,075)	-60%	7,169	3%	(38,290)	-22%
	ABSAROOKEE ELEM	(96,778)	-26%	177,737	25%	5,027	1%

- - - - School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) - - - -
 AVAILABLE GENERAL FUND OVER (UNDER) FY 88 GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES
 Based on estimates of funding Foundation Program proposals, February 28, 1989

COUNTY	DISTRICT	- Current FNDN PROGRAM - (M6FBWV)		- - - - FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS - - - -			
		Schedules	% of Unchanged FND PROG	SR203 - NATHE as of 2/10/89	% of FND PROG	SR203 - GOVERNOR as of 2/24/89	% of FND PROG
	ABSAROOKEE H S	(97,045)	-29%	141,251	23%	22,397	4%
SWEET GRASS	BIG TIMBER ELEM	(138,959)	-24%	284,725	25%	34,886	4%
	MELVILLE ELEM	(5,556)	-12%	24,150	28%	9,460	13%
	GREYCLIFF ELEM	(3,820)	-12%	15,851	27%	7,719	15%
	MCLEOD ELEM	200	1%	21,125	36%	12,679	24%
	BRIDGE ELEM	504	3%	12,845	37%	8,718	28%
	SWEET GRASS CO HS	(204,740)	-43%	124,120	14%	(84,153)	-12%
TETON	CHOTEAU ELEM	(158,145)	-32%	200,615	21%	(37,333)	-5%
	CHOTEAU H S	(240,010)	-57%	47,265	6%	(121,739)	-19%
	BYNUM ELEM	(1,365)	-3%	28,242	31%	14,586	18%
	FAIRFIELD ELEM	4,195	1%	290,171	39%	123,427	21%
	FAIRFIELD H S	(100,245)	-26%	173,226	24%	26,050	4%
	DUTTON ELEM	(112,435)	-57%	26,785	7%	(69,812)	-23%
	DUTTON H S	(97,028)	-48%	44,571	12%	(28,007)	-9%
	POWER ELEM	(100,400)	-51%	29,440	8%	(47,748)	-16%
	POWER H S	(86,306)	-48%	39,225	12%	(22,729)	-8%
	GOLDEN RIDGE ELEM	(5,295)	-11%	24,720	30%	11,638	15%
	PENDROY ELEM	(15,480)	-59%	(277)	-1%	(7,246)	-18%
	GREENFIELD ELEM	(5,397)	-4%	72,517	30%	33,694	16%
TOOLE	SUNBURST ELEM	(182,077)	-53%	61,475	9%	(94,932)	-18%
	SUNBURST H S	(299,714)	-106%	(107,939)	-19%	(248,585)	-57%
	KEVIN ELEM	(46,144)	-101%	(25,896)	-31%	(32,683)	-46%
	SHELBY ELEM	(467,014)	-58%	113,888	7%	(258,784)	-21%
	SHELBY H S	(563,829)	-122%	(246,621)	-27%	(475,196)	-66%
	BALATA ELEM	(30,301)	-60%	(2,537)	-3%	(21,737)	-28%
	NICKOL ELEM	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TREASURE	HYSHAM ELEM	(114,318)	-45%	60,077	12%	(50,319)	-13%
	HYSHAM H S	(119,767)	-50%	41,257	9%	(46,183)	-13%
VALLEY	GLASGOW ELEM	(914,057)	-77%	(78,696)	-3%	(638,578)	-35%
	GLASGOW H S	(728,524)	-106%	(258,572)	-19%	(580,618)	-55%
	FRAZER ELEM	(496,146)	-223%	(339,604)	-73%	(467,660)	-136%
	FRAZER H S	(383,854)	-200%	(253,839)	-67%	(335,811)	-113%
	HINSDALE ELEM	(80,599)	-53%	31,553	11%	(40,429)	-17%
	HINSDALE H S	(93,943)	-56%	31,102	10%	(42,054)	-16%
	OPHEIM ELEM	(115,167)	-55%	26,021	6%	(69,838)	-22%
	OPHEIM H S	(161,459)	-89%	(40,665)	-11%	(119,813)	-43%
	NASHUA ELEM	(141,089)	-52%	52,188	10%	(80,228)	-19%
	NASHUA H S	(114,936)	-44%	61,445	12%	(41,190)	-10%
	FT PECK ELEM	(67,132)	-124%	(39,799)	-39%	(54,552)	-65%
	LUSTRE ELEM	(88,206)	-70%	(12,360)	-6%	(53,626)	-28%
WHEATLAND	TWO DOT ELEM	(10,022)	-50%	(444)	-1%	(3,327)	-11%
	HARLOWTON ELEM	(100,864)	-27%	160,938	23%	20,631	4%
	HARLOWTON H S	(171,934)	-58%	31,930	6%	(85,140)	-19%

- - - - School Year 1990-91 (Fiscal 1991) - - - -
 AVAILABLE GENERAL FUND OVER (UNDER) FY 89 GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES
 Based on estimates of funding Foundation Program proposals, February 29, 1989

COUNTY	DISTRICT	- Current FNDN PROGRAM - (MGFBWV)		- - - - FOUNDATION PROGRAM PROPOSALS - - - -			
		Schedules Unchanged	% of FND PROG	SB203 - NATHE as of 2/10/89	% of FND PROG	SB203 - GOVERNOR as of 2/24/89	% of FND PROG
	SHAWMUT ELEM	(4,217)	-19%	8,585	22%	4,231	12%
	JUDITH GAP ELEM	(42,394)	-23%	85,407	25%	20,095	7%
	JUDITH GAP H S	(37,296)	-26%	60,407	23%	11,511	5%
WIBAUX	WIBAUX ELEM	(123,445)	-36%	120,311	18%	(32,251)	-6%
	WIBAUX H S	(116,042)	-43%	65,667	13%	(28,321)	-7%
YELLOWSTONE	BILLINGS ELEM	(10,092,265)	-62%	1,555,038	5%	(6,401,551)	-26%
	BILLINGS H S	(4,601,455)	-46%	2,553,045	13%	(1,578,804)	-10%
	LOCKWOOD ELEM	(716,030)	-37%	646,670	17%	(177,909)	-6%
	BLUE CREEK ELEM	15,884	8%	135,916	41%	101,164	33%
	CANYON CRK ELEM	(83,130)	-23%	168,314	25%	46,279	8%
	LAUREL ELEM	(550,664)	-26%	930,232	23%	73,375	2%
	LAUREL H S	(454,212)	-41%	330,613	15%	(138,211)	-8%
	ELDER GROVE ELEM	10,574	3%	223,381	39%	135,728	27%
	CUSTER ELEM	(98,431)	-68%	(124)	0%	(71,663)	-32%
	CUSTER H S	(74,494)	-44%	42,390	13%	(29,334)	-11%
	MORIN ELEM	(21,740)	-41%	8,979	10%	(12,470)	-15%
	BROADVIEW ELEM	(86,829)	-43%	60,834	15%	(37,817)	-12%
	BROADVIEW H S	(58,566)	-30%	73,880	20%	3,624	1%
	ELYSIAN ELEM	(63,308)	-50%	7,426	3%	(19,199)	-10%
	HUNTLEY PROJ ELEM	(233,945)	-28%	370,465	23%	(21,293)	-2%
	HUNTLEY PROJ HS	(161,527)	-34%	175,090	19%	(29,916)	-4%
	SHEPHERD ELEM	(69,835)	-10%	464,239	34%	181,894	16%
	SHEPHERD H S	(126,994)	-22%	262,287	24%	54,134	6%
	PIONEER ELEM	(48,495)	-28%	52,180	17%	5,816	2%
	INDEPENDENT ELEM	29,047	10%	213,208	40%	140,616	30%
	YLSTN EDUCATION C	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL		----- (\$141,301,079) -----	-51%	----- \$56,089,804 -----	10%	----- (\$66,939,998) -----	-16%

1 SENATE BILL NO. 203

2 INTRODUCED BY NATHE

3
4 A BILL FOR AN ACT ENTITLED: "AN ACT TO GENERALLY REVISE
5 PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING; TO INCLUDE COMPREHENSIVE INSURANCE,
6 RETIREMENT, FEDERAL SOCIAL SECURITY, AND UNEMPLOYMENT
7 INSURANCE IN THE GENERAL FUND BUDGET; TO ESTABLISH A SCHOOL
8 TERM AS 180 DAYS; TO REQUIRE THE SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM
9 TO FUND 100 PERCENT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS' GENERAL
10 FUND BUDGETS WITHOUT A VOTED LEVY ~~OF ALL ELEMENTARY AND HIGH~~
11 ~~SCHOOLS, AS SET BY FOUNDATION PROGRAM SCHEDULES~~; TO LIMIT BY
12 SCHOOL FISCAL YEAR ~~1995~~ 1996 THE MAXIMUM GENERAL FUND BUDGET
13 OF A DISTRICT TO 117 PERCENT OF THE FOUNDATION PROGRAM
14 AMOUNT FOR THE DISTRICT; TO LIMIT THE GENERAL FUND RESERVE
15 OF A DISTRICT TO 20 PERCENT EXCEPT FOR DISTRICTS NOT
16 RECEIVING STATE EQUALIZATION AID; TO ELIMINATE THE PRESENT
17 PERMISSIVE LEVY; TO INDEX THE RATE OF INCREASE IN THE
18 SCHEDULE AMOUNTS TO THE RATE OF ANNUAL INFLATION; TO
19 REALLOCATE LOTTERY REVENUE FROM RETIREMENT EQUALIZATION TO
20 STATE EQUALIZATION AID; TO PROVIDE A STATE LEVY ON PROPERTY
21 TO FUND ~~90 PERCENT OF~~ THE COSTS FOR ~~TEACHERS'~~ SCHOOL
22 PERSONNEL RETIREMENT, SOCIAL SECURITY, AND UNEMPLOYMENT
23 INSURANCE; TO EXCLUDE THE LEVY FROM THE PROPERTY TAX
24 LIMITATIONS OF INITIATIVE MEASURE NO. 105; TO ELIMINATE
25 TUITION PAYMENTS BETWEEN DISTRICTS; TO REQUIRE DISTRIBUTION

M

1 OF STATE EQUALIZATION AID IN MONTHLY PAYMENTS; ~~TO PROVIDE~~
2 ~~FOR--A--STATUTORY---APPROPRIATION~~ TO COMBINE THE BUS
3 DEPRECIATION RESERVE FUND WITH THE TRANSPORTATION FUND; TO
4 COMBINE THE DEBT SERVICE FUND, LEASED FACILITIES FUND, AND
5 BUILDING RESERVE FUND IN A CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND; AMENDING
6 SECTIONS 15-10-402, ~~17-7-502~~, 17-3-213, 19-4-605, 20-1-301,
7 20-1-304, 20-3-106, 20-3-205, 20-3-210, 20-3-324, 20-3-331,
8 20-5-101, 20-5-102, 20-5-301, 20-5-302, 20-5-304, 20-5-311,
9 20-5-314, 20-6-313, 20-6-401, 20-6-411 THROUGH 20-6-415,
10 20-6-603, 20-6-604, 20-6-608, 20-7-414, 20-7-420 THROUGH
11 20-7-422, 20-7-424, 20-7-431, 20-9-104, 20-9-133, 20-9-141,
12 20-9-201, 20-9-212, 20-9-301, 20-9-303, 20-9-315, 20-9-318
13 THROUGH 20-9-322, 20-9-331, 20-9-333, 20-9-343, 20-9-344,
14 20-9-353, 20-9-405, 20-9-406, 20-9-412, 20-9-435, 20-9-438
15 THROUGH 20-9-441, 20-9-443, 20-9-502, 20-9-503, 20-9-505,
16 20-9-506, 20-9-531, 20-9-532, 20-10-105, 20-10-147,
17 20-16-108, AND 23-5-1027, MCA; REPEALING SECTIONS 20-5-303,
18 20-5-305 THROUGH 20-5-307, 20-5-312, 20-5-313, 20-9-105,
19 20-9-316, 20-9-317, AND 20-9-352, 20-9-501, 20-9-531, AND
20 20-9-532, MCA; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE."

21

22 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MONTANA:

23 **Section 1.** Section 15-10-402, MCA, is amended to read:

24 "15-10-402. Property tax limited to 1986 levels. (1)
25 Except as provided in subsections (2) and (3), the amount of