## MINUTES

## MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES <br> 5lst LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION <br> SELECT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION FUNDING

Call to Order: By Chairman Ray Peck, on March 16, 1989, at 3:45 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

Discussion:
Rep. Eudaily presented a list of proposals. (See Exhibit l.)
Rep. Kadas asked Rep. Eudaily if he knew how much it was going to cost? Rep. Eudaily stated that he has the figures for the 85\% equalization level and that is what he has put on the motion.

Rep. Schye asked that on No. 6 of Exhibit l, if the cap at $120 \%$ is above the $85 \%$. Rep. Eudaily stated that the $85 \%$ would represent $100 \%$ funding of the schedules and the cap would be 120\% above the schedules.

Rep. Schye asked that since the cap would be effective upon the effective date of the bill, in the second year of the biennium, would districts be frozen? Would they then have to come down in future years? Rep. Eudaily stated that this doesn't provide for that.

Rep. Schye asked how many school districts are affected by this cap? Rep. Eudaily stated that he hasn't any figures on that, but $40 \%$ of the districts may be affected.

Rep. Kadas stated that he doesn't see how the committee can send a bill out without any funding. He said this proposal is \$64 million short.

Rep. Kadas presented a chart showing the expenditure base to be equalized from the school district trustee reports for FY 88. (See Exhibit 2.)

Rep. Kadas stated that if you are going to meet the federal test for equalizing PL 874 money, you've got to equalize at least $90 \%$ of districts' expenditures.

Rep. Gilbert presented a list of proposals. (See Exhibit 3.)
Rep. Glaser presented printouts. (See Exhibits 4 and 5.)
Rep. Kadas stated that if you set the cap at $25 \%$ above the schedules which are $85 \%$ of the FY 88 expenditures, the cap is really $106 \%$ of the FY 88 expenditures for the item included in the base.

Motion:
Rep. Eudaily moved the first 19 items. (See Exhibit l.)
Rep. Kadas requested that the committee examine each item separately, acknowledging that some items were already taken care of by previous action.

Amendments:
Rep. Kadas moved to include retirement, social security, and unemployment insurance costs associated with special education salaries as special education allowable costs to be reimbursed by OPI.

## Votes:

The motion passed unanimously with all members voting aye.
Amendments:
Rep. Kadas moved to amend gray bill to exclude PL 874 expenditures from any cap on maximum general fund budget until such time as the system is approved by the Secretary of E.education as meeting federal wealth neutrality test.

## Votes:

The motion passed unanimously with all members voting aye.
Amendments:
Rep. Kadas moved to amend the gray bill to limit general fund cash reserves for districts receiving more than $25 \%$ of their total general fund budget (TGFB) from state equalization aid to $20 \%$ of their ensuing SFY general fund budget, districts receiving $25 \%$ or less of their TGFB from state equalization aid to $30 \%$ of ensuing SFY general fund budget, and schools receiving no state equalization aid to $35 \%$ of ensuing SFY general fund budget.

## Votes:

The motion passed unanimously with all members voting aye, except for Rep. Grinde.

Amendments:
Rep. Kadas moved to increase category 8 elementary districts' schedule funding by $9 \%$ and require that any cap be based on the foundation program amount.

Votes:
The motion passed unanimously with all members voting aye.

Amendments:
Rep. Kadas moved to amend the gray bill to change ANB calculation method to an enrollment amount.

Discussion:
Rep. Kadas stated that this is a simple, more accurate way of counting students in the districts.

Votes:
The motion failed 5-3.
Amendments:
Rep. Kadas moved to fully fund transportation schedule reimbursement in same manner that the county portion of elementary transportation is currently funded, to place transportation into the general fund, and eliminate the transportation fund and levy.

Discussion:
Rep. Kadas stated that there won't be a state payment but, the district would get money from the mandatory basic mills that it levies.

Rep. Glaser asked whether the allowable costs would be shown as a separate item in the general fund expenditures? Rep. Kadas said that we should put it in the general fund but districts may not spend it all on transportation.

Rep. Eudaily asked if the $\$ 17$ million would be distributed in the schedules? Rep. Kadas said no, it is distributed according to the transportation schedules.

Rep. Eudaily stated that the districts would have no ability to levy anything but the voted levy to increase the transportation costs or they could take it from their other programs.

## Motion Withdrawn:

Rep. Kadas withdrew his motion.
Amendments:
Rep. Schye moved to delete tuition amendments from the gray bill.
Votes:
The motion passed 5-2 with Rep. Peck voting nay and Rep. Glaser voting nay.

Amendments:
Rep. Kadas moved to amend the gray bill to only include retirement and comprehensive insurance in the district general fund and leave all other school funds as in current law, to eliminate the current county retirement levy and comprehensive insurance levy, to delete the state retirement levy proposed in the gray bill, and to require transfer of
any balance in a district's retirement fund to its general fund.

## Votes:

The motion passed unanimously.
Amendments:
Rep. Eudaily moved to amend the gray bill to include retirement in the foundation program schedules and delete the requirement for OPI to direct pay district contributions for retirement, social security, and unemployment insurance.

Discussion:
Rep. Kadas stated that he doesn't want to put retirement into the schedules until he sees how other things pan out. Also he wants Greg Groepper, OPI, to respond about having OPI make the direct payments.

Mr. Groepper stated that the state would withhold from the schedule any PERS or teachers' retirement, UI and FICA, and OPI would make the payment to those funds. They could hold back the foundation program distribution that would equal the amount of the employers' contribution and send that to the various retirement programs and federal government. The money would be in the funds quicker to draw interest, it would cut down the cost for PERS and teachers retirement for handling all of the paper work.

Rep. Eudaily stated that the money is available so it must be drawing interest somewhere and who will get the interest on this. Mr. Groepper stated that when OPI makes the foundation program payments they make them five times a year, up until OPI makes the payment, the money draws interest in the general fund. When OPI makes the payment and until the check clears the state of Montana, it draws interest into the general fund.

Rep. Glaser stated that there is about $\$ 35$ million per year of social security money that would no longer go to the local banks.

Rep. Kadas asked how would OPI deal with districts that don't receive any foundation payments? Mr. Groepper stated that whether or not you receive a foundation payment will depend on how the committee ends up funding this.

## Votes:

The motion failed with a tie with Rep. Peck voting nay, Rep. Harrington voting nay, Rep. Kadas voting nay, Rep. Schye voting nay, Rep. Eudaily voting aye, Rep. Gilbert voting aye, Rep. Glaser voting aye and Rep. Grinde voting aye.

## ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment At: 5:40 p.m.


RP/jf
6104.min

DAILY ROLL CALL
SELECT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION FUNDING
date $3-16-89$

| NAME | PRESENT | ABSENT | EXCUSED |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chairman Peck | X |  |  |
| Vice Chairman Eudaily | $X$ |  |  |
| Rep. Gilbert | $X$ |  |  |
| Rep. Glaser | $X$ |  |  |
| Rep. Grinder | $X$ |  |  |
| .Rep. Harrington | $X$ |  |  |
| Rep. Kadas | $X$ |  |  |
| Rep. Schye |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Form CS -30A
Rev. 1985

School Funding Proposal
Representative Eudaily
March 16, 1989
Motions:

1. Amend the gray bill to only include retirement and comprehensive insurance in the district general fund, and leave all other school funds as in current law. Eliminate the current county retirement levy and comprehensive insurance levy, and delete the state retirement levy proposed in the gray bill. Require transfer of any balance in a district's retirement fund to its general fund.
2. Amend the gray bill to include retirement in the foundation program schedules and delete the requirement for OPI to direct pay district contributions for retirement, social security, and unemployment insurance.
3. Include comprehensive insurance in the foundation program schedules (as provided in the gray bill).
4. Amend the gray bill to reinstate tuition. (Leave tuition as provided in current law.)
5. Amend the gray bill io adjust foundation program schedules for school fiscal year 1990-1991 to provide funding equal to 85\% of total 1988 general fund expenditures (not including special education) plus retirement and comprehensive insurance.
6. Amend the gray bill to provide cap on maximum general fund budget at $120 \%$ (rather than $117 \%$ ) of foundation program. The cap would be effective upon the effective date of the bill. Districts then currently above the cap would be frozen, but would not have to reduce budgets.
7. Eliminate the 10 -mill permissive levy (as provided in the gray bill).
8. Lottery revenue would be reallocated to state equalization aid (as provided in gray bill).
9. (Glaser motion on 3-7-89 raised county elementary levy to 60 mills and county high school levy to 40 mills).
10. Expenditures using PL 874 money would not be subject to cap on maximum general fund budget, until such time as the system is approved by secretary of education as meeting federal wealth neutrality test.
11. Amend the gray bill to delete the $20 \%$ limit on the general fund cash reserve. (Leave at $35 \%$ as in current law.)
12. No motion - leave schedule categories as currently defined. but include for study in separate bill.

|  | Current law | SB 203 <br> (introduced) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SB } 203 \\ & \text { (gray) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SB } 203 \\ & \text { (3rdreading) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{11 \text { budgeted }}{\text { Eunds, } 15+} \\ & \text { nonbudgeted } \\ & \text { funds, reserves } \\ & \text { in some } \end{aligned}$ | Retain current funds except add comprehensive insurance to GF | 4 budgeted funds: general, building, transportation, adult education | Retain <br> current funds <br> except add <br> retirement to GF |
| 2. | Mandatory county retirement levy for PERS, TRS, UI, SS, ( 25 mill average) district retirement fund, lottery s used for equalizaton | ```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``` |
| 3. | ```Mandatory district levy for comprehensive insurance (5 mill average)``` | Included in GF and $F P$ schedule | Included in GF and $F P$ schedule | No change, but study needs and method of equalization (\$5 million appropriation proposed for state support in FY 91 separate bill) |
| 4. | ```Separate tuition fund, tuition agreements required for nonresident pupils``` | No tuition except out of state, attendance agreements required | ```Same as introduced, except effective July 1990``` | Same as introduced, except effective FY 91 |
| 5. | FP schedules not <br> based on actual <br> costs of <br> operating <br> schools | 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 |
| 6. | No statutory expenditure $\frac{\overline{\text { limitations }}}{(\text { except I-I } 05)}$ | Voted levy <br> 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 |


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

OFFICE OF THE LEEISLATIVE ALDITOR
FY＇ 70 REVENES USCD IN FINAKING PROPOSAL FOR FOUNDRTION PAMEETT
$30 \%$
REVENUE SOURCE：HJR ND． 15 FY日G SCHEDULE ADJUSTMENT 1.50
6／16／89（2：37 F\％

RPHUNT OF ERSE EXPONDITURES ECLiCine
$\$ 435.827 .045$

AVAILRELE REVENUE SOURCES：

| INCOME TAX | \＄81．604．000 |
| :---: | :---: |
| CORFORATE LICENE TAX | Fi1．632．006 |
| U．S．CIL \％Ofs noyalilejo | \＄17．123．000 |
| INTEREST ${ }^{\text {a INCOME }}$ | ：33．639．003 |
| cari tax | 5，010，000 |
| EDUCATION TRUST | \＄1．564，000 |
| COUNTY REVENUES LESS MANDATORY LEVY | \＄3．926，000 |
| DISTRICT REVENES LESS PERIM．LEYY | 31．410，000 |
| LOTTERY REVEMAE | \＄4．000，000 |


| Tictal revenje sulures | ：5：57．024．000 |
| :---: | :---: |
| zifference <br> LESS AMOUNT FUNDED EY STRTEWIDE 100 MILLS | $\$ 278.803 .045$ <br> $\$ 170,300,800$ |
| AYOLNT NOT FINDED BY 100 MILLS | \＄88，502． 245 |
|  | －E．5． |

FOANDATION PROGRAT：

| GENERAL FUND | \＄445，3EJ． 847 |
| :---: | :---: |
| RETIREMENT FUND | \＄52．7č4．06E |
| COFP．INSURAYCE | \＄10，6ç0， 110 |
| LESS SPECIRL ED | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 508.708 .023 \\ & \$=4.45 .75! \end{aligned}$ |
| ERSE FCJMOATION | 3484．25こ．27E |
| HJN－：亏 REVEMLE EsTHMATE COTIERY REVENUE <br> ES5 MANDATORY MILLS <br> LESS PERMISSIVE LENY | $\begin{array}{r} : 55.786,000 \\ \$ 4.000 .006 \\ 35.635 .000 \\ 3: 7.127 .000 \end{array}$ |
| TOTAL AVAILAELE | \＄157．0E4．006 |

DIfreRence

FY＇90 STATEWIDE TAXABLE VALLATIDFi $\quad 11,9013,008,000$
＋SPECIAL EUUCATION IN THE REIIREMENT FUND IS AN ESTIMATE ERSED DN DISCUSSION WITH OPI PENSONNE
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HB
School Funding Proposal 16-Mar-89

## Expenditure Base to be Equalized 1987-1988 School District Trustee Reports


Direct State Appropriation Allowable Special Education Costs $\$ 35.020$ Allowable Transportation Costs
Total Direct Appropriation
$\$ 52.841$
P.L. 874 Expenditures $\ddagger 18.901$
Foundation and Retirement \$467.778
=========
Equalization Mechanism
$80 \%$ equalized through schedules \& retirement $\$ 374.222$
$10 \%$ equalized through permissive
46.778
Total Foundation and Permissive
$\$ 421.000$
=========
School Funding Proposal16－Mar－89
Expenditure Base to be Equalized 1987－1988 School District Trustee Reports
General Fund ..... $\$ 445.851$
Retirement ..... 52.724
Comprehensive Insurance ..... 10.620
Transportation ..... 28.436
Bus Reserve ..... 1.860
Non－operating ..... 0.029
Total Expenditure Base ..... \＄539．520
Direct State Appropriation
Allowable Special Education Costs ..... $\$ 35.020$
Allowable Transportation Costs17.821
Total Direct Appropriation ..... \＄52．841
P．L． 874 Expenditures ..... \＄18．901
Foundation and Retirement ..... $\$ 467.778$
＝＝ニニ＝＝ニニ＝
Equalization Mechanism
90 \％equalized through schedules \＆retirement ..... $\$ 421.000$No permissive0.000
Total Foundation ..... $\$ 421.000$
$\qquad$

School Funding Proposal
March 16, 1989

## MOTION:

1. Equalize 85 percent of the fiscal 1988 expenditure base (excluding PL 874 expenditures) through the foundation schedules.
2. Provide a 9 percent increase in funding for category 8 of the elementary schedules (ANB of more than 300). This category would be increased by 1.8018 and the other elementary and high school size categories would be increased by 1.653.
3. Tie cap to foundation program schedule funding at 25 percent above the schedules as funded at 85 percent of 1988 base.
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ROLL CALL VOTE
SELECT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION FUNDING
DATE $\qquad$ $3-16-89$

BILL NO. $\qquad$ SB 203 NUMBER $\qquad$

| NAME | AYE | NAY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Vice Chairman Eudaily | $X$ |  |
| Rep. Gilbert | $X$ |  |
| Rep. Glaser | $X$ |  |
| Rep. Grinde | $X$ |  |
| Rep. Harrington |  | $X$ |
| Rep. Kadas |  | $X$ |
| Rep. Schye |  | $X$ |
| Chairman Peck: |  | $X$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |


morion: Rep. Eudally moved to amend the gray bill to include retirement in the foundation program schedules and delete the requirement for OPI to direct pay district contributions for retirement, social security, and unemployment insurano.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

